

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

THE  
CHURCHMAN

---

APRIL, 1899.

---

ART. I.—UNITARIANISM.

THERE are many popular misconceptions concerning Unitarianism, one of which is the misconception that Unitarians are merely theists or deists or monotheists. But as Unitarians believe in the personality and fatherhood of God, they are not mere theists; and as they believe also in revealed religion, they are not mere deists. Nor are they monotheists in the sense in which Jews and Mohammedans are monotheists; for, unlike the Jews, they believe that the Messiah has come, and has, in the Person of Jesus Christ, not only provided an incomparable pattern for the conduct of mankind, but has also manifested forth many of the attributes of God. Not, indeed, in the sense of an Incarnation, but of an Epiphany, many Unitarians behold in Jesus Christ "God manifest in the flesh." It is this belief in Jesus Christ which differentiates the monotheism of Unitarians from that of the most benignant and progressive Jews. And their monotheism is sundered from that of Islam by the whole immeasurableness of its difference in the fundamental conception of God—the Allah of Mohammed being a God of inexorable sovereignty and irresistible will, a Deity above, away from, entirely outside His devotees; whereas the God of modern Unitarianism is a God of righteousness and holiness and love, an immanent God, inspiring and dwelling within the pure and lowly of heart. The Mohammedan crouches beneath the rod of an inflexible Despot; the Unitarian bows before the throne of an all-merciful Father.

And as Unitarians are distinct from all non-Christian monotheists, so also are they distinguishable, in some measure at least, from the Arians of the fourth and fifth centuries and the Socinians of the sixteenth and seventeenth

centuries of the Christian era. Though leaning doctrinally towards Arianism, and especially towards semi-Arianism and Sabellianism, they are partially separated from these heresies by a strong reluctance to dogmatize upon the origin, nature, and attributes of Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit. Arius was not merely a denier, he was a dogmatist. He was a restless heresiarch and ambitious founder of a sect. But nothing is more characteristic of Unitarians, particularly of modern Unitarians, than their antagonism to dogma and their frequent unwillingness to regard even themselves as a Church or a sect. They consider religion a purely personal matter.

Arius would probably have accepted the decrees of the Nicene Council and gloried in them, if he could have added one little letter to the word *homoousion*. But modern Unitarians would accept no edicts of Councils, no articles of creeds, however favourable to themselves the edicts might be, or however anti-Trinitarian the articles. Their dogma is to hold no dogma, and their creed to fix no creed. The trust-deeds of all their places of worship are undogmatic. Ecclesiastically, Unitarians have no organization, being purely congregational; and doctrinally, they are wholly without any formulated system of theology. In respect to both organization and dogmatism they are therefore different from the Arians of the earlier centuries.

And they differ more widely still from the Socinians. Genuine Socinianism has never taken any real hold of Western Europe. Its chief abodes have been in Poland and Transylvania. In England there has been only one congregation of veritable Socinians, the congregation gathered by John Biddle in London during the time of the Commonwealth, and carried on, after Biddle's imprisonment and death, by his pupil Thomas Firmin. With the termination of Firmin's ministry, this solitary congregation of English Socinians disappeared.<sup>1</sup> The principal tenets by which Socinians may be distinguished from Unitarians are the cognoscibility of God, the nominal supremacy of the Scriptures, and the official Divinity of Christ. They have many other minor differences on such matters as baptism, the ascension of our Lord as a preparation for His public ministry, the operation of the Divine Spirit on the human mind, the exquisite torments and final extermination of the wicked, the acquisition of wealth by honest industry, the tenure of magisterial offices, and the like; yet in the supposed anthropic comprehensibility of the Deity, the ambassadorial Godhead of Jesus, and the artificial, though nominally supreme, authority

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Blunt's "Dictionary of Sects and Schools of Thought," p. 567.

of Scripture, we find the principal points of distinction between Socinianism and Unitarianism.

According to the Socinian doctrine, the nature and being of God fall fully within the scope of human reason. God is represented as vastly more perfect than man, yet in nothing beyond the reach of human reason and comprehension. The memorial tablet at Siena erected in honour of Fausto Paolo Sozzini (Faustus Socinus), the founder of Socinianism, characterizes him as "the vindicator of human reason against the supernatural." Socinianism is practically the deification of one single faculty of human nature—namely, reason. Nothing in the scheme of Socinianism is permitted to transcend the perception and sovereignty of reason, not even God Himself.

In like manner the authority of Scripture is subjugated beneath the sceptre of reason. Technically, the Socinians ascribe an immense authority to the Scriptures. They declare that all knowledge of Divine things must be derived from the Bible; but they also declare that "the Bible must be interpreted in conformity with the dictates of right reason; and by "right reason" they mean neither the individual spiritual mind nor the hallowed collective understanding of the Church, but simply natural intelligence and comprehension. Hence, as Mosheim states,<sup>1</sup> "the fundamental maxim of the whole Socinian theology is this: Nothing must be admitted as a Divine doctrine but what the human mind can fully comprehend; and whatever the Holy Scriptures teach concerning either the nature of God or the redemption of man" must be so interpreted as neither to transcend human reason nor afford scope for the supernatural. Socinus himself declares that he regards "the sacred Scriptures as his only guide"; yet, while yielding this nominal homage to the Bible, he practically destroyed its authority as a Divine revelation by making natural reason the sole and supreme interpreter of its oracles. Modern Unitarians do not technically ascribe the same paramount authority to the Bible as the Socinians, but it is certain that the great majority of them pay more real reverence to it. Those Unitarians are in a distinct and diminishing minority who wholly rationalize the Bible, and deny even to its most spiritual revelations any significance above the full grasp of natural reason.

It is not difficult to understand why the Socinians, and especially its early apostles, outwardly rendered such flattering homage to the Bible, while inwardly undermining its entire authority. Some of its early apostles were Italians, living within sight or sound of the miseries and profanities of

<sup>1</sup> "Ecclesiastical History," Book iv., sect. iii., pt. ii.

papal Rome at the period of its worst corruptions. Revolted by the iniquities of the Roman Curia, they were bent upon destroying it. In this enterprise they looked for aid to the Reformers, especially to Calvin and the Swiss doctors. With many of the Swiss reformers the paramount authority, even the verbal infallibility, of the Bible was a primary article of belief. It was necessary, therefore, for Socinus to adopt Swiss forms of speech in reference to the Bible, unless he was prepared to forfeit the aid of the Swiss doctors in his crusade against papal iniquities and papal pretensions. Hence his nominal homage to the Bible and his general adoption of orthodox theological terminology; while under cover of this terminology he was subtly assailing the most treasured tenets of the orthodox Protestant faith. He used the same words and names as the Swiss reformers, but in a wholly different and frequently hostile sense. Nothing is more characteristic of Socinianism than its disingenuous use of familiar theological terms in an unfamiliar sense. In this respect modern Unitarians shine forth in splendid contrast; for however far we may deem them to fall short in their perceptions of the verities of revelation, nothing is more alien from their universal temper than any inclination towards disingenuousness.

Socinian disingenuousness was displayed not only in nominal homage to the Bible, but also in the kind of Godhead ascribed to our Blessed Lord. Here again the Socinians, dreading a rupture with the Swiss reformers, used orthodox terms in an anti-orthodox sense. They ascribed Godhead to Jesus, but only representative or ambassadorial Godhead. Jesus indeed was God, yet not actually and really God, God only officially and by delegation. He was a man, yet not a mere man; He was God, and yet not verily and eternally God. He was miraculously conceived by the Holy Ghost—what this may be supposed to mean in the Socinian sense, seeing that Socinians believe the Holy Ghost to be neither God nor a person, I find it impossible to realize—yet though Divinely conceived Jesus was not Divine. Thus while seeming to adopt the evangelistic narrative, the Socinians practically explained it away. Their interpretation of the Ascension also was peculiar to themselves. They placed it before the beginning of our Lord's public ministry. According to them our Blessed Lord "before entering on His public labours was thought to have been elevated into the immediate presence of God Himself, in order that He might be there invested with authority; and as the high reward of the obedience which He showed in His capacity of Pattern-man, of Teacher, and of Legislator, He was finally admitted to a

share of the Divine sovereignty, and made in one sense equal with the Father. For this reason we may fairly be required to offer Christ a secondary kind of adoration, provided only that it never trenches on the worship which we pay to God Himself."<sup>1</sup>

On this question of the adoration of Christ, great disputes, culminating in divisions, took place in the first days of Socinianism. Owing to these disputes, the followers of Socinus were separated into two sects, denominated "adorantes" and "non-adorantes." Socinus maintained both the adoration and invocation of Christ; Francis David, originally a disciple of Socinus, was the leader of the non-adorants and against all worship of Christ. He also opposed the offering of prayer to Him either directly or through His mediation to the Father. But neither adorants nor non-adorants ascribed a real Godhead to our Blessed Lord; although both alike ascribed to Him an official, *i.e.*, a nominal or titular Godhead. As in reference to the Bible, so also with regard to the Christ, they used ancient and accepted terms in a novel and unaccepted sense. Their phraseology was Protestant and Catholic, but their doctrine was individual and heretical. They sought the shelter of the Bible and the Creeds for teachings which the Creeds were specifically intended to suppress, and which none but themselves could discover in the Bible. All such subterfuges modern Unitarians honourably disdain. They ascribe neither an unreal Godhead to Christ, nor an unreal Sovereignty to the Bible, nor an unreal cognoscibility to the Supreme Deity. Whatever their errors, they are absolutely free from all stain of subterfuge.

It is, however, much more easy to discriminate modern Unitarians ecclesiastically from Arians and ethically from Socinians than to state with anything approaching to precision what their tenets actually are. As they reject all catechisms and creeds and formularies of faith, it is next to impossible to describe, and altogether impossible to define, them. Not a few Unitarians refuse to consider themselves as a religious body at all, and wholly repudiate the imputation of belonging to an organized sect, although others, in common conversation, not uncommonly speak of "the Unitarian Church." Each Unitarian congregation is strictly a vague concourse of individuals bound together against orthodoxy by an indeterminate number of negations, but bound together among themselves by—nothing.<sup>2</sup> In almost any modern Unitarian

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Hardwick's "History of the Reformation," p. 265.

<sup>2</sup> Their contention that they are bound together by liberalism in religion is inadequate, for liberalism is by no means a note exclusively proper to Unitarians.

congregation you could find some persons whose opinions are scarcely distinguishable from those of pure deists, and others who approximate in reality, though not confessedly, to the Catholic faith. They do not all use even the same baptismal formula: some baptize simply "in (or into) the name of the Lord Jesus;" others use (what they call) the formula of the Lord Jesus, and baptize "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit."<sup>1</sup> As elsewhere, so among Unitarians, there are high, low, and broad religionists—persons exceedingly diverse in religious taste, temper, and conviction. Unitarianism is thus a vague and wide term, ranging from simple Deism to approximate Trinitarianism. It has no formal creed, and is perhaps best described, in the language of Unitarians themselves, as a "general way of looking at the subject of religion."<sup>2</sup> Unitarianism is a temper, not a creed; a leaven, not a church; a subjective rather than an objective faith; more a system of negations than of positive beliefs; not a definite grasp of religious truth, but "a general way of looking at religion."

We have seen that modern Unitarians are neither Arians nor Socinians. The Socinians, indeed, styled themselves Unitarians; but very few modern Unitarians would be content to call themselves Socinians.<sup>3</sup> Yet, despite their divergencies, modern Unitarians have not a few features in common with both Arians and Socinians. All alike disbelieve in the Catholic and Apostolic doctrine of the Unity of God. What Unitarians believe in is not the unity—for unity implies undivided plurality—but the single absolute oneness, the uni-personality, of God. The orthodox faith is that the Godhead is a Unity; Unitarians believe that God is a Unit. In reference to our Lord Jesus Christ, the differences of belief among Unitarians are immense, some regarding Him as mere man, others as their Lord, their Divine Master, their adorable Teacher and Saviour, in a unique and very special sense the Son of God, but yet not God the Son.<sup>4</sup> "We look upon

<sup>1</sup> In the Prayer-Book compiled for the use of the Unitarian congregation in Little Portland Street, there are four alternative forms for baptism: (1) "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." (2) "I baptize thee in the name of Jesus Christ." (3) "I dedicate thee to the kingdom of God, through His Son Jesus Christ." (4) "In the name of Jesus Christ, I dedicate thee to God, our Father in heaven."

<sup>2</sup> Cf. "Essex Hall Year Book," 1899.

<sup>3</sup> Biddle's congregation were variously described as Biddellians or Socinians, or Unitarians, but I have often heard modern Unitarians repudiate the appellation of Socinians, and rightly so.

<sup>4</sup> "Regarding the person of Christ," writes Dr. Beard ("Cycl. Rel. Den.," p. 302), "various opinions are held by Unitarians . . . ranging

Jesus Christ," they say, "as the greatest and holiest of Teachers, but not God."<sup>1</sup>

Together with the Eternal Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ they reject, and necessarily reject, the redemption through His blood. For all Unitarians clearly perceive what some Trinitarians are slow in realizing—viz., the essential connection between the Incarnation of the Godhead and the redemption of our manhood. Moreover, in rejecting the Incarnation Unitarians feel themselves logically bound to reject the Atonement, and, in rejecting the Atonement, to reject also the need for the Atonement—a need deeply seated in, and not separable from, the inherent corruption of man's nature and its alienation from the righteousness and holiness of God. Having rejected the Incarnation, they cannot therefore but reject the inherent depravity of man, his being sold under sin,<sup>2</sup> the moral and spiritual bondage from which the Atonement was Divinely undertaken to set man free. They frequently, indeed, use the terms "salvation" and "Saviour," but for them these terms have none other than a human aspect. "Salvation" in their vocabulary means only "deliverance from sin, including everything that heals and helps man towards goodness and God." It does not include any sacrifice for sin, any making of Christ to be sin for us, the just for the unjust,<sup>3</sup> any redeeming oblation to the justice of God. The whole effect of redemption, in the Unitarian view, is upon man, and upon each individual man, not by reason of his baptismal incorporation in the Redeemer, nor even by a justifying faith, but by reason of its efficacy as an object-lesson in the hatefulness of sin and the beauty of an ideal self-sacrifice. Whatever in the New Testament seems to inculcate the doctrine of the remission of sins through the shedding of blood, and that blood the blood of the Incarnate God, they reject as the old leaven of the Jewish doctrine of sacrifice lingering in the new wine-skins of the Gospel.

This liberty to reject whatever they suppose to savour of Judaism is grounded upon the postulate that the Bible, "whilst worthy of all reverence as the text-book of religion, is not itself the Word of God, but the record of God's gradual revelation of His truth and will—a human record, to be studied with perfect freedom, in order to distinguish the Divine from the purely human." Very much is made among

---

from the high Arianism of Milton to the simple Humanitarianism of Belsham; corresponding alike to the pre-existent Logos of John and the 'man approved of God' of Luke. There are other Unitarians who decline to speculate on the point."

<sup>1</sup> "Essex Hall Year Book," 1899.

<sup>2</sup> Rom. vii. 14.

<sup>3</sup> 1 Pet. iii. 18.



Unitarians of this distinction between the Bible as a revelation and as only the record of a revelation. And it is upon the assumption of its being only a series of human records that they base their claim to study it with "perfect freedom"—*i.e.*, independently of primitive tradition and patristic interpretation.

It is not strange that this "perfect freedom," being nothing else than the liberty of individual interpretation, and individual interpretation varying with the knowledge or ignorance, the spiritual temper or the rationalizing tendency, of each several interpreter who is let loose into the library of the Bible to pick and choose, each according to his own idiosyncrasy, what in the Bible is human and what Divine—it is not strange, I say, that this "perfect freedom" should not be able to formulate itself into any definite doctrine or to crystallize into a creed. In theory every Unitarian decides his own belief *ab ovo* for himself, without assistance either from primitive creeds or the teaching Church.

Yet in actual practice Unitarians depend upon, and are influenced by, their environment just as much as other persons. Their creed, or, to use their own phrase, "their way of looking at religion," is for the most part the creed or the way of their upbringing. As the Trinitarian breathes the comprehensive air of the great Universal Church, so the Unitarian breathes the less expansive air of his nursery and his home—often a very beautiful and religious home, yet not grand as a church. The Trinitarian is nourished upon the Ecumenical creeds, the Unitarian upon family traditions. But as family traditions are numerous and variant, so the Unitarian "ways of looking at religion" are numerous and variant also. It is only in abstract theory that every Unitarian possesses "perfect freedom" to distinguish for himself what is Divine and what human in the Bible, and to formulate his own creed accordingly. Unitarians are but men, and therefore do not and cannot possess absolute individual freedom. They live and think and act under the influence of environment like other men. Their religious tenets, therefore, naturally form themselves into groups, and are more or less spiritual, more or less rationalistic, more or less political, according to environment. No one familiar with Unitarian circles can fail to observe that there are among them two distinct and opposing tendencies—one radical and sceptical, the other spiritual and conservative—and that family traditions and political companionships have a large share in determining to which of these groups each individual Unitarian belongs.

