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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

THE

CHURCHMAN

MAY, 1900.

ART. I.—THE ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY SINCE THE RESTORATION.

V. THOMAS TENISON.

ARCHBISHOP TENISON'S grandfather, John Tenison, Rector of Downham, Cambridgeshire, died in 1614. His son John, Rector of Mundesley, married Mercy Dowsing of Cottenham, and their son Thomas was born at Cottenham, September 29, 1636. The boy was educated as "one of Archbishop Parker's six scholars" in the school of Norwich, and then at the age of seventeen was elected scholar of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. He matriculated there in 1653, took his B.A. degree in 1657, and became Fellow. Though he yearned for the ministry, his first intention, owing to the establishment of Independency, was to study physic, but in 1659 he was privately ordained at Richmond by Brian Duppa, Bishop of Salisbury. The Master of his college, Dr. Love, had always shown a particular esteem for him, and gave him his daughter in marriage with a good dowry. They had no children. After the Restoration he became tutor in his college, and in 1665 Vicar of St. Andrew the Great, Cambridge, where he won great and lasting respect for his unbroken residence and unflagging ministrations during the great plague. In 1667 the Earl of Manchester, to whose son he had been tutor, presented him to the rectory of Holywell, with Needingworth, Hunts, and here he wrote his first book, "The Creed of Mr. Hobbes Examined." In 1678 he wrote "A Discourse of Idolatry" against the Church of Rome. For six years (1674-1680) he was Vicar of St. Peter, Mancroft, Norwich, having been elected by the parishioners' vote. But Charles II., having appointed him one of his chaplains in ordinary, presented him, in October, 1680, to the rectory of St. Martin's-

in-the-Fields, vacant by the appointment of Lloyd to the See of St. Asaph. His reputation as a preacher was already established, and was resorted to by large congregations. Evelyn in his Diary speaks of him with enthusiasm: "Dr. Tenison preached at Whitehall on 1 Cor. vi. 12. I esteem him to be one of the most profitable preachers in the Church of England, being also of a most holy conversation, very learned and ingenious. The pains he takes and care of his parish will, I fear, wear him out, which would be an inexpressible loss" (March 21, 1683). The following extract from the same Diary (April 8, 1685) is curious: "Being now somewhat composed after my great affliction [the death of his daughter] I went to London to hear Dr. Tenison (it being a Wednesday in Lent) at Whitehall. I observed that though the King [James II.] was not in his seat above in the chapel, the Doctor made his three congés, which they were not used to do when the late King was absent, making then one bowing only. I asked the reason; it was said he had a special order so to do. The Princess of Denmark [Anne] was in the King's closet, but sat on the left hand of the choir, the clerk of the closet standing by His Majesty's chair as if he had been present." Once more (same year): "April 17, Good Friday. Dr. Tenison preached at the new Church at St. James's on 1 Cor. xvi. 22, upon the infinite love of God to us, which he illustrated in many instances. The Holy Sacrament followed, at which I participated. The Lord make me thankful." The "new church," it is hardly needful to say, was St. James's, Piccadilly. It was erected by Henry Jermyn, Earl of St. Albans, Wren being the architect, consecrated Sunday, July 13, 1684, and named in compliment to the Duke of York. Tenison was the first Rector, holding it with St. Martin's.[1]

These were days, as we have already seen, of acute controversy. The Duke of York was exerting all his power to proselytize, and Churchmen and Nonconformists were equally eager to resist him. Tenison threw himself earnestly upon this side, preached and wrote pamphlets, in one of the latter beseeching the Nonconformists to join with the Church. He is said to have been largely assisted by Wharton, whom we have already had to name as the learned chaplain of Sancroft. When the acute crisis came, he took part with the seven Bishops in their address to King James against his declaration. Evelyn tells how he was privy to the requisition to the Prince of Orange.