Yet even these distinct and opposing groups are more or

less bound together by their negations. None of them believe in the unity of the Triune Godhead, or the expiatory sacrifice of the Redeemer, or the fallen nature of man, or the inspired supremacy of Holy Scripture. None of them believe that Christ founded on earth a Catholic and Apostolic Church, or that He ordained a special order for the ministry of the Word and Sacraments, or conferred an inherent grace on Holy Baptism and Holy Communion. None of them believe, with Arius, that the Christ was of like essence with the Father; nor, like Socinus, that heaven and hell are separate worlds. On the other hand, very few of them consider Christ either as a myth in the sense invented by Strauss, or as the kind of amiable Rabbi whom, according to the dramatic fictions of M. Renan, death has made Divine.

JOHN W. DIGGLE.

(*To be continued.*)



## ART. II.—THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE PENTATEUCH.

### No. XIX.

I HAVE not yet seen the new "Dictionary of the Bible." But if it be true, as has been stated, that in it Professor Ryle has placed the composition of Deuteronomy in the reign of Ahaz, the opponents of Wellhausen and his school have reason once more to congratulate themselves. Just as in the case of the New Testament, the followers of German critics of the Old Testament are being forced slowly backward in the date they are compelled to assign to its various books. Originally Deuteronomy was supposed by Wellhausen and his school to have been written shortly before its supposed discovery in the Temple. Professor Driver's theories in regard to the Pentateuch in general have already been described by Professor James Robertson,<sup>1</sup> as "a set of critical canons quite different from those of Wellhausen," and I have quite independently remarked on his recent description of Deuteronomy as a "compilation," not a composition, of the age—or somewhere about the age—in which it appeared, as a new departure. And now its composition, or, it may be, compilation, has been driven backward from the reign of Hezekiah to that of Ahaz. All this is an excellent omen of the prospects before those who would criticise the critics. It were, however, much to be wished that the "intelligent students" in our Universities

<sup>1</sup> "Early Religion of Israel," Preface, p. x (first edit.).

would depart from the attitude they have assumed, so admirably described by Dr. Salmon in his recent work on the text of the New Testament. It may be all very well "to accept the [alleged] new discoveries" with "little examination and less knowledge, believing that one is ranging one's self on the side of learned progressive research against fossilized bigotry."<sup>1</sup> But one is bound at least to read and to examine the arguments of those who apply the same methods to the critics of the Old Testament that these critics do to the Old Testament itself.

To proceed with our examination of the alleged sources. We may pass over chaps. xxix., xxx., as containing little to our purpose. In chap. xxix. vers. 24, 29 are apparently assigned to P because שפחה, not אמה, is the word used. Of course this is pure assumption.<sup>2</sup> Whether the probability of the assumption is greater than the improbability that the redactor would have been likely to have interrupted his transcription of JE here in order to introduce from P the utterly unimportant details in vers. 24, 29, may be left to the reader to decide. The narrator, however, of the "eighth or ninth century B.C." in xxx. 3, 4, 9, 10, is evidently aware that Bilhah and Zilpah have been previously mentioned by his successor of four centuries afterwards.<sup>3</sup> The phenomena appear, therefore, to point, here as often elsewhere, not to transcription from two different MSS., but to unity of authorship.

Coming to chap. xxxi., one cannot but see the importance attached to Bethel by *all* the writers who are supposed to have been used for this narrative. Why this general agreement on such a point, when we are told that the object of the later writers was to glorify *Jerusalem*, and when we know that Bethel had long, at the time when even J and E wrote, been the centre of an idolatrous worship on the part of the followers of Jeroboam? It is remarkable, moreover, that this prominence of Bethel in early history is witnessed to by the

<sup>1</sup> "Some Criticisms of the Text of the New Testament," p. 9.

<sup>2</sup> It is rather awkward for the critics that שפחה suddenly appears in xxx. 18 in a continuous selection from JE. But criticism is equal to the occasion. שפחה in this verse is the redactor's insertion! See also note on p. 519 of the CHURCHMAN for 1898 on "ama" and "shipcha," as Wellhausen calls them.

<sup>3</sup> One must have the eye of a hawk to avoid making a slip occasionally. And if one *does* make a slip, others have the eye and the swoop of the hawk, and are down upon one at once. I had forgotten for the moment that my argument as to ver. 4 has been anticipated by the usual convenient expedient of assigning the first part of ver. 4 to P. The assignment is a little astounding. First of all, there is no ground, literary, historical, or "stylistic," for it; next, in ver. 9 the parallel passage in regard to Zilpah is *not* assigned to P.

author of the later chapters of the Book of Judges,<sup>1</sup> parts of which are admitted to be of early origin. Here, then, we have the post-exilic writer once more in possession of early authentic information, and once more, like Balaam, blessing that which it is supposed to have been his intention to curse.<sup>2</sup>

I must refer my readers to the Kautzsch and Socin for the strange and altogether arbitrary division of chap. xxx. 1-4 between JE and the redactor, because I do not understand our latest school to insist on the accuracy of this division in all its detail. It is remarkable enough, in the eyes of any genuine critic, to find that *four words only* ("and God remembered Rachel") in ver. 22, in a continuous narrative (in which, by the way, the words "Jehovah" and "Elohim" are *not* indications of authorship), are supposed to have been taken from P. What *criterion* "stylistic" or other, has established this fact we are left to imagine. We proceed to xxxi. 18,<sup>3</sup> where the words "and all his substance which he had gathered, the cattle of his getting, which he had gotten in Paddan-Aram, for to go to Isaac his father in the land of Canaan," are detached from a continuous narrative of E, and assigned to P because of the words רכש and "Paddan-Aram," which are supposed to be characteristic of P. With Paddan-Aram I have previously dealt.<sup>4</sup> As to רכש, the statement that it is characteristic of P is a mere assertion, incapable of being proved. If it *can* be proved, let the proof be given. As to Paddan-Aram, we have a similar severance of a brief passage in chap. xxxiii. 18 from a continuous narrative simply because it contains the word Paddan-Aram, and for

<sup>1</sup> Judg. xx. 18, 26. Professor Driver thinks it difficult to separate the older from the later part of chap. xx. None but an early writer, however, would have given prominence to Bethel.

<sup>2</sup> Since the above was written, I have observed in the *Church Gazette*, March 4, 1899, a statement that "Jacob's conduct is of a piece with what we know of *bætulion* worship in other places." The critics really cannot be allowed to employ contradictory arguments to strengthen their position. In patriarchal times the form of worship would naturally be determined by the *cults* of surrounding nations, and if Jacob were here following the precedent of "*bætulion*-worship," the fact makes for the genuineness of the history. But if the whole history has been "*worked over*" in the interests of Judaism, the whole strength of the later redactors would have been employed to remove all traces of these earlier cults from it. If the writer of the article above cited be correct, he has brought forward a strong argument for the authenticity of Genesis.

<sup>3</sup> It may help us to have P's continuous narrative here: "And when Rachel saw she had no children, and she gave him Bilhah her handmaid to wife. And God remembered Rachel and all the substance which he had gathered, the cattle of his getting," etc.—an interesting and truly consecutive narrative.

<sup>4</sup> CHURCHMAN for September, 1897, pp. 618-620, and for January, 1898, p. 175.

no other reason whatever.<sup>1</sup> And those who have so severed it have failed, in spite of their claims to be the only scientific critics, to notice the two significant facts, (1) that the passage *was not written in Canaan*, and (2) that it was written for those who were ignorant of Canaanitish geography. No Israelite of post-exilic times could have been ignorant that Shechem was in Canaan. Israel in Egypt, or in the wilderness, might very possibly have been so. Moreover, P's narrative is a little startling here. In xxxiii. 18 Jacob starts "to go to Isaac his father. In xxxiii. 18 we find that P has brought him suddenly to Shalem, or Shechem. Here, once more, we have not the whole of P's narrative, but find a very serious *lacuna* instead. J brings him to Succoth. E assumes, for what reasons we know not, that he has arrived at Shechem. JE, again, knows nothing of Jacob's arrival at Shechem. At least, nothing is *said* about it. Yet in chap. xxxiv. both P and JE agree in stating that he *was* there. Again we ask, *Why* is this? And why was a short passage from P inserted here instead of the obviously parallel narrative of J or E? J brings Jacob to *Succoth* (xxxiii. 17), and E finds him at Shechem, encamping before "the city" (clearly Shechem), of which we have no mention in his narrative, but only in the extract from the post-exilic writer of four or five centuries later. Once more, then, we are confronted with a whole set of facts which demand some explanation, but have received none. Nor ought chap. xxxi. 47, which gives both the Hebrew and Aramaic names of the "heap of witness," to be passed over. Kautzsch and Socin assign it to the post-exilic redactor. But how did he know the Aramaic name of the heap of witness? And if he *did* know it, what reason had he for mentioning it? He was writing long after the events he recorded had passed away. No one was likely to care in the least, in post-exilic times, what the Aramaic name was. On the other hand, if we are here following the course of an

---

<sup>1</sup> Here again it may be well to give P's narrative consecutively. I follow on from the place where I left off (see last page): "which he had gathered in Paddan-Aram, for to go to Isaac his father in the land of Canaan. And Jacob came to Shalem [or "came safe and sound to"], a city of Shechem, which is in the land of Canaan, when he came from Paddan-Aram." Then follows the story of Dinah. It is obvious that the probability of the insertion of the story of Dinah between the statement that Jacob started to go to his father (xxxi. 18) and the statement that he came to him (xxxv. 27) becomes smaller in inverse proportion to the amount of detail usually contained in the history. For the continuity of P, see last paper. The character of P's narrative, taken as a whole, demands a vast deal more investigation than it has as yet received. The more one examines the subject, the more one feels that the critical analysis has not been accepted on objective, but on subjective, grounds.

authentic narrative, the touch is natural, and marks the full information of the writer.<sup>1</sup> The allusions to the oath by the "fear of Isaac," too, in chap. xxxi. 42, 53, seem altogether unintelligible, unless they are of very early date. Here, again, is an indication of the ancient *cults*, of which, on the critical theory, it was the object of the redactor to obliterate every trace. On the traditional theory all is natural and probable.

We proceed now to chap. xxxiv. The treatment of this chapter is so elaborate that the only way to display it is to put JE and P into parallel columns. It will be seen that the redactor pieces together his narrative in a very remarkable, not to say eccentric, manner. The result does credit to his ingenuity. But one is a little inclined to wonder why he gave himself so much trouble, when two presumably coherent narratives lay before him. And the separate narratives are, to say the least, extraordinary, and appear to demand a great deal more critical examination than they have at present received. Let the reader carefully study each of them in detail :

## CHAP. XXXIV.

*JE's Narrative.*<sup>2</sup>

"To see the daughters of the land. Saw her, and he took her and lay with her and humbled her. And his soul clave unto Dinah, the daughter of Jacob, and [he] spake kindly to the damsel. Now Jacob heard that he had defiled Dinah his daughter, and his sons were with his cattle in the field, and Jacob held his peace until they came. And the sons of Jacob came in from the field when they heard it, and the men were grieved, and

## CHAP. XXXIV.

*P's Narrative.*

"And Dinah, the daughter of Leah, which she bare unto Jacob, went out. And Shechem, the son of Hamor the Hivite, the prince of the land, and he loved the damsel. And Shechem spake unto his father Hamor, saying, Get me this damsel to wife. And Hamor, the father of Shechem, went out unto Jacob to commune with him. And Hamor communed with them, saying, The soul of my son Shechem longeth for your daughter. I pray you, give her unto him to wife. And make ye marriages with us ; give your daughters unto us and take

<sup>1</sup> I am not an Aramaic scholar, but it might be interesting to inquire whether "Jegar-Sahadutha" is Aramaic of the third or fourth century B.C., or whether it is ancient. In Exod. xx. 6 the Targum has Samech instead of Sin, as here, in the word "Sahadutha."

<sup>2</sup> The words are taken from Professor Bissell's "Genesis printed in Colours." I have not the Polychrome Bible at hand.

they were very wroth, because he had wrought folly in Israel in lying with Jacob's daughter, which thing ought not to be done. And Shechem said unto her father and unto her brethren, Let me find favour in your eyes, and what ye shall say unto me I will give. Ask me never so much dowry and gift, and I will give according as ye shall say unto me, but give me the damsel to wife. And the young man deferred not to do the thing, because he had delight in Jacob's daughter, and he was honoured above all the house of his father. . . . Two of . . . Simeon and Levi, Dinah's brethren. And they slew Shechem with the edge of the sword, and took Dinah out of Shechem's house, and went forth. And Jacob said to Simeon and Levi, Ye have troubled me, to make me to stink among the inhabitants of the land, among the Canaanites and the Perizzites; and I being few in number, they will gather themselves against me and smite me, and I shall be destroyed, I and my house. And they said, Should he deal with our sister as with a harlot?"

our daughters unto you. And ye shall dwell with us: and the land shall be before you; dwell and trade ye therein, and get you possessions therein. And the sons of Jacob<sup>1</sup> answered Shechem and Hamor with guile, and spake [because he had defiled Dinah, their sister] and said to them, We cannot do this thing, to give our sister to one uncircumcised, for that were a reproach unto us. Only on this condition will we consent unto you: if ye will be as we be, that every male of you be circumcised, then will we give our daughters unto you, and we will take your daughters unto us, and we will become one people. But if ye will not hearken unto us, to be circumcised, then we will take our daughter and be gone. And their words pleased Hamor and Shechem, Hamor's son. And Hamor and Shechem his son came unto the gate of their city, and communed with the men of their city, saying, These men are peaceable with us; therefore let them dwell in the land and trade therein, for, behold, the land is large enough for them; let us take their daughters to us for wives, and let us give them our daughters. Only on this condition will the men consent unto us to dwell with us, to become our people, if every male among us be circumcised, as they are circumcised. Shall not their cattle and their substance and all their beasts be ours? Only let us consent unto them, and they will dwell with us. And unto

<sup>1</sup> See JE (ver. 7).

Hamor and Shechem hearkened all that went out of the gate of his city, and every man was circumcised, all that went out of the gate of his city. And it came to pass on the third day, when they were sore, that the sons of Jacob<sup>1</sup> took each man his sword and came upon the city unawares and slew all the males."<sup>2</sup>

We will take what is supposed to be the older narrative first. It commences in the middle of a sentence, "To see the daughters of the land." If we wish to fill up the gap in the sentence, we are driven to a narrative four or five centuries later. Once more we ask for some reason why the redactor used his authorities in this remarkable manner, and what, conceivably, his early authority had here that he preferred the later one. There is no obvious reason, "stylistic" or other, why the words "And Dinah went out" should be at least four hundred years later than "to see the daughters of the land." And it is surely not altogether unreasonable or unscientific to demand a full statement of the grounds on which this division has been made. Next, somebody, we know not who, "took her and lay with her." That this person was Shechem we never learn from JE at all. It is not by any means too intelligible from JE's narrative as it stands *who* has "wrought folly in Israel in lying with Jacob's daughter." There are indications in vers. 11, 26, that Shechem is the offender, but nothing more. Once more we are obliged to have recourse to the narrative of four or five centuries later to supply the blanks in the older narrative. Another strange *lacuna* appears in ver. 19: "The young man deferred not to do the thing." What thing? No "thing" has been mentioned. Grammatically, in JE's narrative, it means to marry Dinah. Once more the redactor fills up the deficiencies in JE from the far later narrative in P. Why? Had JE the same or different details? In either case the resort to P for all the salient features of the narrative, especially as he is known to be "formal and wearisome," needs some explanation. Can it be that JE, as in chap. xvii., "knows nothing" of the obligation of circumcision? Whether this be so or

<sup>1</sup> See JE (ver. 7).

<sup>2</sup> "Hamor and his son," in ver. 26, is now assigned by Kautzsch and Socin to the redactor, as are also vers. 27-29 and the words in brackets above in ver. 13.



not, what, once more we ask, was "the thing" which Shechem "deferred not to do"? Do not the phenomena point to the conclusion that P can be no more satisfactorily separated from JE than J from E?

Then the introduction of Simeon and Levi is a little abrupt and peculiar. Why should the mention of these be confined to JE? Was it because of the priestly functions assigned in the Priestly Code to the tribe of Levi? If so, why did the redactor, a disciple of the priestly party, rescue this fact from the oblivion to which his master P had consigned it? For the redactor has taken special trouble to drag Simeon and Levi in. They appear not only in JE's narrative, but in Jacob's song. Wellhausen, it is true, discovers a contradiction here which shows, in his opinion, that two narratives are combined. Simeon and Levi, he tells us, after they have slain *Hamor* and Shechem ("Hamor and his son" is now, as we have seen, assigned to the redactor by Kautzsch and Socin), go off with Dinah. After they have gone off, they return (ver. 27) and plunder the town. Then Simeon and Levi are alone spoken of in ver. 26, whereas *all* the sons of Jacob are spoken of in the next three verses.<sup>1</sup> Then, ver. 30 agrees with ver. 26, because "*Israel in corpore*" will have nothing to do with the violent proceedings of Simeon and Levi. Lastly, it is absurd to suppose that two individuals could overcome a town and slay its defenders. On these irrefutable grounds the division is effected. Just as if it were not a special characteristic of early Hebrew to give emphasis by repetition;<sup>2</sup> as if "Jacob" in ver. 30 must mean a tribe and not a person, while Simeon and Levi must mean themselves alone and unaided; as if anyone could possibly imagine that Simeon and Levi stormed Shechem themselves, without any followers; and as if, under the circumstances mentioned in what is assigned P, a very small troop would not have been sufficient to make victory certain. If, we may add, Simeon and Levi resorted to no such stratagem, how could victory have been secured at all, especially if there be any historic truth in the statement that all the tribes of Israel were not united in this summary act of vengeance? It should be noted, moreover, that the narrative as we now have it was known to the author of Jacob's song. Surely such criticism as that of Wellhausen is not so absolutely conclusive

<sup>1</sup> The words "sons of Jacob" are used by JE in ver. 7, by P in vers. 13 and 25, and by the redactor, according to Kautzsch and Socin, in ver. 27. Ordinary critics would see in all these traces of the same hand.

<sup>2</sup> Even the critical analysis cannot get rid of this characteristic, and it is admitted that it is found to a considerable extent in P, a post-exilic writer!

that we are debarred from examining, and cannot possibly be justified in rejecting, it. Moreover, Wellhausen's assignment of the portions of the narrative to their sources has no finality about it. Kautzsch and Socin assign vers. 27-29 to the redactor, thus destroying the premises on which Wellhausen's division rested. But it is not an uncommon practice with the new critics to disavow the premises on which their conclusion rests, and to retain the conclusion notwithstanding.

It is further worthy of note that it is the *redactor* himself who has here, brilliant and far-sighted as he often is, created the contradiction on which Wellhausen relies; for it is he who has introduced from JE the words "two of" Jacob's sons, "Simeon and Levi," while in ver. 27 he follows P in saying "the sons of Jacob." Could not the redactor, with the two alleged contradictory narratives before him, have observed the contradiction Wellhausen has brought to light? If not, was there no post-exilic critic capable of pointing the fact out to him? And if he had perceived it, would not he have corrected it?

The next noticeable point is that JE represents Simeon and Levi as taking Dinah out of Shechem's house. But JE "knows nothing" of her ever having been in it. The words "to see the daughters of the land" detached, as by the critics they are detached, from their context, are not sufficient to imply that she had entered the house of Shechem. Before we can get Dinah into Shechem's house in any reasonable way, we must put together again the dismembered narrative, and then the whole becomes intelligible. In fact, the alleged pre- and post-exilic narratives presuppose one another so continually and so plainly here that it is impossible to separate them. In other words, the narrative here is homogeneous, the division of it into JE and P an ingenious fiction. Jacob's language again, in vers. 30, 31, is more reconcilable with the destruction and spoliation of the city than with the mere murder of Shechem himself—a very light matter in days such as those, and, though not unlikely to cause a blood-feud with the Hivites of Shechem, most unlikely to embroil Jacob with the Canaanites and Perizzites as well.

It is possible that a yet more minute examination might reveal a good deal else to excite suspicion of the infallibility of the critics in their division of this chapter. We turn, however, to the supposed narrative of P. "Formal and wearisome" as, *ex hypothesi*, that narrative is, it is here quite as lively, if not a little livelier, than the narrative of JE. We really have a right to ask, in the interests of scientific discovery, that P shall keep up the character science has ascertained to be his. If he be not legal and precise, or at least a good deal more

legal and precise than his competitor, *cadit quæstio*, we have no *data* on which we can rest the severance of his narrative from the rest. This, however, is a question we will not further discuss, but leave it to the reader. There is no difference in the *Hebrew* style here. We are often told that even the *English* reader can discover the difference between the two writers. The case of this chapter is one in which the English reader is quite as capable of judging as the Hebrew scholar.

But to proceed to detail. Not to insist on the grammatical absurdity of such a sentence (with which, at present at least, the redactor is not held to have interfered) as "And Shechem, the son of Hamor the Hivite, the prince of the land, and he loved the damsel," there are serious gaps in P's narrative, which we are supposed to have almost, if not quite, *in extenso*. Dinah, for instance, is said to have been the daughter of Jacob by Leah. But the previous passage, in which this piece of information is to be found, is taken, so the critics tell us, from JE's narrative by the redactor. P up to this point "knows nothing" of Dinah. Of Leah, too, P "knows nothing," so far, except that Laban gave her Zilpah for a handmaid. He "knows nothing" of her marriage, nor of her bearing children to Jacob, though, it is true, he in a very slovenly fashion brings these things in later on (chap. xxxv. 46). Of course he *might* have assumed the truth of JE's narrative here. But *did* he? In page 171 I have given P's narrative as separated by the critics.<sup>1</sup> At first sight it seems as if Laban had only given Rachel to Jacob as his wife, and had solaced Leah, his eldest daughter (if P supposed her to be the elder), by making her a present of a "shipcha." It is true that P *afterwards* (in chap. xxxv. 46) mentions the sons of Leah. But that is to put "the cart before the horse." Either we must suppose that, in the original P, chap. xxxv. 23-29 *preceded* his narrative in chap. xxxiv., or we must postulate another *lacuna* in a history which we are told is given us *in extenso* or nearly so. But to proceed. Dinah, we are told by P, "went out." Went out whither and whence? Why should she *not* go out? And what had her "going out" to do with Shechem? The combined narrative makes all clear. But what ground can there possibly be for severing the words "to see the daughters of the land" from "went out"? Then, in ver. 6,

<sup>1</sup> And very odd the printer found it. No wonder his proof was returned to me scored with queries! For I must confess it very much resembles the well-known *jeu d'esprit*, "She went into the garden to cut some cabbagees to make an apple-pie," etc.

P tells us of a private conference between Hamor and Jacob concerning the marriage of their children. But in ver. 8 Jacob is suddenly multiplied into the plural number. Hamor is communing with "them." Thus P, though he "knows nothing" about it, is obviously acquainted with the return of Jacob's sons from the field. Dinah, too, is no longer "thy," but "your" daughter. If the aid of the redactor should be summoned to plaster over this crevice (Kautzsch and Socin have not discovered the need of him), this step will also obliterate all signs whereby we can arrive at the distinction of authorship. For the unseparated narrative here runs most smoothly and naturally. And it is an undesigned coincidence—that is to say, it is in strict keeping with all we learn of him elsewhere—that the timid Jacob does not venture to arrive at any conclusion without the presence and countenance of his sons. As JE tells us, the patriarch "held his peace until his sons came." It was they, not he, who dared to be "wroth" at the "folly" Shechem had "wrought in Israel," by "dealing with their sister as with a harlot." Once more, it is only the narrative as we have it that brings this out clearly, though the touches which indicate Jacob's character are to be found equally in both portions of it. But surely all this is very surprising, if the separatist theory be true. Surely, the more carefully the history is examined, the less probable that theory appears.

Then, again, it is P who records the ferocious dealings of Simeon and Levi with the male inhabitants of Shechem. But he does not give us the slightest hint of any dishonourable conduct, or even overtures, on the part of any one of them to Dinah. Save in the part of ver. 13 assigned by Kautzsch and Socin to the redactor, P "knows nothing" of any outrage offered to Dinah. All we are told is that Shechem loved Dinah, and was anxious to make all kinds of sacrifices to marry her. It is, to say the least, a little unusual to receive honourable proposals of marriage and perpetual amity in quite so ferocious a manner, especially on the side of the weaker party. Here, at least, P's narrative must have suffered some serious omissions, or it is a scandal to Jewish history and literature, and would have been felt to be such by the Jews themselves. Criticism clearly here has invented a number of difficulties which do not exist in the story as it stands. Then, in regard to the general reasonableness of the story, we have to thank Professor Driver once more here, as in chap. xxvii., for departing from his usual custom and giving a reason for his division of chap. xxxiv. Whence he derived his argument it is impossible to say. It does not appear in Wellhausen's "Komposition des Hexateuchs." If it is Professor Driver's own,

he is hardly to be congratulated upon it. It proves that, although he may be an admirable authority on the reconstruction of a corrupt Hebrew text, as a judge of the historical probability of a narrative he is, if this be original criticism of his own, about the worst authority conceivable. We have heard him on Rebekah.<sup>1</sup> Let us listen to him on Shechem and Dinah. "The motives and aims of the actors seem not to be *uniformly the same*. In vers. 3, 11, 12, Shechem himself is the spokesman, and his aim is the *personal* one of securing Dinah as his wife; in vers. 8-10 (*cf.* 16, 21-23) his father Hamor is spokesman, and his aim is to secure an amalgamation between his people and Jacob's."<sup>2</sup> Were it not that Dr. Driver is invariably serious, one might suspect him of a little sly humour here, at his reader's expense. His *naïveté* is so exquisite. Can he tell us of any marriage in which it is not, presumably at least, the desire of the intended bridegroom to possess the lady, and in which, if the relatives are satisfied, it is not because they consider it a "good match"? This remarkable passage in Dr. Driver's "Introduction" might be described as one of the curiosities of criticism. And as such it must ultimately come to be regarded. If otherwise, then for the future, whenever we hear people say, "Everybody is delighted about it. He is so fond of her, and the family are pleased because it is such an excellent connection for them," the critical faculty of the hearers should be aroused, and they should set to work to find the "sources" of this want of "uniformity" in the description of "the motives and aims of the actors." The truth is that while a vivid, or, rather, a diseased, imagination has busied itself in the manufacture of divergencies, these alleged divergencies are creatures of the imagination alone. They have no existence in sober and solid fact. The theory is wanted to satisfy the preconceived ideas of its inventors. And the facts are tortured into agreement with it.<sup>3</sup>

J. J. LIAS.

<sup>1</sup> CHURCHMAN for January, 1899, p. 172.

<sup>2</sup> "Introduction," p. 15.

<sup>3</sup> Professor Green, in his "Unity of the Book of Genesis," pp. 388-398, shows how each critic of this chapter has a different analysis of its contents. Under these circumstances, it is a little bold, perhaps, to offer to the student *any* analysis at all as established. Professor Green adds (p. 396): "The critics have thus demonstrated that it is possible to sunder this chapter into parts, each of which, taken separately, shall yield a different narrative, and that this can be done very variously and with the most remarkable divergence in the results. Now, which are we to believe—Dillmann, Wellhausen, Oort, Kuenen, Merx, or Delitzsch? [The division in the text is that of Kautzsch and Socin.] They each profess to give us the original form or forms of the story, and no two agree. Is it

## ART. III.—THE SACERDOTIUM OF CHRIST.

## PART III.—THE HEAVENLY REALITY IN RELATION TO THE EARTHLY TYPES, AS ILLUMINED BY THE WORD OF PROPHECY AND THE LIGHT OF THE GOSPEL.

HAVING now viewed the typical shadows of the true *sacerdotium* in relation to the Grand Reality of the New Covenant, and having marked, in some important particulars, the *differentia* of the Heavenly Antitype, we must proceed in the present paper to fix our attention on the *sacerdotium* of Christ as seen in relation, not only to ceremonial types, but to the unfolding of the Divine Revelation, which was as a light shining more and more unto the perfect day.

We have already been led to recognise as the basis of this true *sacerdotium* the Divine Sonship of our Great High Priest.

In the light of the New Testament it can scarcely be necessary to observe that it must be impossible to take a true view of the *sacerdotal office* of Christ, apart from the true view of the *Incarnation* of the Son of God, and His Nature as the Only-begotten of the Father, very God of very God, and His relation to the Eternal counsel ordained before the world unto our glory. "We have a great High Priest, that is passed through the heavens, JESUS, THE SON OF GOD" (Heb. iv. 14).

Very observable is the collocation of two quotations from the Old Testament which we find in the fifth chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews. There, following on the assertion that "no man taketh this honour [of Priesthood] unto himself," the writer says, "So also Christ glorified not Himself to be made an high priest; but He that said unto Him, Thou art My Son, to-day have I begotten Thee. As He saith also in another place, Thou art a Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec" (vers. 5, 6). Observe the first word alleged as constituting Him by Divine appointment the Great High Priest of the new order is the word which speaks directly of Divine Sonship, "Thou art My Son."<sup>1</sup> Upon this *follows* the

---

not apparent that the critical process is purely subjective? The critic makes out of the narrative just what he pleases, selecting such portions as suit him, and discarding the rest. The result is a mere speculative fancy, without the slightest historical value." If Professor Green has rightly represented the facts here, is it quite candid of Professor Driver to tell the student (as he does in his "Introduction," p. 15) that "in chap. xxxiv. the analysis is not throughout equally certain," and to add no more on the divergence of the critics?

<sup>1</sup> Viewing the quotation from Ps. ii, in its relation to 2 Sam. vii., we may doubtless see in it more than an affirmation of the Divine Sonship of the Messiah. It has been said: "Jesus, who is the Messiah, is . . .

word which speaks of sacerdotal dignity, "Thou art a Priest for ever."

Doubtless we are intended to connect the ideas conveyed by these two quotations. Both apparently are to be dated together, and, if so, we can hardly be wrong in dating both, with St. Paul (Acts xiii. 35),<sup>1</sup> to the point of time when the world's Burden-bearer, having finished His burden-bearing work—having through death brought to naught the power of him that had the power of death—that is, the devil—entered on His resurrection life, begotten again from the dead by the Father's power through the blood of the everlasting Covenant, to live for ever the Man Christ Jesus, the Mediator of the

similar to Aaron in this, that like him He is called of God in the high priesthood, called in the prophecy of Nathan itself, and in the two Psalms, which refer to that prophecy, which represent the future Messiah as Mediator of men with God, and the second of which even names Him 'Priest' (Ebrard, "On Heb.," p. 181). See Perowne, "On Psalms," vol. i., p. 8.

"If the Messiah is to be a priest after the order of Melchisedec, then to him also is ascribed not the Levitical hereditary priesthood, but an independent priesthood having *its root in HIS OWN PERSON.*"—*Ibid.*, p. 214.

<sup>1</sup> Clemens Alexandrinus, indeed, would make this declaration of Ps. ii. 7 belong to the day of our Lord's baptism. But this is obviously the result of a misquotation (Pædag., Lib. I., cap. vi., Op., tom. i., p. 113; edit. Potter; Venice, 1757). See also Justin Martyr, "Dial. cum Tryph.," chap. lxxxviii; Lactantius, "De Vera Sapientia," Lib. IV., chap. xv.; Augustin, "Enchiridion," chap. xlix., § 14, Op., tom. vi., c. 215; Paris, 1685.

So others would date our Lord's priesthood to His baptism. This view is maintained by P. Damiani, who says: "Ipse cum sacramento Baptismatis et veri Sacerdotii jura suscepit" (Opusc. VI., cap. iv., Op., tom. iii., p. 44; Paris, 1743). See also Ferus, "In Pent.," f. 159, b, col. 1574.

And possibly such language may seem to some to admit of a sense which may be justified by regarding our Lord's baptism as the initial stage of His consecration to the *Sacerdotium* of the New Testament. See Lev. viii. 6. See also Luke iv. verses 14 and 18.

Dr. Owen, relying on John xvii. 19 (*ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἐγὼ ἀγιαζῶ ἑμαυτόν*), says: "In that prayer of our Saviour—John xvii.—do I place the beginning and entrance of the exercise of His priestly office" (Works, vol. xix., p. 154; edit. Gould).

But (1) let the proleptical character of this prayer be noted (see, e.g., ver. 4 and ver. 11: "I am no more in the world"). And then (2) let it be granted that this dedication (to use Owen's own words) "doth also respect the sacrifice which He was to offer: 'I consecrate and give up Myself to be a sacrifice.'" And then the Saviour's words will be found rather to confirm the view taken in the text.

On the sense of John xvii. 19 see Outram, "De Sacrificiis," pp. 286, 293, 294; edit. 1688; and Deylingius, "Obser. Sacr.," Par. iv., p. 560.

Lightfoot speaks of Christ being *sealed* "for the High Priest," both at His baptism and at His transfiguration, by which we are apparently to understand the recognition by Divine attestation of the qualification contained in His Divine Sonship. (See "Horæ Hebraicæ," on St. Matt., chap. xvii., ver. 2, vol. ii., p. 242; Oxford, 1859.)

New Covenant; to be exalted on our behalf; to enter the Most Holy Place, a Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedec.<sup>1</sup>

But further. We can hardly doubt that we are to see in

<sup>1</sup> "This day" of Ps. ii. 7 may, indeed, strictly be referred to the morning of Christ's resurrection—the day on which He was raised from "the womb of the earth, the 'Firstborn from the dead' (Col. i. 18), and had bestowed on Him the incommunicable prerogative of being 'Heir of all things' (Heb. i. 2)" (Kay, "On Psalms," p. 9). See Pearson, "On Creed": "Christ must therefore be acknowledged the *Son of God*, because He is raised immediately by God out of the earth unto immortal life" (p. 162; London, 1840).