During his incumbency of St. Martin's, however, he did

[1] Two succeeding Archbishops were also rectors of St. James's, viz., Wake and Secker.

something more than engage in controversy. Once more let us have a quotation from Evelyn's Diary: "February 15, 1684. Dr. Tenison communicated to me his intention of erecting a library in St. Martin's parish for the public use, and desired my assistance, with Sir Christopher Wren, about the placing and structure thereof. A worthy and laudable design. He told me there were thirty or forty young men in Orders in his parish, either governors to young gentlemen or chaplains to noblemen, who, being reproved by him on occasion for frequenting taverns or coffee-houses, told him they would study or employ their time better if they had books. This put the pious Doctor on this design." It was a very admirable design, and was admirably carried out. The library was built in Castle Street, St. Martin's Lane, and opened with 4,000 volumes to the parishioners of St. Martin's, St. James's, St. Anne's, Soho, and St. George's, Hanover Square. The chief treasure of the original library was a manuscript Chaucer, but there were also many other rare and valuable books and manuscripts. He also founded a Grammar School on the same premises the next year. The buildings were removed in 1861, in order to enlarge the National Gallery; the manuscripts and books were then sold, by order of the Charity Commissioners. The school was removed to Leicester Square, and now occupies the site of Hogarth's house and the Sablonière Hotel. It is flourishing at the present moment.

Nor were these all Tenison's good works of foundation. He built a chapel-of-ease on the west side of King Street, Golden Square. It was known in Evelyn's time as "Tenison's Tabernacle," and that writer records more than once in after years how he went to hear Tenison and others preach there. "He took great pains," says one of his biographers, "to conceal his private charities in this parish, though these were numerous. At the time of the hard frost in 1683 his disbursements for his poor people amounted to more than £300, insomuch that he distributed more to the poor and needy at that juncture out of his own stock than arose from the Archbishop and whole parish of Lambeth." In one passage where Evelyn mentions some of his works he says that he has been down to Kensington to visit him, he having retired thither to refresh after recovering from the small-pox. Kensington in those days was a rural suburb. William III. was afterwards fiercely abused because, as he could not live at Whitehall owing to his asthma, he insisted on buying at the national expense the house of Lord Nottingham and turning it into Kensington Palace, which became the favourite royal residence for many years.

One person who acquired an unhappy notoriety died in his

parish in 1687, and was buried in his Church of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields. Eleanor Gwyn, the favourite mistress of Charles II., was left in comparative poverty at his death. But she seems to have spent her last days penitently and usefully. Tenison, at her request, preached a funeral sermon over her. He testified to her penitence; but the sermon is not among the many of his sermons that are printed. Her contemporaries have mentioned in their letters her humility and repentance. She left £20 "to deliver poor debtors out of prison."

In November, 1689, the new King and Queen made him Archdeacon of London, and he was one of the Commission, described already in Tillotson's Life, for the revision of the Liturgy to satisfy the Dissenters. He was anxious to promote this, but in his "Argument for Union" he took care to express his opinion that comprehension must have its limits, and could not include "Arians, Socinians, Anabaptists, Fifth-monarchy men, sensual millenaries, Behmenists, Familists, Seekers, Antinomians, Ranters, Sabbatarians, Quakers, Muggletonians, Sweet Singers." You might put them altogether into a caravan, he says, but cannot join them in the Communion of a Church.

In December, 1691, through the influence of the Queen, he was elected Bishop of Lincoln, and consecrated at Lambeth on January 10 following; and although his tenure of the See was a short one, he made his mark for good in the diocese. He preached earnestly and constantly, and did much to restore discipline and good order. He instructed his Archdeacons to make diligent inquiry, through the clergy, into the condition of the poor. Two years later he refused the Archbishopric of Dublin; but when Tillotson died he was offered the See of Canterbury, and accepted it, to the grief of his late diocese. He was elected on January 15, 1695, and enthroned on May 16 following. His successor at Lincoln, Gardiner, was his nominee.

He soon showed that he was alive to his responsibilities; for he summoned Thomas Watson, Bishop of St. David's, to his archiepiscopal court, on the charge of simoniacal practices, tried him and deprived him.

On December 28, 1694, Queen Mary died of small-pox. Tenison attended her death-bed, received her confession, and at her burial in Westminster Abbey preached a sermon, of which it becomes necessary to quote a portion. It is eulogistic, certainly; but there is no doubt that both Tenison and his predecessor had a deep conviction of the beauty of the Queen's character, and of her earnest personal piety. His text was Eccl. vii. 14. He spoke first of her wide read-

ing and her clearness of understanding, and whilst she read much, she read the Bible most, he said. She spent a long time each day in devotion, and was most regular at public worship and at the Sacrament. The following passage describes the end of her life:

"Some few days before the Feast of our Lord's Nativity she found herself indisposed . . . I will not say that of this affliction she had any formal presage, but yet there was something which looked like an immediate preparation for it. I mean her choosing to hear, more than once, a little before it, the last sermon of a good and learned man [Tillotson], now with God, upon this subject: 'What! shall we receive good at the hand of God, and shall we not receive evil?'