But then it must be noted that this begetting anew is the result not only of what Christ was by nature, but also and rather of what in that nature, and in virtue of that nature, He had accomplished in His death—viz., the perfect Atonement of His sacrifice for sins (see 1 Cor. xv. 3, 17, 20). He was raised from the dead "in the blood of the Everlasting Covenant" (Heb. xiii. 20; cf. Rom. iv. 25, where the natural force of *dià* with an accusative ought not to be explained away. See Dr. Moule's admirable note on Romans, pp. 126, 127, and cf. Rom. viii. 10). He was "declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead" (Rom. i. 4; cf. Ps. xvi. 10; and Acts ii. 25, *sqq.*, with xiii. 35). It is well said by Bishop Bull: "In loco . . . Act. xiii. 32, 33, *Apostolus Paulus verba Davidis in Psalmo II<sup>o</sup>. Tu es Filius meus, ego hodie te genui, Christi ex mortuis resurrectioni accommodat, contra novos Artemonitas notandum est, id non ita accipiendum esse, quasi demum per et post resurrectionem Christus cœperit esse excellentissimo modo Dei Filius, et ab eo gigni, sed quia tum potentissime per resurrectionem verus atque unigenitus Dei Filius declaratus atque ostensus fuerit. Hic enim est Scripturæ mos, ut res tum dicantur fieri, cum manifestantur et sese produunt" ("Judicium Eccles. Cath.," v. 7; Works, vol. vi., pp. 113, 114; Oxford, 1846). See also Owen, "On Heb. vii. 26," Works, vol. xxii., p. 550; edit. Goold; and "On Heb. v. 9," vol. xxi., p. 534.*

If the second quotation (from Ps. cx.) is also to be dated to the same day, then the same principle of interpretation should be adopted. Christ is addressed as, and declared to be, what He had been before, and as having an office in which He had been accepted before—although the function and its recognition had been in suspense, as it were hid behind a cloud, during the brief period in which the Christ (see Westcott, "On Heb.," p. 122), the anointed Priest, was "a dead man" (*νεκρὸς*, Rev. i. 18).

In all this there is nothing that should be seen as contravening the truth that the Old Covenant came to an end in death, the death of Christ for us; and that when the blood of the New Covenant was shed for remission, the New Covenant in that blood was established, although the resurrection life of the New Covenant, and with it the *declared* recognition of the *Sacerdotium* of the New Covenant, with the confirmation of the Divine oath, waited for the fulfilment of the sign of the prophet Jonah.

Dean Jackson's view is doubtless the result of much thoughtful study of the subject. He holds that from the day of Christ's resurrection, "and not before, doth His endless everlasting priesthood commence" ("On Creed," Book IX., chap. iv., Works, vol. viii., p. 215; Oxford, 1844). But on the cross He was "a priest in *feri*, though not in *facto*, or a priest *inter consecrandum*." (p. 214). Thus "the sacrifice of the Son of God" is regarded "an intermediate (though an especial) part of His consecration to the priesthood after the order of Melchizedec; not the



the first quotation that which is the qualification for the office assigned in the second. In other words, we are to see in the priesthood of the One High Priest an office which, in a very true sense, belongs to His nature. The nearness, the mediatorial nearness, of the sacrificing priests who ministered in the shadows of earth was a nearness of merely elective calling. But the nearness of the One Mediator of the New Covenant, the One Priest after the order of Melchizedec, is inherent in His eternal relationship to the Father.<sup>1</sup> The glory

*ultimum esse*, or accomplishment of it" (p. 215 ; see also p. 245). Yet this does not hinder the Dean's recognition of the truth that "the everlasting sacrifice whereby He is consecrated an everlasting Priest was then accomplished, and the cessation of the Aaronical priesthood proclaimed, when He said, *Consummatum est*, and commended His spirit unto God" (chap. xxviii., p. 379).

It may, perhaps, be open to question whether Dean Jackson may not have gone somewhat too far in arguing, as regards Christ's consecration to the priesthood, from the ordinances of the Aaronical priesthood to the priesthood of the new order (see p. 212).

Certainly, if it be so that "the word of the oath since the law" (Heb. vii. 28) did then (at the Resurrection) make Him (*καθίστησιν*) priest (cf. iii. 2, *τω ποιήσαντι αὐτόν*), and that because of the sacrifice offered and accepted—then that very making must have been a formal and solemn recognition of His high priestly work accomplished before, for which work He must have been (in some sense) fully qualified before that solemn and formal recognition. And is not this very qualification indicated to us in the words which follow the telling us of His making—His making by the word of the oath? That word makes whom? *Υἱὸν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τετελειωμένον* (vii. 28).

On this point see Owen, "On Heb. v. 9," Works, vol. xxi., p. 534 ; edit. Goold.

<sup>1</sup> So Cyril Alexandrinus speaks of Christ's priesthood as implicitly contained in His Divine Sonship, and its calling, therefore (after the order of Melchizedec), as differing from that after the order of Aaron : *Κέκληται τοῖνον καθ' ἑ καὶ Ἀαρῶν, πλὴν οὐκ ἐν ἴσῳ τρόπῳ ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἐχρίετο πρὸς ἱεροουργίαν, καὶ ἦν οἰκέτης, ὁ δὲ ὡς Υἱὸς καλεῖται, καὶ κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ ἱεροουργεῖ τῷ Πατρὶ* ("On Heb.," v. 5, Op., tom. vii., c. 973 ; edit. Migne). It is the calling to an office of sacerdotal nearness, which nearness was (in some sense) His before, because His by nature.

"The position of sonship includes every special honour, kingly or priestly. He to whom this had been given could not be said to 'glorify Himself.' The second quotation (Ps. cx. 4) defines the particular application of the first. The kingly priesthood of Melchizedec was promised to Christ. Such a priesthood naturally belongs to the exalted Son."—Westcott, "On Heb. v. 5, 6," p. 122.

"Christ, as sinless man, could approach God for Himself ; but He waited for His Father's appointment, that He might approach God as Son of man for sinful humanity. Comp. John viii. 54, 42 ; Acts iii. 13."—Westcott, "On Heb. v. 5," p. 122.

"Priorem adducit locum [Ps. ii. 7] quia in antecedente capite i. 5 quum Jesu Christi *διαφρόνητα* præ Angelis demonstrasset, eo usus erat ; quo ipso in animum revocat superiora, et de veritate magis convincit. Alludit etiam ad illum versu 8, quum de dignitate et eminentia sacerdotii exponit, *καίπερ ὢν Υἱὸς*. Innuvit, Christum ab eodem vocatum esse ad

which He has entered upon after His suffering is the very glory which He had with the Father before the worlds were. And after He had emptied Himself, and taken upon Him the form of a servant, made of a woman, made under the law, still the voice of the Father testified, "This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." This was testimony to Him, indeed, when, in the days of His flesh, He was on our side, on sin's side, of the veil; yet it was testimony to that in Him which was to rend the veil, and to hear the word, "Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee." Now, in the nearness which knows no separation, the mediatorial nearness of the man Christ Jesus, the nearness of the Priesthood after the order of Melchizedec, He ever liveth at God's right hand to make intercession for us.

But further. There is a teaching most important to be added here which has relation not only to the nature, but to the past work of our great High Priest. If we are right in the date to be assigned to the word which officially confers (or rather perhaps solemnly recognises) the priestly dignity, that word falls on His ear after He has finished His sacrificial work. Does such a statement strike some as strange and paradoxical? It may be asked, Are we, then, to suppose that our great High Priest glorified Himself to be made a high priest, and took upon Him to offer His sacrifice as high priest before He had received His appointment as high priest?

We have here before us a problem which seems to have led some reverent minds astray—seeking to find a way to escape from what may have appeared to them its perplexing difficulties—some falling into the error of supposing that the true *oblation* of the sacrifice was not made on the cross, but waited for the sacerdotal ministry of Christ in the heavens. Yet, as I am persuaded, the inspired Word not only leads us towards a light shining in our darkness, but in that light is seen pointing to a solution which leaves no difficulties, and brings the typical teaching of priesthood and sacrifice into line with the revealed mystery of God's redeeming love and His justifying grace in the Gospel of His dear Son.

It is not for nothing, we may be sure, that in the Epistle to the Hebrews, side by side with the teaching concerning the Priesthood, and the transition from that of Aaron to that of Melchizedec, we have set before us the true view of the relation

Pontificatum, a quo esset genitus, et a quo dictum ei esset *Υἱός μου ἐστὶν ὁ* ε. σ. γ. σ."—Carpzovii, "Sacrae Exercitationes," p. 229; Helmstadii, 1701.

"Qualem nobis Filium manifestavit Deus? an nullo honore, nullaque facultate præditum? imo ut inter se et homines Mediator esset. Ergo *sacerdotium continet genitura.*"—Calvin, "On Heb. v. 5," Op., tom. vii., p. 537; Amst., 1667.

of the Old Covenant to the New. The New casts forth the Old.<sup>1</sup> The Old Covenant had its teaching, typical shadows: the New Covenant has its blessed realities. The realities of the New do not belong to the shadows of the Old. They have no standing-place among them. Again, the shadows of the Old have no place among the realities of the New. The Old and the New are to be seen as clearly distinct one from another. They are not to stand together.<sup>2</sup> They are to be viewed in their distinction. Faith is to see them as separate. Yet there is a passage from the legal types to the realities of the Gospel. The Old was intended to lead to the New. But there is only

<sup>1</sup> Εἶπε, κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελησιδεκ. τοῦτο τὴν Λαρῶν ἰξίβαλεν . . . εἰ τοῖνυν ἱερῶσύνῃ εἰσήκται ἄλλη, δεῖ διαθήκην εἶναι ἑτέραν.—Chrysostom, "In Ep. ad Heb.," cap. vii., Hom. XIII., Op., tom. xii., p. 129; edit. Montfaucon; Paris, 1735. So also Johannes Damascenus, "In Ep. ad Heb.," chap. vii., Op., tom. ii., p. 242; Paris, 1712.

In the series of contrasts, in which the writer sets before us, in Heb. vii., the change, or transference, which accompanies the transition of the priesthood, we have :

(1) In verses 11-14, a change of law—νόμου μετάθεσις—a transference from law to law.

(2) In verses 15-17, a change from law to power of life—κατὰ δύναμιν ζωῆς ἀκαταλύτου.

(3) In verses 18-22, a change from the weakness and unprofitableness of the law to a better covenant, with Jesus as ἕγγυος, with a better hope, with nearness to God (cf. x. 19).

(4) In verses 23-25, a change from the many to the One, with no more need of transference, seeing the One is able to save to the uttermost, ever living to make intercession.

(5) In verses 26, 27, a change from many sinful priests, needing daily sacrifices for themselves and for the people, to the One who is holy, and higher than the heavens, having once for all offered Himself in sacrifice for sins.

(6) In verse 28, a change from men with infirmity to the Son—Υἱὸν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τετελειωμένον.

This last sums up and crowns all the foregoing. The transcendent dignity of the Divine Priesthood of the Son of God naturally demands a corresponding dignity of a new order of things, before which the old things are to pass away.

"When, at the death of our great High Priest, the veil . . . was rent in twain from the top to the bottom, there was clear demonstration that all those rites and services were abolished; and that the office of the high priest, which was distinguished from the other priests only by those usages [entering in the Holy of Holies], was now determined and brought to its full period. The pontificate, therefore, drawing its last breath, prophecies concerning the redemption of mankind by the great High Priest and Bishop of souls, 'that He should die for the people,' etc."—Lightfoot, "Horæ Hebraicæ," on John xi. 51, vol. iii., p. 372; Oxford, 1859.

<sup>2</sup> This was clearly seen and forcibly expressed thus: "Tamdiu enim debuit umbra manere et sacerdotium legis existere, quousque verus sacerdos verum sacrificium offerret in significato tabernaculo et veritate" "In Ep. ad Heb.," cap. viii., Comment., fol. 232, b.; edit. 1533; perhaps by Anselm of Laon, or rather Herveus. See Cave's "Hist. Lit.," p. 439.)

one way of transition from the one to the other. What is that one way? For those who accept the teaching of God's Word there is no room for question about the answer. The one only way is the Death of the Incarnate Son of God, the Atonement made by the Cross of Christ, the Redemption effected by His precious Blood, the Peace made by the Blood of the Cross.

Contemplate that death of Christ for a moment as the sure word of prophecy sets it before us in Isa. liii.<sup>1</sup> There we

<sup>1</sup> Thus the prophetic word interprets the typical sacrifice for sin. It is very noteworthy that this typical import of the sacrifice actually did develop itself (as Kurtz observes, p. 121, E. T.) in the heart of Judaism, without any New Testament influence. "Not only is it expressed from the pre-Christian standpoint of an Isaiah (chap. liii.), but from the equally pre-Christian standpoint of many of the later Rabbins, who maintained very decidedly that the animal sacrifices would cease with the coming of the Messiah, because *He would perform in the most perfect manner all that the sacrifices had been designed to accomplish.*"

Indeed, the juridical interpretation of sacrifice (the death of the victim being regarded as a *pœna vicaria*) has been the one generally received from the time of the Rabbins and the Fathers (see Kurtz, p. 123). It is impossible to explain away the undeniable fact that the doctrine of Isa. liii. as an exposition of sacrificial efficacy is in accord with the later Jewish theory which saw in the sin-offering a substitutional death (*Ibid.*, p. 107). See also "The Death of Christ," pp. 86, 87, and 46, 47.

The Revised Version of Lev. xvii. 11, which is generally approved by modern critics as preferable to the Authorised Version, need by no means be understood as excluding from the sense the idea of *pœna vicaria* (see Girdlestone's "Synonyms of the Old Testament," p. 129). Indeed, the LXX. version—though as a translation it may be discredited—may be regarded as bearing good witness to the sense in which the teaching was understood by Jewish authorities. (See Streane's "Age of Maccabees," p. 243; and Girdlestone's "Synonyms," p. 9.) And, indeed, there is elsewhere abundant evidence on this point. See Outram, "De Sacri," Lib. I., cap. xxii., § xi., pp. 258, 259 (Amst., 1688). Thus R. Salomon Jarchi wrote: "Anima omnis animantis est in sanguine. Quare eum dedi ad expiandas animas vestras. Veniet anima et animam expiabit." And Abenezra: "Sanguis expiat animã, quæ sibi inest, sensusque est; animã vice animæ." And R. Moses Ben Nachman: "Eum [sanguinem] in aram dedi, ut anima pecudis pro illius anima expiationem faciat." And so Isaac Ben Arama understands "animam scilicet vice animæ." And R. Lipmannus: "Victimæ animam vestrarum animalium vice dedi." And so Isaac Abrabanel: "Erit etiam pecudis sanguis (quia anima sentiens in eo inest) pro anima hominis. Anima nimirum vice animæ." And so Alenezra spoke of the sin-offering as "*pœnæ cuique debitæ λύτρον.*" The Hebrew of all these quotations may be seen in Outram. See also Schoettgen, "Horæ Heb.," tom. ii., p. 650 *et seq.*

Moreover, when it is admitted that "the juridical idea that the victim in the Mosaic sacrifices took the place of the sinner, and suffered vicariously, is certainly found in Isa. liii., and seems to be taught in Deut. xxi. 1-9 (comp. Exod. xxi. 23)" (see Oehler, in Schaff's "Encycl. of Herzog.," vol. iii., p. 1687; article "Offerings"), can it be doubted that in the Divine counsel there was that in the Mosaic sin-offering which was intended to convey the idea of *pœna vicaria*? See also Magee

see it in its relation, indeed, to the ceremonial types of the Law. It is an offering for guilt (ver. 10). Yet it is such an offering as the Law knows nothing of—the Servant of Jehovah, the Man of Sorrows, stricken for our transgressions, bearing the chastisement of our peace, so that “He shall see of the travail of His soul and be satisfied” (ver. 11).

But yet again contemplate that death for a moment, as it is set before us (apart from the dim light of typical teaching) in the clearer and fuller light of the Gospel revelation. Behold Christ dying, the just for the unjust, to bring us to God, redeeming us from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us—made to be sin for us who knew no sin—that God may be just, and yet the justifier of the justly-condemned sinner believing in Him who justifieth the ungodly. Contemplate that solemn hour—nay, rather, that supreme moment—in the history of the Universe, when the Death of Christ for us brings to an end the Old Covenant with its condemnation, and ushers in the New Covenant with its justification for the justly condemned. The Old, with its typical ordinances and its earthly tabernacle, has now no standing before God. Now the truth of all is made ours. Now old things have passed away, and all things are become new. And now, in the light of that which is new, we see how the truth of the New is the fulfilment and explanation of the shadows of the Old, and perceive the death of Christ the fulfilment and explanation of expiatory sacrifice, not only of sacrificial blood shedding, but of the sacerdotal offering and oblation to God.