"This indisposition speedily grew up into a dangerous distemper. As soon as that was understood, the earliest care of this charitable mistress was for the removing of such immediate servants as might by distance be preserved in health. Soon after this she fixed the times of prayer in that chamber to which her sickness had confined her. On that very day she showed how sensible she was of death, and how little she feared it. She required him who officiated there to add that Collect in the Communion of the Sick in which are these words: 'That whensoever the soul shall depart from the body it may be without spot presented unto Thee.' 'I will,' said she, 'have this collect read twice every day. All have need to be put in mind of death, and princes as much as anybody else.'

"On Monday the flattering disease occasioned some hopes, though they were but faint ones. On the next day, the feast of Christ's birth, these hopes were raised into a kind of assurance, and there was joy, great joy, seen in the countenance of all good people and heard from their mouths; and I believe it was very warm in their hearts. But alas! we saw what a few hours could bring forth. That joy endured but for a day, and that day was closed with a very dismal night. The disease showed itself in various forms, and small hopes of life were now left. Then it was that he who performed the holy office believed himself obliged to acquaint the good Queen with the apprehensions all had of an unlikelihood at least of her recovery. She received the tidings with a courage agreeable to the strength of her faith. Loath she was to terrify those about her, but for herself she seemed neither to fear death nor to covet life. There appeared not the least sign of regret for the leaving of those temporal greatnesses which make so many of high estate unwilling to die.

"It was, you may imagine, high satisfaction to hear her say a great many most Christian things, and this among

them: 'I believe I shall now soon die, and I thank God I have from my youth learned a true doctrine, that repentance is not to be put off to a death-bed.'

"That day she called for prayers a third time, fearing she had slept a little when they were a second time read; for she thought a duty was not performed when it was not minded.

"On Thursday she prepared herself for the blessed Communion to which she had been no stranger from the fifteenth year of her age. She was much concerned that she found herself in so dozing a condition, as she expressed it. To that she added: 'Others had need to pray for me, seeing I am so little able to pray for myself.' However, she stirred up her attention, and prayed to God for His assistance, and God heard her; for from thenceforth to the end of the office she had the perfect command of her understanding, and was intent upon the great work she was going about, and so intent that when the second portion of a certain draught was offered her she refused it, saying: 'I have but a little time to live, and I would spend it in a better way.'

"The Holy Elements being ready, and several Bishops coming to be communicants, she repeated piously and distinctly, but with a low voice (for such her weakness had then made it), all the parts of the holy office which were proper for her, and received with all the signs of a strong faith and earnest devotion the blessed pledges of God's favour, and thanked Him with a joyful heart that she was not deprived of the opportunity. She owned, also, that God had been good to her beyond her expectation, though in a circumstance of smaller importance, she having without any hindrance or difficulty taken down *that bread* when it had not been so easy for her for some time to swallow any other.

"That afternoon she called for prayers somewhat earlier than the appointed time because she feared that she should not long be so well composed. And so it came to pass, for every minute after this 'twas plain death made nearer and nearer approaches. However, this true Christian kept her mind as fixed as she possibly could upon the best things; and there were read, by her directions, several Psalms, and also a chapter of a pious book concerning *Trust in God.* Toward the latter end of it her apprehension began to fail, yet not so much but that she could say a devout *Amen!* to that prayer in which her soul was commended to God.

"During all this time there appeared nothing of impatience, nothing of forwardness, nothing of anger; there was heard nothing of murmuring, and scarce a murmur of disjointed words. At last, the helps of art and prayer and tears not prevailing, a quarter before one on Friday morning, after two

or three small strugglings of nature, and without such agonies as in such cases are common, having, like David, served her own generation, by the will of God she fell asleep."

I have transcribed these words in full, but have not felt very happy in doing so. Tenison was too good a man to write what he did not believe, and those who knew Queen Mary best would certainly approve what he said. But silence is almost always better than eulogy. It is F. D. Maurice who points out that of all the saints in the Bible there is silence concerning their death-beds. The few simple but beautiful words on the death of St. Stephen make the only exception. The awful glory of Calvary hides all other light. That is the Death on which to gaze brings rest and peace.