The death of Christ the truth of sacrifice and of sacrificial oblation? But, then, offered by whom? By none other than Himself, who, possessing in His own person all the qualifications<sup>1</sup> of the order of priesthood after the order of Melchizedec,

“On Atonement,” pp. 70, 71, 94, 97; edit. 1849; and Archdeacon Perowne’s “Our High Priest in Heaven,” pp. 35-38, second edition.

<sup>1</sup> Ἀρχιερεὺς γὰρ ἐστὶ μόνος πιστὸς ὁ Υἱὸς, δυνάμιμος τοῦτοις, ὃν ἐστὶν ἀρχιερεὺς, ἀπαλλάξαι τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων.—Chrys., “In Ep. ad Heb.,” cap. ii., Hom. V., Op., tom. xii., p. 52; edit. Montfaucon; Paris, 1735.

τί συμβάλλεται τὸ τοιοῦτον πρὸς τὸ ζητούμενον; καὶ πανύγε· προκατασκευὴ γὰρ ἐστὶ τοῦ ὑπὸ Θεοῦ χειροτονηθῆναι.—*Ibid.*, cap. v., Hom. VIII., p. 82.

So Theodoret, after expounding the typical significance of the silence of the inspired record concerning the particulars in the case of Melchizedec, adds: ὁ μὲντοι Δεσπότης Χριστὸς φύσει καὶ ἀληθῶς τούτων ἕκαστον ἔχει.—“Ep. Heb.,” cap. vii., Op., tom. iii., p. 585; edit. Noesult; Halæ, 1771.

Compare the following:

Σοφῶς δὲ αὐτὸν εἰδείξεν οὐκ ἀρχιερίᾳ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ Υἱὸν προσαγορευόμενον, καὶ καινὴν τινα καὶ παράδοξον ἀρχιερωσύνην δεξάμενον.—Theodoret, “Ep. Heb.,” cap. v., Op., tom. iii., p. 573; Halæ, 1771.

Ἄλλ’ ὅμως ἐπανθρωπήσας ὁ μονογενὴς τοῦ Θεοῦ Υἱὸς, καὶ ἀρχιερεὺς ἡμῶν ἐγένετο κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ, οὐκ ἀξίωμα προσλαβὼν, ἀλλὰ τὴν θείαν κατακρύψας ἀξίαν καὶ τὴν ὑπὲρ τῆς ἡμετέρας σωτηρίας καταδεξάμενος ταπεινότητα.—*Ibid.*, cap. vii., Op., tom. iii., pp. 585, 586; Halæ, 1771.

received not the title of Priest while the Old Covenant was standing, because the Old Covenant had its priests of another order; and while the law stands, the priests of the law are to stand. Christ is no Priest of the Law. He has no Priesthood after the order of Aaron. His priesthood has no standing-place while the law stands. But when the Old Covenant falls in His death, immediately that death is recognised as the One Atoning Sacrifice. And He Himself is to be recognised as the One Priest—the Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedec<sup>1</sup> the Priest, not now a Priest in virtue of His Priesthood to offer sacrifice or to do the work of sacerdotal oblation in the future, but rather in virtue of His One Sacrifice in the past, to be invested with the dignity of the Royal Priesthood, King of Righteousness and King of Peace, to sit a Priest upon His throne for ever.<sup>2</sup>

If, in the statement of this view, some details may be open to question, there can hardly be any question about the truth that, in transferring our ideas from the shadows to the realities, a difference, and one of the most important of differences, to be recognised is this: that, whereas in the shadow, sacrificial propitiation is the end and purpose of priesthood, in the corresponding reality the one atoning sacrifice is the starting-point, not the end, the ἀρχή, not the τέλος, of the priestly function. The importance of this point must plead an apology for again and again insisting upon it.

If we would view this matter in the truth of the Divine reality, we must recognise the stupendous *opus operatum* which was typified by the throwing open of the Holy of Holies, when the veil of the Temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom. That veil was a shadow—the typical shadow of a truth of most awful significance for outcast sinners—condemned to eternal outcasting. But it was the shadow of a reality which belonged to the Old Covenant, and has no place in the new. By that veil—the Holy Ghost thus signified that the way into the holiest was not yet made manifest while as yet the first tabernacle had

<sup>1</sup> Bishop Pearson says: "Neither was the death of Christ necessary only in respect of us immediately for whom He died, but in reference to the Priest Himself who died, both in regard of the qualification of Himself and consummation of His office" ("On Creed," Article IV., under section "Dead," p. 328; edit. Hobson, 1840).

<sup>2</sup> See Jewel (Works, ii., p. 738, P.S.): "Christ only is that priest for ever according to the order of Melchizedec. He hath made an endless sacrifice; He Himself hath offered up Himself unto God His Father upon the cross. Therefore God the Father saith unto Him, 'Thou art a priest for ever'; not any mortal creature or worldly wight, but Thou (only), being both God and man, are that priest for ever."

its standing.<sup>1</sup> The high priest of the shadow ministered once a year on the other side of the veil. The true High Priest, having made His way through the veil, that is to say, His flesh (*i.e.*, the life of the flesh which He took for us), ministers behind no veil. The days of the veil were the days of the Old Covenant which are past—the days in which He lived the life of our flesh upon earth. The Holy of Holies is now thrown quite open, and we have boldness to enter into the Holiest by the blood of Jesus—not once a year, but every day; not because every day is a day of atonement, but because the atonement of that one day has done its perfect work, and left the way quite open, and open for ever. Our High Priest is the Priest, not of a hidden place behind the veil, but of the rent veil, of a rent veil and an open heaven<sup>2</sup>—a throne of grace with nothing between—“no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus.”

When Christ overcame the sharpness of death,<sup>3</sup> He opened the kingdom of Heaven to all believers.

Here the limits of our space require us not to stop, but to pause. We cannot stop, for we are just about to enter on ground which we have been aiming at in our progress hitherto. But we may well pause in admiring and adoring view of the one grand *opus operatum* which now stands before us—may we venture to say, stands as some snow-white mountain-peak against the sky, all on glow in the sunlight of heaven?

N. DIMOCK.

(To be continued.)

<sup>1</sup> Ὁσπηρ πολὺ τὸ μέσον Λαρῶν καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοσοῦτον ἡμῶν καὶ Ἰουδαίων τὸ μέσον. ὄρα γάρ· ἄνω ἔχομεν τὸ ἱερεῖον, ἄνω τὸν ἱερέα, τοιαύτας ἀναφέροντες θυσίας, τὰς ἐν ἐκείνῃ δυνάμενας τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ προσφέρεισθαι· λέλυται γὰρ τὰ τοῦ νόμου. ἀντεισενήνεκται δὲ ἡ λογικὴ λατρεία, τὰ διὰ Πνεύματος, ὅσα μὴ δεῖται σώματος, μὴ ὀρδίνων, μὴ τόπων. — Chrysostom, in Cramer's "Catena," tom. vii., p. 523; Oxford, 1844.

<sup>2</sup> Διεῖρηγνυτο καὶ τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ, τοῖς εἰς αὐτὸν πιστεύουσιν ἐκκαλίπτου ἤδη τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων, καὶ τὰ ἰσωτάτω δεικνύου· ὡς οὐκέτι μὲν ἐχούσης στάσις τῆς πρώτης σκιμῆς, πεφανερωμένης δὲ ἤδη τῆς τῶν ἁγίων ὁδοῦ, δῆλον δι' ὅτι τῆς εἰς τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων. — Cyril Alex., "Adv. Nestor," Lib. V., cap. v., Op., tom. ix., c. 236; edit. Migne.

It may be worth observing (lest we should follow the example of some German divines, and fasten our thoughts too much on the very physical *αἷμα*, instead of the sacrificial death of Him "who died the just for the unjust") that the veil was rent, not when the blood of life flowed from the pierced side, but when the life of this blood was poured out unto death—when *παρεδόθη εἰς θάνατον ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ* (Isa. liii. 12, LXX.).

<sup>3</sup> Tu, devicto mortis aculeo: aperuisti credentibus regna cœlorum." This is the Canticle's recognition of the true sacrificial work of the *Sacerdotium* of the New Covenant. It knows none other.

ART. IV.—POPE PIUS IV. AND THE ELIZABETHAN PRAYER-BOOK.

THE subject involved in this inquiry is not only interesting from a historical point of view, but it is also of importance in these days of renewed aggression on the part of the Italian Ecclesiastical Mission to this country. If it can be shown that an infallible Pope, so called, did offer to sanction the English Prayer-Book, then it follows that the validity of English Orders cannot consistently be disputed by Romish partisans, and that the mission of the Roman Church to these shores is schismatical, and, as such, a violation of Church order. These conclusions are apparent to all intelligent Romanists, and their aim, therefore, is to throw discredit upon the statement, and discard it as a fable.

In this paper I propose to cite in the briefest possible manner the evidence in favour of an affirmative answer to the question of the Pope's offer to confirm Elizabeth's Prayer-Book, and examine the rebutting testimony of the negative side. In fact, the process I have adopted is similar in principle to that of a court of law where evidence for and against is taken and sifted in order to determine the question of fact. In cases of this nature circumstantial evidence has great weight. Motives and probabilities command attention, and cumulative testimony is a convincing factor. The evidence of one person considered by itself may be of little value, but when others step into the witness-box and add link to link, a whole chain is made sufficiently strong upon which certainty may be safely placed. And so in the matter of historical investigations. Absolute proof is not always attainable, because the actual facts of the case may not have been committed to writing, or, if they have, they may have been destroyed by malice, or lost by accident; but there are other sources of testimony. Matters, circumstances, facts, corroborations may oftentimes be found which, though in themselves separately are not sufficient to carry conviction, yet together amount to proof positive, and especially so when a contrary explanation is weak.<sup>1</sup>

To return to the special question of our historical consideration, I must, in the first place, call attention to the circumstances and facts of the time which favour the opinion that the Pope's offer to confirm the English Prayer-Book was not then improbable.

I. The Papal power on the accession of Queen Elizabeth was shaken to its foundations, and apparently tottering to its fall.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Vide* stcourt's "Questions of Anglican Ordinations," p. 9.



The blows that it had received on all sides, and its losses in the conflicts of the Reformation movement, are too well known to need repetition. Rome herself, as Ranke tells us, looked out upon a shattered ecclesiastical empire, and lamented the fact that of all nations once under her sway Spain and Italy were the only ones safe and sound in their allegiance.<sup>1</sup> To recover the lost ascendancy became the imperative policy of the Roman Curia. By hook or by crook the revolted nations were to be brought to acknowledge the supremacy of the Pope. This by all means was to be the paramount end of Vatican astuteness, and neither conciliation, nor blandishments, nor promises should be wanted for its achievement.

II. The condition of England on the accession of Queen Elizabeth, and her policy of compromise and conciliation, are important considerations. She submitted to be crowned with all the ceremony of the Roman Pontifical, she retained the services of her sister's counsellors, she prided herself in the name of Catholic, and sent a special envoy to the Pope. For months the country was in union with the Papacy. The estrangement that followed the restoration of the Edwardian Service Book was thought at Rome to be only of a temporary character, which skilful diplomacy might remove. A Roman Catholic author writes: "A corporate return of the whole English nation to Catholic unity was in the year 1560 by no means an improbable event, and it is possible that the Pope, in his zeal for this most desirable consummation, may have contemplated the grant of certain privileges to a restored Catholic Church of England."<sup>2</sup> How anxious the Pope was to obtain the co-operation of Elizabeth in the revived assembly of the Council of Trent may be seen in the correspondence shown in Appendix I.

III. The use of an English Service Book did not at that time present an insurmountable difficulty to union with the Roman Church. The opinion was then general that every national Church had not only authority over its own discipline, but also to decree rites and ceremonies, and adopt uses suited to its taste and circumstances. Before the days of Queen Mary the Roman use had not been adopted in this country. Previously, as now, our people enjoyed their insular proclivities, and amongst these was the right of various and divers uses, as Salisbury, Hereford, Bangor, York, Lincoln. What Elizabeth did was to give the whole realm one use, and that in the vulgar tongue.<sup>3</sup> It should be remembered also that the dogmas

<sup>1</sup> Ranke, "Popes of Rome, vol. i., p. 390, *note*.

<sup>2</sup> Hutton's "Anglican Ministry," p. 136.

<sup>3</sup> *vide* Preface, Book of Common Prayer.

decreed by the Council of Trent had not yet been formulated and fixed in the Creed of Pope Pius IV.; indeed, some of them, as those relating to the ordination of the priesthood, sacrament of marriage, indulgence, purgatory, worship of saints, the most important reforming arrangements, were not decided upon until the three last sessions of the Council, in the latter half of 1563.<sup>1</sup> The hostility to the English use which eventually arose in the ultramontane mind after the theology of the Council was fixed and raised as a standard of orthodoxy did not then commonly exist.

Moreover, a prudent and conciliatory spirit had removed from the adopted Edwardian Liturgy expressions that might give offence. The deprecation in the Litany from the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities was expunged, and the rubric at the end of the Communion Office against the notion of our Lord's real and essential presence in the Holy Sacrament was omitted. The protestation at the end of the Communion Service disclaiming any intended adoration, by kneeling, "either unto the sacramental bread or wine there bodily received, or unto any real and essential presence there being of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood," was also left out. Besides these omissions, there were sundry additions of a like tendency. In the delivery of the elements in the Holy Communion the two sentences respectively before *take* and *drink this* were added, and the "Ornaments of the Church and the ministers thereof," enjoined by the first book of King Edward, were restored. Furthermore, the Forty-two Articles of Religion, established under Edward VI., were not adopted when the Book of Common Prayer was restored in 1559. The question of the Articles was not definitely settled until 1563.

In all these important changes, by avoiding definitions and leaving free scope for speculative opinions, it was manifestly the design of the Queen and her advisers not only to appease the prejudices of Romanist theologians abroad, but also "to unite the nation in one faith."<sup>2</sup> How favourably the English use under Elizabeth was considered at this time by leading Romanists in France may be seen in the correspondence of our ambassadors recorded in the Calendar of State Papers, under date December 28, A.D. 1561. Throgmorton, the English ambassador at the French Court, writes to Cecil: "The abuses of the Roman Church and clergy so long inveterate are now so discovered and disliked that there is no remedy; there must be some reformation universally of that state and kingdom.

<sup>1</sup> *Vide* Ranke, "Popes of Rome," vol. i., p. 252.

<sup>2</sup> Wheatley, "On the Common Prayer," p. 28.

The matter has come to that pass that the Cardinals and Bishops will now condescend to a reformation rather than hazard an entire destruction. It is the same with ecclesiastical princes as with secular potentates: every man stands upon his reputation, and desires to make his bargain as honourably and profitably as he can. As the formulary of the Church of England is better *allowed*<sup>1</sup> of the Papists, and less repugnant to them than that of Geneva, or any form used in Germany, he perceives that the English order will have more suffrages when the matter shall come in question than any other. Of late a learned Papist of great reputation in France told Throgmorton that he marvelled why the clergy of England did not fortify the ceremonies, rites, and observations retained in their Church with the authority of the ancient writers, and the examples of the old Churches, both amongst the Greeks and Latins. Since which time another man, singularly learned and a great favourer of the true religion, lately advised him to procure some of the clergy of England, substantially learned, and that had well travailed in antiquities and ancient Greek and Latin ecclesiastical writers, to set forth an Apology, to approve the ceremonies and usages retained in the Church of England, as he confessed they might do well enough; saying that the order in England (because they were not noted contemners of all antiquity and ceremonies) has more estimation amongst the adversaries than the novelties of Geneva. . . . Therefore it would be well if Cecil were to set some of the Bishops and learned men to work about this matter, and to put the same into Latin, like as is meet the whole ecclesiastical order should be, whereof there is already a part well done. A modest Apology will commend it greatly, and to avoid as much as may be to irritate any party. There is a good pattern already in the Preface of the Book of Service printed in Latin."<sup>2</sup>

There are good grounds for believing that the "learned Papist of great reputation" mentioned in this letter was no other than the powerful member of the House of Guise, the Cardinal of Lorraine, who was then the Papal Legate in France. I shall refer to another letter in support of this belief later on.

In corroboration of the statements of Throgmorton in the above letter, we have the demands of the Imperial delegates, as well as those of France, in the Council of Trent, which

<sup>1</sup> The word "allowed," from French *allower*, from Lat. *allaudare*, had then the meaning of "commended," "praised." Cf. Ps. xi. 6; Luke xi. 48 — "ye allow" (*συνευδοκείτε*). Vide Trench, "Select Glossary," p. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Calendar of State Papers, Foreign, 1561, No. 751.

reassembled, after a long interval, January 18, 1562. The Imperialists demanded that the cup should be given to the laity in Holy Communion; the marriage of priests; the purgation of breviaries, legends, and postilles (i.e., notes and explanations); more intelligible catechisms; and church psalmody in German. The Cardinal of Lorraine, at the head of the French prelates, supported on the whole the German proposals. They demanded the cup for the laity; the Sacraments to be administered in the mother-tongue; instruction and preaching at the Mass; and congregational singing of the Psalms in French.<sup>1</sup> The English Romanists also petitioned the Council for permission to use the Book of Common Prayer, thus showing that in their opinion the English Service Book only needed ecclesiastical authority to complete its usefulness for every religious purpose.<sup>2</sup>

Space forbids me to do more than hint at the Papal invitation to Elizabeth, several times renewed, to send delegates to the third assembly of the Council of Trent,<sup>3</sup> and also to the discussion held therein in reference to the validity and status of the English Episcopate.<sup>4</sup> All these incontrovertible facts of history show plainly that a *modus vivendi* existed at that period between England and Rome, provided the supremacy of the latter were acknowledged.