But yet more out of place and more painful to read is the trenchant letter addressed to the preacher by Ken. It was published anonymously, and the authorship has been called in question, but Dean Plumptre, in his "Life of Ken," after carefully weighing the evidence, decides that it is his. There is a copy in the London Institution with Ken's autograph signature. That he should think the dead Queen unfilial is natural enough, for he believed that the nation had sinned in rejecting James. But Tenison did not believe so, and the English people for the most part believed their action a righteous one, and therefore Ken's accusations of bad faith and cowardice all fall to the ground. Mary had been pure of life, devout, sincerely attached to the Church of England, charitable to the poor; and the influence which she so largely exercised in ecclesiastical appointments was invariably given in favour of good men. Ken was not the only man to hurl invectives upon her grave. In some places the church bells were rung, as for a victory, and a non-juring preacher took for his text the words, "Go, see now this cursed woman, and bury her, for she is a king's daughter." But we must let Ken speak for himself.

He begins by telling how he is disappointed. "When I heard of the sickness of the late illustrious Princess, whom I had never failed to recommend to God in my daily prayers, and that yourself was her Confessor, I could not but hope that, at least on her death-bed, you would have dealt faithfully with her. But when I had read the sermon you preached at her funeral I was heartily grieved to find myself disappointed, and God knows how bitterly I bewailed in secret the manner of her death; and reflecting again and again on your conduct of her soul, methought a spirit of slumber seemed to have possessed you; otherwise it is impossible for one who so well understood the duty of a spiritual guide as yourself, who had such happy opportunities and such signal

encouragements to practise it in her case, should so grossly fail in your performance, as either to overlook or wilfully to omit that which all the world said besides yourself, and was expected from you, and was of great importance to her salvation. You are a person of noted abilities, and had a full knowledge of your duty; you had been many years a parish priest, and exercised your function with good repute; none could be better versed in the Office for the Visitation of the Sick than yourself, and the sick person was no stranger to you, and you very well knew her whole story." He goes on to say that he had also full opportunities, seeing that the progress of the disease gave hopes of recovery, and he could have taken such opportunity then, and also that her mind all through remained unclouded. And then comes the fulmination: with all these opportunities he never moved her to confess that she had behaved wickedly to her father. She had been instant in prayer all through her illness, had gratefully received his ministrations, had made pious provisions for divers matters, had even uttered "Amen!" at the commendatory prayer, and yet had not been moved to confess that she was an undutiful child, an abettor of her father's chief enemy. "I challenge you to answer before God and the world: Did you know of no weighty matter which ought to have troubled the Princess's conscience, though at present she seemed not to have felt it, and for which you ought to have moved her to a special confession, in order to absolution? Were you satisfied that she was in charity with all the world? Did you know of no enmity between her and her father, nor variance between her and her sister? Did you know of no person who ever offended her whom she was to forgive? Did you know of no one person whom she had offended, and of whom she was to ask forgiveness? Did you know of no one injury or wrong she had done to any man, to whom she was to make amends to the utmost of her power? Was the whole Revolution managed with that purity of intention, that perfect innocence, that exact justice, that tender charity, and that irreproachable veracity, that there was nothing amiss in it—no remarkable failings; nothing that might deserve one penitent reflection?"

After saying that the answers to these questions must be such that there is nothing further for the Archbishop to do but to testify his repentance before God and the world, and to mourn in sackcloth and ashes all the rest of his life, and after directly charging him with having violated his conscience for the sake of Court favour, he writes:

"You tell us she was one who, 'I am well assured, had all the duty in the world for her other relations, which after long

and laborious consideration she judged consistent with her obligations to God and to her country.' The consideration then which she used to reconcile her judgment to the Revolution was, it seems, long and laborious, notwithstanding the assistance of her new casuists, it being no easy matter to overcome the contrary remonstrances of nature and of her own conscience, and to unlearn these evangelical maxims which were carefully taught her by the guides of her youth. . . . 'All the duty in the world' is a comprehensive term; but wherein, sir, did any part of that duty appear? Why are you not so just to her and to yourself as to give us some of those compassionate and melting expressions of filial duty which flowed from her on that subject? Why do you not produce some instances of her mildness and mercifulness to her enemies, and whom you know she treated as such, though their crime was their being her father's friends? These would have been much for her honour, would have given great satisfaction to all good people, would have convinced the world that the manner of her death had been in all respects truly Christian, would have been much for your own reputation and much for the credit of the Revolution in which you are as great a zealot as a gainer."