IV. One other consideration remains to be noticed. The character of Pope Pius IV. must be taken into account. He is described as a man of an easy-going nature, fond of life, worldly in tastes and manners, and resented the intrusion of anything that might disturb his peace. Conciliatory in disposition, he wished to be on good terms with everybody. With princes especially he courted favour, and "was convinced, and openly said so, that the power of the Pope could no longer be maintained without the authority of princes."<sup>5</sup> Some Italian writers say that he possessed "a mind more like that of a prince, who looks only to his own affairs, than of a Pontiff who has respect to the good and salvation of others."<sup>6</sup> In harmony with the latter description, Bishop Jewel mentions him as one who "purchased his place by the unjust practices of simony and bribery, and managed it with murder and cruelty."<sup>7</sup>

Such, then, are the facts and circumstances, related under these four heads, which antecedently would make the Papal offer to Queen Elizabeth most probable in the highest degree.

<sup>1</sup> Ranke, "Popes of Rome," vol. i., p. 243.

<sup>2</sup> Froude, *Longman's Magazine*, February, 1895.

<sup>3</sup> *Vide* Appendix I.

<sup>4</sup> *Vide* Appendix III.

<sup>5</sup> Ranke, "Popes of Rome," vol. i., pp. 236-240.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 257, note.

<sup>7</sup> Fuller, "Church History," Book IX., p. 70, edit. 1655.

Pope Julius III. had condoned the spoliation of the monasteries as the price of England's submission, under Queen Mary, to his supremacy, in spite of his Bull *Rescissio Alienationum*, which declared the restoration of ecclesiastical property to be an indispensable duty, the postponement of which would be followed with everlasting damnation.<sup>1</sup> He also authorized Cardinal Pole to allow the clergy consecrated according to the Reformed Ordinal to hold their benefices without reordination, conditional upon their submission to the Papacy.<sup>2</sup>

With such precedents as these—so near, too, in point of time—Pius IV., with his aims, character, and needs, might well justify his advances to England, and promise the recognition of the English Prayer-Book, if by so doing he could accomplish the dearest wish of his heart—the re-establishment of the Papal supremacy. That he did so, the following evidence is most conclusive :

Early in the year 1560, Vincent Parpaglia, Abbot of St. Salute, who had held a position in the household of Cardinal Pole, was selected as envoy to Elizabeth. He bore a most flattering letter to the Queen from the Pontiff, who addressed her thus: "To our most dear daughter in Christ, Elizabeth, Queen of England. Dear daughter in Christ, greeting and Apostolic benediction." He had also secret instructions and proposals, which Camden thinks were not put in writing.<sup>3</sup> At the same time the Pope wrote to Ferdinand, King of Hungary and Emperor, younger brother of Charles V., and to Philip II. of Spain, entreating their good offices with Elizabeth to secure the success of the Abbot's mission. "If she consents thereto," he writes to the former, "he will grant her anything in his power which may tend to the security of her kingdom."<sup>4</sup>

Cecil was informed of this embassy by a secret agent of his at Venice, one John Sheres, who had managed to bribe the private secretary of the Duke of Savoy's ambassador, and in this way obtain copies of letters to the Bishop of Vercelli, the Nuncio there. Sheres, amongst other things, gives the

<sup>1</sup> Ranke, "Popes of Rome," p. 230.

<sup>2</sup> Courayer, "Dissertation," etc., pp. 232-235, edit. Oxford, 1844.

<sup>3</sup> Camden's "Annals of Queen Elizabeth," pp. 33, 34, edit. 1635.

<sup>4</sup> Raynaldi, MS. Vatican 2896, quoted in Calendar of State Papers, Foreign, 1560 :

"May 5, 1560.—The Pope, anxious to reduce once more England to the union of the Catholic faith (of which he has some hope), has sent thither Parpaglia, Abbot of Saint Salute. . . . The Pope asks him to assist Parpaglia by writing and sending messages to the Queen, urging her to agree to the object of the mission. If she consents thereto, he will grant her anything in his power which may tend to the security of her kingdom."

suggestive information that "he [Parpaglia] goes to France to consult with some there, then to Flanders."<sup>1</sup> Sheres is corroborated in this by a despatch from Sir Thomas Parry, at Rome, to Cecil, under date June 6, 1560: "Her Majestie hath receaved lettres from Mr. Carne of the vi of May that ymportes that Abbate de Salute hath his dispathe. And comes by france into the low parts to the Regent, to pray her to send hither for a licence for him to com to do his message (S.P.O. Dom., 6 June, 1560). And ye have hard partly before this, Mr. Englefield hathe also wreten to my Lord Keeper of the Great Seal thereof" (Bacon).

This intimation of the visit to France is important in connection with the correspondence of our ambassadors from that Court, to which I shall presently refer.

Parpaglia arrived in Brussels about the middle of June, and waited there a considerable time for further instructions. He was refused admission into England, and there is no doubt whatever but that negotiations were carried on with the English Court by some channel or other. The latter fact is conclusive from the Abbot's letter to the Nuncio at Venice, which Sheres again managed to get a copy of, and which may be seen in the Calendar of State Papers, September 8, 1560. "Nevertheless," he writes, "this Queen says continually that she has a good opinion of the disposition of the present Pope, and would not refuse to listen willingly to what he might propose to her, hoping that he would not wish for anything but what was just, and for the good of herself and her kingdom."

From expressions in the Pope's letters, it cannot be denied that Parpaglia had definite proposals to make to the Queen. The closing sentence of the one entrusted to the Abbot demonstrates without the shadow of a doubt that conciliatory offers were in the charge of this envoy. It reads thus: "But concerning this matter, the same Vincentius shall deal with you more largely, and shall declare our fatherly affection toward you; and we entreat your Majesty to receive him graciously, to hear him diligently, and to give the same credit to his speeches as to ourselves." The question is, What were these proposals? Camden thinks they were not committed to writing; and, from the nature of the mission, one need not be surprised if such were really the case. But there is a fact mentioned in a letter dated December 3, 1560, from Chamberlain, the English ambassador in Spain, to Cecil, which makes it more than probable that they were

---

<sup>1</sup> Calendar of State Papers, Foreign, May 11, 1560, No. 74. *Vide* Appendix II.

committed to writing. He writes: "The talk is as to the person whom the Queen will send to the General Council now assented unto by the Pope, the Emperor, and the French and Spanish Kings, to be kept at Trent, and that she, for the quietness of Christendom, will not refuse to understand and hear the matter in question debated. Sent the Queen long since a copy of the Pope's brief, which the Abbot of St. Salute should have brought her."<sup>1</sup> Here, it is to be observed, the ambassador speaks of the Pope's *brief*, which he knew very well was something more than an ordinary letter. It has not, however, been found amongst the State Papers. Strange to say, other letters from the English ambassador at Rome and his suite, which might throw light upon this transaction, are also missing. The letters are those of Sir Edward Carne to the Queen, and of Sir Francis Englefield to Bacon, to which reference is made in Sir Thomas Parry's despatch to Cecil. The compiler of the Calendar of State Papers, Foreign, 1560-61, says in the preface that copies of certain letters, obtained by Sheres from the secretary of the Duke of Savoy's ambassador at Venice, relating to Parpaglia's mission, are missing from the collection. It is possible that all these documents may yet be found, though their disappearance from other records of the subject and period is mysterious.

D. MORRIS.

(*To be continued.*)



#### ART. V.—ST. AUGUSTINE OF HIPPO.

Smith's and Wace's "Dictionary of Christian Biography," vol. i.; Ceillier's "Auteurs Sacrés"; Ueberweg's "History of Philosophy," vol. i.; Schaff's "History of the Church, Nicene and Post-Nicene Christianity," vol. i.; Robertson's "History of the Christian Church," vol. ii.; "St. Augustine" (S.P.C.K.); "St. Augustine" (R.T.S.); Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, Augustinus.

THE end of the fourth century A.D. saw the final dissolution of the vast Roman Empire which had been reunited under Theodosius the Great. The East and West were divided between his two sons, weak boys of eighteen and eleven. Arcadius reigned at Constantinople, guided successively by his favourites, Rufinus and Eutropius, and by his wife Eudoxia, the bitter enemy of St. John Chrysostom. Honorius watched from Milan the resistance of the great general Stilicho to the tide of barbarian invasion which was

<sup>1</sup> Calendar of State Papers, Foreign, December 3, 1560, No. 762.

threatening to overwhelm Italy ; till the passage of the Alps by the Goths under Alaric made the feeble representative of the Cæsars seek safety in the impregnable fortifications and marshes of Ravenna, which remained the seat of the Court till the fall of the Western Empire. In 410 the civilized world was stupefied by the sack of Rome, and the Roman citizens who were able fled over the sea to the flourishing Roman provinces of North Africa. Still the strong race from the North pursued them. A Visigoth kingdom was set up in Spain ; the Vandals were led into Africa by Genseric ; and Augustine himself died in the middle of the siege of his own city, Hippo Royal, which was taken and destroyed a few months after his death.

During the whole of the fourth century Christianity was making great strides. In 313 came Constantine's Edict of Milan, establishing Universal Freedom of Religion, followed by other acts in favour of Christianity. In 324 Constantine, now sole Emperor, publicly professed the faith of Christ, and recommended it to his subjects. Next year was held, under the ægis of the Emperor, the first General Council, that of Nicæa, which condemned the Arians. In 363 Christianity, which had been abjured by the Emperor Julian the Apostate during his brief reign, was restored by the Emperor Jovian. In 381 was held at the imperial city of Constantinople the second General Council, that which condemned the Macedonian and Apollinarian heresies. In 381 and 385 laws were passed against heathen rites in both West and East ; and in 390 paganism received its final blow in the destruction of the famous temple at Alexandria, the Serapeum, and other shrines in Egypt, at the orders of Theodosius the Great, Emperor of the East.

It was an age, too, of illustrious Christian leaders : in 330 died Lactantius the Apologist ; about 340 was born St. Jerome ; in 347 St. John Chrysostom ; in 354 was born St. Augustine ; in 354 died St. Anthony, the father of the ascetic life ; in 368 died Hilary of Poitiers ; 372 is the traditional date of the birth of St. Patrick, the British Apostle of Ireland ; in 373 died the most illustrious champion of the faith, St. Athanasius ; in 379 died St. Basil the Great, and St. Ephrem Syrus ; in 386 died St. Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem ; in 390 died St. Gregory of Nazianzus ; in 395 St. Gregory of Nyssa ; in 397 St. Ambrose ; about 400 St. Martin, Bishop of Tours ; in 407 St. John Chrysostom ; in 420 St. Jerome.

The distinction between East and West in religious thought and speculation was always marked, the Eastern Fathers being constantly engaged in subtle questionings about the nature of Christ and the doctrine of the Trinity, whereas the leaders



of Western Christianity attended more to matters of conduct and practice. Christian thought had been raised in the third century to a very high level by the Catechetical School of Alexandria, founded at the end of the second century by Pantænus, and carried on by Clement, Origen, and their successors. "The Alexandrian theology aims at the reconciliation of Christianity with philosophy, of faith with knowledge; but it seeks this union on the basis of the Bible and the doctrine of the Church. Its centre, therefore, is the LOGOS, the Word, viewed as the sum of all reason and truth before and after the Incarnation. . . . The elements of truth in the heathen philosophy they attributed partly to the secret operation of the LOGOS in the word of reason, partly to acquaintance with the Jewish philosophy, the writings of Moses and the prophets."

And in the fourth century the leaders of Christian thought in the Eastern part of the civilized world were keenly exercised by the heresies of Arius, Sabellius, Macedonius, and Apollinaris. Christianity had ceased to be a despised sect of the lower middle class; it occupied the attention of the most prominent and able men of the day. It was the glory of Augustine to do for the West what men before him and of his day were doing for the East—to place Christianity in an intellectual and philosophical form which should satisfy the men of thought and culture; and in so doing he did more. The vigour of his mind, the brilliance of his eloquence, the originality of his thought, and the clearness of his language, left their impress on the form of Christian doctrine which has lasted from his day to ours, so that his influence in the Christian Church is second only to that of St. Paul, and is recognised alike by Roman and by Protestant.

It is not the purpose of this sketch to give a biography of St. Augustine. Few biographies would be more fascinating, and his own matchless "Confessions" have taken their place with the "Imitation of Christ" and the "Pilgrim's Progress" as one of the three most popular books in the world. But a brief outline may be given as an introduction to an estimate of his place in the history of philosophy and religion. Aurelius Augustinus was born November 13, 354 A.D., at the village of Thagaste, in the North African Province of Numidia, not far from his future bishopric, and died August 28, 430, while Bishop of Hippo Royal, in the middle of the siege of that town by the Vandals. His father, Patricius, was a heathen, but was baptized shortly before his death. His mother Monica was a fervent Christian, a woman of a very noble and beautiful character, and brought up her son as a Christian; but he was not baptized till his thirty-fourth year. After

going to school at Thagaste and at the neighbouring town of Madaura, at the age of seventeen he went to the University of Carthage, where he studied rhetoric with a view of becoming a Professor. As he was not yet definitely Christian, and was not restrained by moral or religious principle, his ardent affections led him into every kind of vice, details of which he has given with pathetic humility in his "Confessions." At the age of eighteen he had a natural son, whom he called Adeodatus (Given by God), by a young woman to whom he remained faithful for fourteen years. The son was his companion till an early death removed him, and was baptized at the same time as himself. At Carthage he for a time joined the Manichæans, a heretical sect from Persia, who tried to combine Christianity with the teaching of Zoroaster—that there are two great principles, good and evil, equally powerful, and perpetually in conflict. But with this system he soon became dissatisfied. For a time he became a sceptic, and studied the systems of Plato and the Neo-Platonists to see if he could find firmer ground. The idealism of Plato is always attractive to young and ardent minds; but it presents no firm basis. The Neo-Platonists had tried to evolve a philosophic system out of Greek philosophy which would comprise the supreme monotheism of the Christians and something of their ideal morality. But their notions were fantastic and far-fetched, and could not long keep hold of a mind so earnest, practical, and ardent as Augustine's. Having gone as a Professor of Rhetoric to Milan, he attended the sermons of the famous Bishop Ambrose, on account of their finished and powerful eloquence. Ambrose stirred in him all his latent sympathy with the sublime and simple doctrines of Christianity; and after a long and agonized period of indecision, the voice of a child saying, "Take up and read," induced him to look once more to the Word of God, especially St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. His conversion was as complete and sudden as that of St. Paul himself, and not less momentous. He retired with his friends to a villa at the neighbouring town of Cassiciacum, where he spent six months in spiritual conversation and composition, and at the ensuing Easter he was baptized with his friend Alypius, afterwards Bishop of Thagaste, and his son Adeodatus.

Looking back in his "Confessions" to the time of his sinful life in youth, he says with consummate pathos: "I have loved Thee late, Thou Beauty, so old and so new: I have loved Thee late! And lo, Thou wast within, but I was without, and was seeking Thee there. And into Thy fair creation I plunged myself in my ugliness; for Thou wast with me, and I was not with Thee! Those things kept me away from

Thee, which had not been except they had been in Thee! Thou didst call, and didst cry aloud, and break through my deafness. Thou didst glimmer, Thou didst shine, and didst drive away my blindness. Thou didst breathe, and I drew breath, and breathed in Thee. I tasted Thee, and I hunger and thirst. Thou didst touch me, and I burn for Thy peace. If I, with all that is within me, may once live in Thee, then shall pain and trouble forsake me; entirely filled with Thee, all shall be life to me."

He now broke utterly with the world, gave up his brilliant and lucrative calling of Professor of Rhetoric, which he had followed at Rome and Milan; sold his goods for the poor, and to the end of his life devoted his rare gifts to the service of Christ. He took his mother home to Thagaste, but she died on the way. Then he went to Rome for several months, and wrote books in defence of Christianity against false philosophy and the Manichæan heresy. Returning to Africa, he spent three years with his friends Alypius and Evodius on an estate in his native Thagaste, in contemplation and literary retirement.

Then in 391 he was chosen Presbyter against his will by the voice of the people in the seaside city of Hippo Royal in Numidia, and in 395 he was elected Bishop of the same city. For eight-and-twenty years, until his death, he laboured in this place, and made it the intellectual centre of Western Christendom.