Peace to his ashes! Ken was not a great man, but he was a very holy man, a veritable confessor. A few of his works are become part of our acknowledged religious classics; he published four volumes of poems which have never been republished, and never will, for they are so crude as to be unreadable. To say that he had his faults is to say that he was human. He put those faults on his sleeve for daws to peck at. There are several of his letters which are querulous and almost unforgiving. And Queen Mary had her faults also. There was an unseemly exultation, apparently, when the Convention Parliament declared her Queen (Evelyn, February 13, 1689), which Ken remembered. Her explanation afterwards was that she was playing Katharine to her husband's Petruchio, that he had ordered her to look cheerful lest the situation should be misunderstood. Ken is certainly unjust as to her feelings towards her father. She knew that the latter had encouraged the attempt to assassinate her husband. And her reconciliation with her sister, the Princess Anne, was sincere and cordial on both sides.

We turn to a brighter subject, the Archbishop's eagerness to preserve and restore the discipline of the Church. He prevailed with the King to issue the following "Injunctions to the Archbishops, to be communicated by them to the Bishops and the rest of the clergy":

"WILLIAM REX.

"Most Reverend Father in God, our right trusty and entirely beloved counsellor, we greet you well. We being very sensible that nothing can more effectually conduce to the glory and honour of God and the support of the Protestant religion than the protecting and maintaining of the Church of England as it is by law established, which we are resolved to do to the utmost of our power, have therefore upon mature deliberation, with you and our other Bishops, by virtue of our royal and supreme authority, thought fit with the advice of our Privy Council to ordain and publish the following injunctions:

"I. That the 34th and 35th Canons concerning Ordinations be strictly observed. II. That every person to be admitted to Holy Orders do signify his name and the place of his abode fourteen days before he is ordained, to the end that inquiry may be made into his life and conversation; and that he appear, at the furthest, on Thursday in Ember week; that so such, who upon examination shall be found fit, may have time to prepare themselves by fasting and prayer before the day of Ordination. III. That every Bishop shall be well satisfied that all persons that are to be ordained have a real title, with a sufficient maintenance, according to the 33rd Canon, in which matter we require the Bishops to have an especial care. IV. That a certificate of the age of the person to be ordained be brought, if it can be, out of the parish register, or at least a certificate very well attested. V. That the part of the 34th Canon which relates to the giving of certificates concerning the lives and manners of those who are to be ordained be strictly looked to, and that the Bishop lay it on the consciences of the clergy that they sign no certificates unless upon their own knowledge they judge the persons to be duly qualified. VI. That every Bishop shall transmit between Michaelmas and Christmas to the Archbishop of the Province a list of all such persons as have been ordained by him during that year, according to the Constitution in the year 1584, in order to be put in a public register, which shall be prepared by you for that use. VII. That the Bishops shall reside in their dioceses, and shall take care to oblige their clergy to such residence as the laws of the land and the canons do require, particularly the 41st Canon. VIII. That they who keep curates have none but such as are licensed by the Bishop of the Diocese, or, in exempt jurisdictions, by the Ordinary of the place having episcopal jurisdiction, as is required both by the Act of Uniformity and the 48th Canon; that so when the incumbent does not reside, the Bishop or such Ordinary may know how the Cure is supplied, and that

no person shall presume to serve any Cure without license from the Bishop or such Ordinary upon pain of suspension. IX. That you use the most effectual endeavours to suppress the great abuses occasioned by Pluralities, and restrain them as much as you can, except where the parishes lie near one another and the livings are small; that all qualifications be carefully examined, we being determined to have no chaplains to be qualified by us but such as do attend upon us, and that due caution be taken before any faculty is granted, and that such persons as are legally qualified shall reside at least two months in the year in each of their livings, and provide a curate to serve where they are not in person, with a due maintenance, to be determined by the Bishop of the Diocese, unless the two parishes lie so near that the incumbent can constantly serve both cures. X. That the Bishop shall look to the lives and manners of their Clergy, that they may be in all things regular and exemplary, according to the 75th Canon. XI. That the Bishops do use their utmost endeavours to oblige their Clergy to have public prayers in the Church, not only on holy days, but as often as may be, and to celebrate the Holy Sacrament frequently. XII. That the Bishops shall require the Clergy to use their utmost endeavours that the Lord's Day be religiously observed; that they set a good example to their people and exhort them frequently to their duty herein. XIII. That the Bishops remind their Clergy to visit the sick frequently, and require them to perform that duty with great care and diligence, according to the 67th Canon. XIV. That Catechizing be duly performed according to the 59th Canon. XV. That the Bishops be careful to confirm not only in their triennial Visitations but at other convenient seasons. XVI. That care be taken that the Archdeacons do make their Visitations personally, and that as much as may be they live within the bounds of their jurisdiction and do their duty according to the Canons. XVII. That no commutation of Penance shall be made but by express order and direction of the Bishop himself, which shall be declared in open court, and that the commutation money shall be applied only to pious and charitable uses, according to the 'Articuli pro Clero' made in the year 1584, and the Constitutions made in the year 1597. XVIII. That no License for marriage without Banns shall be granted by any Ecclesiastical Judge without first taking the oaths of two sufficient witnesses, and also sufficient security for performing the conditions of the license according to the 102nd and 103rd Canons.