His outward mode of life was extremely simple, and mildly ascetic. He lived with his clergy in one house in an Apostolic community of goods, and made this house a seminary of theology, out of which ten Bishops and many other eminent clergy went forth. Females, even his sisters, were excluded from his house, and could only see him in the presence of others. But he founded religious societies of women, and over one of these his sister, a saintly widow, presided. He wore the black dress of the Eastern cœnobites, with cowl and leathern girdle. He lived almost entirely on vegetables, and seasoned the common meal with reading or free conversation. It was a rule engraved on the table, that the character of the absent should never be criticised. To his clergy he allowed a plain diet with wine. He often preached five days in succession, sometimes twice a day, and set it as the object of his preaching that all might live with him, and he with all, in Christ. Wherever he went in Africa he was urged to preach the word of salvation. He was specially devoted to the poor. He took never-ceasing interest in all theological and ecclesiastical questions. He was the champion of the orthodox doctrine against Manichæan, Donatist and Pelagian.

In him was concentrated the whole polemic power of the Catholicism of the time against heresy and schism, and in him it won the victory. In his hands the highest philosophical thought of the time became Christian.

In his last years he made a critical review of his writings, and gave them a thorough sifting in a book which he called "Retractations." His latest controversial works, against the Semi-Pelagians, written in a gentle spirit, date from the same time.

The last ten days of his life he spent in close retirement, in prayers and tears and repeated readings of the penitential Psalms, which he had caused to be written large on the wall opposite his bed, that he might have them always before his eyes.

In the third month of the siege of Hippo, August 28, 430, in the seventy-sixth year of his age, in full possession of his faculties, and in the presence of many friends and pupils, he passed gently and happily into that eternity to which he had so long aspired. "O how wonderful," he wrote in his meditations, "how beautiful and lovely, are the dwellings of Thy house, Almighty God! I burn with longing to behold Thy beauty in Thy bridal chamber. . . . O Jerusalem, holy city of God, dear bride of Christ, my heart loves thee, my soul has already long sighed for thy beauty! . . . The King of kings Himself is in the midst of thee, and His children are within thy walls. There are the hymning choirs of angels, the fellowship of heavenly citizens. There is the wedding-feast of all who from this sad earthly pilgrimage have reached thy joys. There is the far-seeing choir of the prophets; there the number of the twelve Apostles; there the triumphant army of innumerable martyrs and holy confessors. Full and perfect love there reigns, for God is all in all. They love and praise, they praise and love evermore. . . . Blessed, perfectly and for ever blessed, shall I be too, if, when my poor body shall be dissolved . . . I may stand before my King and God, and see Him in His glory, as He Himself hath deigned to promise: 'Father, I will that they also whom Thou hast given Me be with Me where I am: that they may behold My glory which I had with Thee before the world was!'"

Augustine, says the philosophical Church historian Schaff, the man with upturned eye, with pen in the left hand and a burning heart in the right (as he is usually represented in mediæval art), is a theological and philosophical genius of the first order, towering like a pyramid above his age, and looking down commandingly upon succeeding centuries. He had a mind uncommonly fertile and deep, bold and soaring; and with it, what is better, a heart full of Christian love and

humility. He stands of right by the side of the greatest philosopher of antiquity and of modern times. We meet him alike on the broad highways and on the narrow footpaths, on the giddy Alpine heights and in the awful depths of speculation, wherever philosophical thinkers before him or after him have trod. As a theologian he is *facile princeps*—at least, surpassed by no Church Father, Scholastic, or Reformer. With royal munificence he scattered ideas in passing, which have set in mighty motion other lands and later times. He combined the creative power of Tertullian with the churchly spirit of Cyprian, the speculative intellect of the Greek Church with the practical tact of the Latin. He was a Christian philosopher and a philosophical theologian to the full. It was his need and his delight to wrestle again and again with the hardest problems of thought, and he comprehended to the utmost the divinely revealed matter of the faith.

He has enriched Latin literature with a greater store of original, beautiful, and pregnant sayings than either any classic author or any other teacher of the Church. Here are a few of them :

The New Testament lies hid in the Old, the Old lies open in the New.  
 Make a distinction between the ages, and Scriptures will agree together.  
 Our heart is restless till it finds rest in Thee.  
 Grant what Thou orderest, and order what Thou wilt.  
 Nothing conquers but Truth, and the victory of Truth is Charity.  
 Where love is, there is the Triune God.  
 Faith precedes understanding.  
 The service of God is perfect freedom.  
 No misfortune breaks him whom good fortune does not corrupt.

He had a creative and decisive hand in the form of almost every dogma of the Church, completing some and advancing others. The centre of his system is THE FREE REDEEMING GRACE OF GOD IN CHRIST, OPERATING THROUGH THE ACTUAL HISTORICAL CHURCH. He is Evangelical or Pauline in his doctrine of sin and grace, old-Catholic in his doctrine of the Church. The Pauline element comes forward mainly in the Pelagian controversy, the old-Catholic churchly in the *Donatist*; but each is modified by the other.

There were five main controversies which elicited in succession the philosophical and theological genius of Augustine, and which were the material on which he formulated his teaching. In these controversies his opponents were successively the Academic philosophers, the Neo-Platonists, the Manichæans, the Donatists, and the Pelagians. The Academics were sceptics, and held that the search for truth was sufficient happiness, without the prospect of finding it. Against them he urges that man needs the knowledge of truth for his true development; that it is not enough merely to inquire and to

doubt; and he finds a foundation for all our knowledge, a foundation invulnerable against every doubt, in the consciousness we have of our sensations, feelings, our willing and thinking—in short, of all our psychical processes. From the undeniable existence and possession by man of some truth, he concludes to the existence of God as the Truth of truths, the self-existent Truth; whereas our conviction of the existence of the material world he regards as only an irresistible belief.

As against the Neo-Platonists, Augustine is led to combat the unsatisfactory basis and effects of heathen religion and philosophy. He defends with consummate ability the doctrines and institutions peculiar to Christianity, and maintains the Christian theses that salvation is to be found in Christ alone; that Divine worship is due to no other being except God in His threefold nature, since He created all things Himself, and did not commission inferior beings, gods, geniuses, or angels, to produce the material world; that the soul, with its spiritualized body, will rise again to eternal salvation or damnation, and will not return periodically to renewed life upon the earth; that the soul does not exist before the body, and that the latter is not the prison of the former, but that the soul begins to exist at the same time with the body; that the world both had a beginning and is perishable, and that only God and the souls of angels and men are eternal.

Against the dualism of the Manichæans, who regarded good and evil as both in the same degree primitive and original, and represented a portion of the Divine or good substance as having entered into the region of evil, in order to war against and conquer it, Augustine defends the oneness of the good principle, or of the purely spiritual God, explaining evil as a mere negation or privation, and seeking to show, from the finiteness of the things in the world, and from their differing degrees of perfection, that the evils in the world are necessary, and not in contradiction with the idea of Creation. Against Manichæism and Gnosticism in general, he also defends the fundamental Catholic doctrine of the essential harmony between the Old and New Testaments. He was one of the first to state the doctrine of the full inspiration of Scripture in its most rigorous meaning. He wrote a well-known treatise in which he tried to reconcile even the slightest discrepancies in the narratives of the Evangelists. When the letter of the text, especially in the Old Testament, presented any difficulties, he treated it allegorically. This treatment he applied with much imaginativeness to the early chapters of Genesis.

It was in controversy with the Donatists that his strong

ecclesiastical principles were manifested. The Donatist schism had arisen in consequence of the decision of a number of rather pedantic Bishops of Africa not to receive those who had fallen away in time of persecution unless they were baptized again. In one respect the Donatists were something like the Baptists. Holiness, they argued, is, above all, the characteristic of the Church of Christ, and whenever that holiness is either marred or compromised, the Church cannot be said to exist, although a regular succession can be traced back uninterruptedly to the Apostles. According to them, catholicity was independent of external circumstances. The name of Catholic, they said, should not be given to provinces or nations. He alone is a true Catholic who is a tried Christian. The Donatists concluded from this that no Church deserved the name of Church which had admitted within its pale faithless or unworthy members, especially persons who, during the last persecutions, had been guilty of betraying Christ. From so tainted a community separation was absolutely necessary at any cost. There is, answered Augustine, only one Church, namely, that which, by an uninterrupted succession, can be traced back to the Apostles. It is the hallowed ark which alone floats on the waters of the flood, and out of its walls there is no salvation. No one, said he, can have Jesus Christ, the Head of the Church, unless he belongs to Christ's body, and the body of Christ is the orthodox Church. Those persons, therefore, commit a serious error who think that the existence of the Church depends upon the holiness of its members. We must attach ourselves exclusively to the Divine character of the institution. The Church is founded by God upon the rock of an immutable and sovereign will; if we make it depend on the dispositions of men, we shift its foundations from the rock to the quicksands. Thus, while the Donatists placed holiness above catholicity, Augustine reversed the order, and no one has carried the theocratic idea farther than the Bishop of Hippo. Augustine did more than persecute the Donatists; he maintained the right of persecution against them. In his writings the whole theory of religious persecution is laid down in its crudest form.

The most influential of St. Augustine's controversies, and that which has had the most lasting effect on the Church, is that against Pelagius on the relation of Divine grace and the freedom of the human will.

Pelagius, the monk of Britain, had entered a convent at an early age, and had lived in peace and solitude far from the world and its temptations. It had never seemed very difficult to him to attain the somewhat formal and mechanical ideal

of Christian conduct which he had placed before himself. Augustine's experience and ideals were very different. When confronted by Pelagius and his practical denial of Divine grace, he could not assume the calm attitude of a theologian. We feel that his indignation masters him ; he longs to beat down human pride ; he follows it from one lurking-place to the other ; and he stops only when he has annihilated both pride and man himself in the presence of God and of His sovereign grace. Who comes and talks to us about the capacity for good that is in our nature ? Our nature will nothing but evil, and can do nothing but unmitigated evil. Our fall has been complete ; it has not been limited to one man : in Adam all have sinned, in him all have been condemned. St. Augustine pictures to himself humanity as if, like Lazarus, it were lying in its tomb. He rolls the funeral stone against the door of the sepulchre, and engraves upon it the mournful epitaph, " Without God, without hope." Mankind has not one spark of the Divine life ; it can only recover life through a resurrection, which, for it, is like a second creation. It is the work of that Mediator who " by His one sacrifice has appeased the anger of God." Son of God and son of man, equal to the Father, our Mediator having reascended to heaven, the efficacious grace of God is imparted to men, not for any merit or for any will on their part, but solely in the name of an entirely gratuitous act of God's mercy. Man is quite passive in the scheme of his salvation ; the Father draws him powerfully to the Son, and if he remains in the faith, it is because he has received the gift of perseverance. " When God preserves a just man from all scandal, and makes him appear before His presence spotless and full of joy, what gift does He bestow upon him if not that of perseverance in what is good ?"

In the same strong, uncompromising terms he speaks of predestination. How can one say, he asks, that all men would receive grace if those to whom it is not given did not reject it of their own free will, because God will have all men to be saved ? How can one say this, when we consider that there are so many children to whom grace has never been given, and that several of them die without receiving it, although there is in them no act of the will opposing itself to the reception of that gift ? It even sometimes happens, he says, that the parents of a child eagerly long to have him baptized, and yet the child does not receive the Sacrament because God, not willing that he should, causes him to die before baptism is administered. It is evident, therefore, that those who argue against so obvious a determination do not understand the meaning of the expression, " God will have all



men to be saved," since there are so many men who remain unsaved, not because they refuse to be saved, but because He wills not that they should.

By these assertions Augustine attained the extreme point of reaction against the Pelagians: he could go no further. He had stripped man of everything; and we are led to ask ourselves whether on such a system man 'himself exists as a moral creature? The Catholic Church, fortunately, after the time of Augustine, recoiled from this extreme position and these terrible conclusions—not by denying Divine grace, like Pelagius, but by insisting on the necessity of the free will of man co-operating with the grace of God.

In the history of philosophy, Augustine deserves a place of the highest rank, and has done greater service to that science of sciences than any other Father, Clement of Alexandria and Origen not excepted. He attacked and refuted the pagan philosophy as pantheistic or dualistic at heart; he shook the superstitions of astrology and magic; he expelled from philosophy the doctrine of one series of beings emanating from another, and the idea that God is the soul of the world; he substantially advanced psychology; he solved the question of the origin and the nature of evil more nearly than any of his predecessors, and as nearly as most of his successors; he was the first to investigate thoroughly the relation of Divine omnipotence and omniscience to human freedom, and to construct a theodicy; in short, he is properly the founder of a Christian philosophy, and not only divided with Aristotle the empire of the mediæval scholasticism, but furnished the living germs for new systems of philosophy, and will always be consulted in the speculative establishment of Christian doctrines.

Augustine contributed much to the doctrinal basis which Catholicism and Protestantism hold in common against such radical and recurring heresies of antiquity, Manichæism, Arianism, and Pelagianism. In all these great intellectual conflicts he was in general the champion of the cause of Christian truth against dangerous errors. Through his influence the canon of Holy Scriptures (including Old Testament Apocrypha) was fixed in its present form by the Councils of Hippo (393) and Carthage (397). He conquered the Manichæan dualism, materialism, and fatalism, and saved the Biblical idea of God and of creation, and the Biblical doctrine of the nature of sin and its origin in the choice of man. He developed the Nicene dogma of the Trinity, completed it by the doctrine of the double procession of the Holy Ghost, and gave it the form in which it has ever since prevailed in the West.

Augustine is also the principal theological creator of the Latin Catholic system, as distinct from the Greek Catholicism on the one hand, and from Evangelical Protestantism on the other. He ruled the entire theology of the Middle Ages, and became the father of scholasticism in virtue of his dialectical mind, and the father of mysticism in virtue of his devout heart, without being responsible for the excesses of either system.

He was the first to give a clear and fixed definition of the Sacrament, as a visible sign of an invisible grace, resting on Divine appointment; of the number seven he says nothing: this was a much later enactment. In the doctrine of baptism he is entirely Catholic, though in logical contradiction with his dogma of predestination; but in the doctrine of the Holy Communion he stands, like his predecessors Tertullian and Cyprian, nearer to the Calvinistic theory of a spiritual presence and fruition of Christ's body and blood. His strongest expressions are shown by other expressions to be figurative. He also contributes to promote—at least, in his later writings—the Catholic faith of miracles, and the worship of Mary. Mary he exempts from actual sin, not from original; and with all his reverence for her, he never calls her the Mother of God.

On the other hand, Augustine is, of all the Fathers, the nearest to Evangelical Protestantism, and may be called, in respect of his doctrine of sin and grace, after St. Paul, the first forerunner of the Reformation. The Lutheran and Reformed Churches have ever conceded to him without scruple the cognomen of Saint, and claimed him as one of the most enlightened witnesses of the truth, and most striking examples of the power of Divine grace in the transformation of a sinner.

Even in the Middle Ages the better sects, which attempted to simplify, purify, and spiritualize the reigning Christianity by return to the Holy Scriptures, and the Reformers before the Reformation, such as Wicliff, Huss, Wessel, resorted most, after the Apostle Paul, to the Bishop of Hippo as the representative of the doctrine of free grace.

The Reformers were led by his writings into a deeper understanding of St. Paul, and so prepared for their great vocation. No Church teacher did so much to mould Luther and Calvin; none furnished them so powerful weapons against the dominant Pelagianism and formalism; none is so often quoted by them with esteem and love.

Erasmus said of him that the whole Christian world contained nothing more golden or more august (playing on his name, Aurelius Augustinus).

The great philosopher Leibnitz calls him a truly great

mind, and of stupendous genius, endowed with a mind superlatively vast.

Baur said that there is scarcely another theological author so fertile, and withal so able, as Augustine.

Bindemann, a Lutheran divine, remarks: "St. Augustine is one of the greatest personages in the Church. He is second in importance to none of the teachers who have wrought most in the Church since the Apostolic time; and it can be well said that among the Church Fathers the first place is due to him; and in the time of the Reformation, Luther alone, for fulness and depth of thought and grandeur of character, may stand by his side. He is the summit of the development of the mediæval Western Church; from him descended the mysticism no less than the scholasticism of the Middle Age. He was, on the one hand, one of the strongest pillars of Roman Catholicism, and, on the other, from his works, next to the Holy Scriptures, especially the Epistles of St. Paul, the leaders of the Reformation drew most of that conviction by which a new age was introduced. The Roman Catholic philosophers Günther and Gangauf put him on an equality with the greatest of thinkers, and discern in him a Providential personage, endowed by the Spirit of God for the instruction of all ages. Nourisson, the latest French writer on Augustine, whose work is clothed with the authority of the Institute of France, assigns to the Bishop of Hippo the first rank amongst the masters of human thought, alongside of Plato and Leibnitz, Thomas Aquinas and Bossuet."

"Augustine," says M. de Pressensé, "belonged to that class of men who, though dead, yet speak. Ardent in his affections, comprehensive and deep in his learning (though that was limited again by the fact that he knew little Greek and no Hebrew), he had the greatness and also the want of moderation which we discover in all great and impassioned natures. He could do neither good nor evil by halves. From a dissolute youth he recoiled into extreme asceticism, and from metaphysical freedom into the most stringent system of authority. He was the standard champion of orthodoxy; nor did he sufficiently respect the claims of conscience. He sacrificed the moral element to God's sovereignty, which he maintained most unflinchingly. But, on the other hand, his love for Christ and for the souls of his fellow-men was quite as decided; nay, it was its very vehemence which often carried him beyond the bounds of moderation. Therefore it is that, if in more than one respect he committed mistakes, the influence he has exercised has been equally wide and beneficent. He still claims the honour of having brought out in all its light the fundamental doctrine of Christianity; despite

the errors of his system, he has opened to the Church the path of every progress and of every reform, by stating with the utmost rigour the scheme of free salvation which he had learnt in the school of St. Paul.

WILLIAM SINCLAIR.

---

◆ ◆ ◆

## Short Notices.

---

*The Clergy List, 1899.* Kelly and Co., Ltd.

THIS wonderful compilation continues its vast repertory of accurate and valuable information. In 1897 the list of the clergy portion rose from 496 pages to 1,000. In 1898 it went up to 1,050; this year it is 1,084. The clergy would greatly help the editor if they would give him accurately the gross and net value of their incomes. The volume is in future to be ready by the end of January in each year.

*The Official Year-Book of the Church of England for 1899.* S.P.C.K. Pp. 734. Price 3s.

This most valuable epitome of English Church work affords extremely interesting study for all who desire to estimate the religious and social influence of the National Church, besides a mine of reference for facts and statistics. It is understood that some of the statistics this year, as to numbers in Confirmations, etc., are not so satisfactory as before. It is extremely probable that the lamentable internal dissensions in the Church would produce this result. There is hardly any subject connected with Church life on which this book does not throw light.

*Some English Church Principles and the Ritualistic Controversy.* By the Rev. W. L. PAIGE COX. Young, Liverpool. Pp. 73. Price 1s.

This timely little book gives plain teaching on the Reformation Process, the Doctrine of Justification, the Significance of Church Ordinances, the Invocation of Saints and Veneration of Images, the Holy Communion, the Christian Ministry, and the Ritualistic Movement.

The tone throughout is moderate and reasonable, and the book might well be put in the hands of those who wish to know something about the present controversy.

*Lawlessness in the National Church.* By the Right. Hon. Sir WM. VERNON HARCOURT, M.P. Macmillan and Co. Pp. 156. Price 1s. net.

This is a reprint from the *Times* of Sir William Harcourt's stirring appeals to the Protestantism of the country, and it forms a useful handbook on the subject of current disputes. It is to be hoped that from all these controversies the good sense of the English people, and the providence of God, will produce a satisfactory result.

*Plain Words on some Present-Day Questions.* By Principal CHAVASSE. Oxford University Press. Pp. 54. Price 1s.

This pamphlet contains four sermons—on Confession, the State of the Dead, the Christian Ministry, and the Lord's Supper—marked by the spiritual insight and fervour characteristic of Mr. Chavasse.

*Our One Priest on High.* By the Rev. N. DIMOCK. Pp. 115. Price 2s. 6d.

This is a reproduction of the valuable articles of Mr. Dimock on the Sacerdotium of Christ in THE CHURCHMAN. It is a very satisfactory and learned justification of the accepted Church of England doctrine, that Christ's offering was complete on the Cross.

*Some Elements of Success.* By the Rev. A. B. EVANS. H. and C. Franklin-Twickenham. Pp. 46.

Mr. Evans has lately been appointed Assistant-Secretary to the British and Foreign Bible Society, and was well known as a useful and impressive preacher in his curacy at Twickenham. He has done well in printing five thoughtful and interesting sermons as a memento of his work there.

*Banners of the Christian Faith.* By Bishop WINNINGTON INGRAM. Wells Gardner and Co. Pp. 211.

This volume contains fourteen earnest and eloquent sermons, mostly preached in St. Paul's Cathedral, one or two at Oxford, Cambridge, and Westminster. They were taken down by reporters, as the Bishop does not use a MS. The plain speaking, direct appeals, and happy illustrations of these discourses will explain to readers at a distance the reason for the very large congregations which assemble at St. Paul's to hear the Bishop of Stepney.

*The Sermon Bible.* Hodder and Stoughton. Pp. 395.

The present volume, which is a second edition, occupies the ground from John iv. to Acts vi. Besides quoting passages on important texts from various eminent preachers, a useful paragraph of references is also given to other sermons on the subject. The work must necessarily be a great help to those who have little or no access to libraries.

*Dale's Clergyman's Legal Handbook.* Edited by JOHN S. RISLEY, D.C.L. Seeley and Co. Pp. 507. Price 7s. 6d.

This is the seventh edition, and has been brought up to date by including all important alterations made in the laws of the Church since the last edition, and also a concise notice of all the most recently decided cases. There always has been an important body of legal decisions and enactments known as the King's Ecclesiastical Law, by which plain men have been content to abide. It is not desirable that lay judges should alter doctrine, but most men consider them better interpreters of law than are ecclesiastics.

*Helps to Godly Living: Extracts from Archbishop Temple.* By J. H. BURN, B.D. Elliot Stock. Pp. 199. Price 5s.

The Archbishop has always made a profound impression by the earnestness of his spiritual addresses. He is a powerful extemporary thinker, and has the gift of expressing his thoughts in a clear, plain, manly, and striking manner. This little book deals with a great variety of subjects, all of a spiritual character, and of a type that can be used with gratitude by all sincere Christians.

*Church Law.* By BENJAMIN WHITEHEAD, Barrister-at-Law. Stevens and Sons, Chancery Lane. Pp. 331. Price 10s. 6d.

Without being voluminous, this treatise is clear and comprehensive. Throughout it is a strong supporter of the Reformation settlement and principles. It refers to Privy Council judgments and to the reasons which decided them. The work is temperate, learned, and full of interesting information.

*University and other Sermons.* By the Rev. H. M. BUTLER, D.D. Cambridge: Macmillan and Bowes. Pp. 351.

The Master of Trinity has added to our obligations to him by publishing in this volume eleven very beautiful University sermons, and sixteen which are historical and biographical. Amongst these latter we find estimates of Augustine, Aidan, Bede, Anselm, Edward the Confessor, Whitgift, William Wilberforce, Lord Shaftesbury, President Garfield, Waterloo, General Gordon, Balaclava, Dean Stanley, Dean Vaughan, the Vaughan family, and Mr. Gladstone. The Master has a special charm of style, and the thought is on a level with the best Church of England teaching. His calm and eminently Christian tone will be found very helpful in these times of trouble and disquiet.

*Caird's University Sermons.* Macle hose and Sons, Glasgow. Pp. 402.

The Principal of Glasgow University was, in the opinion of many, the ablest and most eloquent preacher of our time. The appearance of this collection, edited by his brother, the Master of Balliol, will be welcomed by the whole theological world. We have here nineteen sermons preached before the University on the profoundest subjects, the treatment of which is powerfully stimulating both to faith and devotion.

*Maxims of Piety and Christianity.* By Bishop WILSON of Sodor and Man. Edited by the Rev. FREDERICK RELTON. Macmillan and Co. Pp. 169.

Messrs. Macmillan are bringing out a valuable series of standard theological works called "The English Theological Library." The general editor is Mr. Relton, the able and learned Vicar of St. Andrew's, Stoke Newington. Mr. Relton quotes in his preface a very high appreciation by Matthew Arnold of the *Maxims* of the famous Bishop of Sodor and Man. The work has been considerably neglected, but has now the advantage of a careful reproduction by a sympathetic editor, with very interesting and appropriate notes.

*In His Steps.* By C. M. SHELDON. Sunday School Union, Ludgate Hill. Pp. 265. Price 6d.

This admirable story is worthy of all the attention that has been paid it. The idea is not new, but it is worked out in a manner that must attract universal notice. The advantage of a story is that it shows how people in real life might be expected to act when such considerations as the book presents are put before them. The story is a commentary on the very true remark of the Mohammedan refugee from Khartoum, who said, "If all Christians were like Gordon Pasha, all the world would be Christian." It is a very high and difficult ideal, but Mr. Sheldon shows that it is not impracticable. The book is calculated to do much good.

---

## The Month.

---

WE have to announce that the Ecclesiastical Commissioners are prepared to receive, on or before December 1, 1899, offers of benefactions of not less than £100 each in capital value towards making better provision for the cure of souls, with a view to such offers being met by the Board with grants of capital sums, during the spring of 1900. It must be clearly understood that the means at the Commissioners' disposal for meeting benefactions are much reduced, and that the Board do not undertake to meet all the offers which may be made. The distribution of these grants will be made subject to the usual regulations.

The Commissioners are also prepared to receive offers of benefactions of not less value than £2,000 each, in favour of parishes or cures containing populations of six thousand and upwards, with a view to such benefactions being met by grants, not exceeding sixty pounds (£60) per annum in each case, to be appropriated towards the maintenance of assistant curates. The grants can only be very few in number, and will be subject to the ordinary conditions.

We are pleased to notice the announcement of Dr. H. C. G. Moule's appointment to the Norrisian Professorship of Divinity, Cambridge. We have every reason to believe that this appointment will not involve his resigning the Principalship of Ridley Hall.

On Wednesday, March 1, the London diocesan branch of the Queen Victoria Clergy Fund held its second annual service at St. Paul's. The Lord Mayor and Sheriffs attended in state, with other members of the City Corporation, and several representatives of City companies joined in the procession, which formed in the south aisle and afterwards moved to the west door, where the Bishop was received by the Dean and Chapter. About one hundred and twenty robed clergy also attended. The preacher on this occasion was the Dean of Canterbury, the Archbishop having pleaded the cause last year. There was a very large congregation, many standing throughout the service. Dean Farrar's sermon was a powerful and eloquent appeal on behalf of the poorer clergy of England, and was listened to with unusual interest. During the singing of the hymn, "Light's abode, celestial Salem," a collection was taken by students from St. John's College, Battersea, the offerings amounting to £390 4s.—nearly £100 more than last year.

The Government have re-introduced their sensible Bill for dealing with the question of Secondary Education. A Board of Education of the same character as the Board of Trade or the Board of Agriculture is to be constituted. The proposals are of a modest and tentative description, and would, if carried out, go a long way to improving the education of the country.

The Truro Cathedral Building Committee has accepted the tender of Messrs. H. Wilcocks and Co., of Wolverhampton, in £34,000, to erect the nave and western towers up to the nave roof, as a memorial of the late Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Benson having been the first Bishop of the restored See of Truro.

The Memorial issued by the E.C.U. on the ritual crisis was duly recited at the meeting of Union delegates—nearly 1,000 in number—which took place in London on Tuesday, February 28, at the Cannon Street Hotel. Lord Halifax presided. The Memorial was, after being signed, forwarded to the Queen, and another copy was sent to the Archbishop of Canterbury. It has already raised a considerable amount of criticism, and signs are not wanting that it may ultimately lead to a secession of certain E.C.U. members. The substance of the "Ultimatum" may briefly be summarized thus: Complete independence in matters of doctrine, discipline, and ceremonial, of the Civil Power, whether Parliament or Courts; complete liberty to practise any pre-Reformation usage which is not explicitly forbidden; no deference to be paid to the fact that these usages have been discontinued since the Reformation; deference to be paid to bishops only in so far as they can prove that what they forbid is forbidden in so many words of the Prayer-Book; and that a "Catholic," and not a Protestant interpretation of the Prayer-Book be upheld.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, in his recent speech at the Church House on March 10, made the following pertinent allusion to the present ecclesiastical troubles: "He deprecated," to use his own words, "the sort of earnestness which made people so hot. Whatever improvements were wanted would be best obtained by being calm and quiet; and, in his opinion, the quiet people, who were simply praying to God for the right guidance of His Church at this moment, were much more near doing the right thing than those who filled the columns of the papers with the cherished speculations which probably they had been brooding over for years." At the same time the quiet attitude does not always arise from patient persistence in well-doing. People are often quiet simply because they are either slack or indifferent.

As an instance of the extraordinary expansion of some of our northern towns, and of the corresponding need of further developing the Church life to meet growing religious needs, we note that the board of management of the Leeds Church Extension Society have recently issued an appeal to the Church people of that city for the sum of £100,000 to be raised in ten years. It is urged that the Church in Leeds is faced by an extremely serious problem, and attention is called to the fact that between 1865 and 1885 the sum of £125,000 was provided irrespective of money collected from other sources. The population in 1885 was 333,000; at the end of 1898 it was estimated at about 426,000—an increase of 93,000. It is pointed out that 50,000 more church sittings and seventy-four more clergy are urgently needed. The church accommodation at present is 12.9 per cent. of the population, and this should at least be doubled. At present the number of parochial clergy is 139. There is now church accommodation for 43,517, and in mission churches and rooms for 11,430.

In view of the forthcoming "May meetings" in London, some of the principal railway companies have officially notified to the religious societies the reduction of fares to be granted to the representatives attending these gatherings. These concessions have recently been made by the railway companies, after years of agitation.

No less than 2,000 of the "Russian pilgrims" have already reached Winnipeg. On arriving at the port, the wayfarers broke into a hymn, and Prince Hilkoﬀ offered up a thanksgiving to God for their safe voyage. Their name, Dukhobortsi, means "those who strive in the Spirit," and though they are unwilling to engage in the wars of the world, they are quite ready to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered unto the saints. It is believed that the present Tsar and the Empress-Mother have been touched with compassion for them, and thus permission has been obtained for them to leave Russia.

It was while acting in the service of his country that Lord Herschell died in America, and, as a national honour to the memory of so distinguished a man, the first part of the Office for the Dead was performed in Westminster Abbey, on March 21, in the presence of an immense congregation. Political opponents were as conspicuous as political friends of the deceased.

CHURCH ARMY.—The Bishop of Bristol will preside at the annual meeting of the Church Army in St. James's Hall, on Wednesday, May 3, and the Bishop of Rochester will give the address at the United Communion of Church Army evangelists and mission nurses in Henry VII. Chapel, Westminster Abbey, on the morning of the same day. The Bishop of Salisbury will preside at a great public meeting in St. James's



Hall in the evening, on "The Church's Duty to the Outcast." The Bishop of Hereford, Sir T. Fowell Buxton, Bart., and a large number of members of Parliament, and clergy of "all schools of thought" in the Church, will be present and speak, as "the Council of the Army is specially anxious at the present time to press home upon the public what the Church is doing throughout the whole country for the outcast and destitute, and to emphasize the fact that in the carrying out of this work of helping the helpless, homeless, and hopeless to help themselves the Church Army knows no creed."

BRITISH AND FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY.—At the Guildhall, early in March, the annual meeting of juvenile collectors of this Society was held, under the presidency of the Lord Mayor, who attended in state, accompanied by the Lady Mayoress, Mr. Alderman and Sheriff Alliston, and Lieutenant-Colonel and Sheriff Probyn. There were also present Mrs. Isabella Bishop, the well-known traveller, Prebendary Borrett White, Mr. C. R. Kemp, the Rev. Dr. Wright (editorial superintendent), Major-General Hutchinson, the Rev. J. Gordon Watt, the Rev. E. H. Pearce, and the Rev. J. Thomas. The Lord Mayor said that they had met to celebrate the ninety-fifth birthday of this valuable Society, whose useful work had extended to all parts of the world. Since its formation, in 1804, it had paid away £12,500,000 in connection with the translation and circulation of the Holy Scriptures. Upwards of 151,000,000 copies of the Bible and New Testament, or portions of them, in three hundred and forty different languages, had been issued from its various depôts.

#### APPEALS, GRANTS, AND BEQUESTS.

We would draw attention to the fact that the Irish Church Missions, in announcing 1899 as the Jubilee year of the Society, are appealing for jubilee gifts in aid of its work. The committee have issued a short statement of the present position of the Society, showing that while the work has steadily pushed forward, and now, by manifold agencies, reaches practically the whole Roman Catholic population, yet the ordinary income, exclusive of legacies, falls short of the expenditure by nearly £9,000 a year.

The appeal made by the Bishop of St. David's last autumn for £1,750, on behalf of the diocesan fund for the augmentation of small benefices, has resulted in a response of £4,127, which, together with £170 from the "Bull Fund," brings the income of the fund up to £4,297.

The Rev. Herbert H. Dibben, Rector of St. Michael's, Brierley Hill, is making an effort to restore the Parish Church, which is in a dilapidated condition. The cost will be £5,000, towards which he has about £4,400 already promised, and he very wisely wishes to obtain the money to avoid involving the parish, which is a poor one, in debt. At present there is a deficiency of about £600, and if this cannot be obtained, some very necessary part of the work must be left undone.

The trustees under the Birmingham Churches Act have, with the sanction of the Bishop of Worcester, decided to make, out of the funds arising from the sale of Christ Church, the following grants for church building in the rural deaneries of Birmingham, Aston, and Northfield: St. Luke's, £4,000; Aston St. James, £500; Stechford, £500; St. Barnabas, Balsall Heath, £1,000; for a new church at King's Heath, £1,000; and for a new church at The Cotteridge, £2,500. They have also granted a sum for the site of a second new church in the parish of Sparkbrook.