"These injunctions we do require you to transmit to the Bishops of your respective Provinces, to be by them communicated to their Clergy, and to be strictly observed and

often inquired after both by you and them. For as we esteem it the chief part of our princely care to promote true religion as it is established in this Church, and in order thereunto we have determined not to dispose of any Church preferments in our gift but to such of our clergy as we shall have reason to believe live exemplarily, and preach and watch most faithfully over the people committed to their charge; so we assure ourselves that these our pious intentions will be effectually seconded by you and the rest of the Bishops; and that you will, without favour or partial affections, study to suppress impiety and vice, and to reform all disorders as far as in you lies, well knowing that nothing will so much advance the great ends of religion, and so certainly secure and establish this Church, as the exemplary lives and faithful labours of those who minister in it, and so we commend ourselves heartily to your prayers, and bid you very hearty farewell. *Given at* our Court at Kensington in the 7th year of our reign. By His Majesty's command.

"SHREWSBURY."

In a very short time, so at least the Archbishop believed, came the need of another royal proclamation. It was issued immediately after the King's return from a highly successful campaign in the Netherlands, and the occasion was the following: The Socinians, taking advantage of the Act of Toleration, had busied themselves by issuing some pamphlets impugning the doctrine of the Trinity. Sherlock, Dean of St. Paul's, had undertaken the confutation of these, with the result that South, then a Prebendary of Westminster, had charged him with teaching Tritheism, and Sherlock had retorted that South's doctrine was Sabellianism. The war of pamphlets grew hot, for the two antagonists were men of great ability, learned and witty, and outsiders began to join in the quarrel. On St. Simon and Jude's day, 1695, Bingham, Fellow of the University, in a University sermon preached in favour of Sherlock's views, maintaining that "there are three infinite distinct minds and substances in the Trinity," and that "the three Persons in the Trinity are three distinct minds or spirits and three individual substances." South's friends took up the quarrel and procured the condemnation of these words by a solemn decree in Convocation, declaring them to be "false, impious, and heretical, disagreeing with and contrary to the doctrine of the Catholic Church, and especially to the doctrine of the Church of England publicly received." So hot did the quarrel become that Tenison again called on the King to interpose, and another proclamation came forth. After a calm exordium, it gives the following directions:

I. No preacher is "to deliver any other doctrine concerning the Blessed Trinity than what is contained in the Holy Scriptures, and is agreeable to the three Creeds and the Thirty-nine Articles." II. Preachers are to avoid all new terms, and are above all things to "abstain from bitter invectives and scurrilous language," and that all means such as the law provides shall be used to repress books impugning the Christian Faith.

Tenison issued another Pastoral the same year, of which the following are the principal recommendations: Preaching on Sunday afternoons "upon Catechistical Heads," with a view to the better instruction of the people in Church doctrine; care to prevent Simoniacal Covenants, especially "artificial bargains which are made by bonds of resignation"; "the causing of stipends of Curates to be proportioned to the value of the Benefice, and the greatness of their duty required of them, especially when the Incumbent is a Pluralist and cannot constantly reside in person, so that the service of God may not suffer by the employment of such ignorant and scandalous men as these incumbents generally procure, who choose to have such for their curates as will serve for the meanest salaries." Next he deals with dilapidations, especially where pluralists do not keep constant residence. "As for such who upon any pretences whatsoever desire a dispensation of non-residence, I entreat you not to grant it to any of them without their giving sufficient security to keep their chancels and parsonage houses in good repair if they be so already, or if not, to put them in good repair with all convenient speed." Then follow directions as to carefulness against illegal and irregular marriages, and against "pronouncing sentence of Excommunication and Absolution without such solemnity as that great weighty affair requires." There are several directions for securing good and proper men for Holy Orders; and when a man offers himself for ordination it is "to be laid upon his conscience to observe such fasting as is prescribed upon Ember Days, and to give himself in most serious manner to Meditation and Prayer," and he is also to be exhorted to observe his Ordination day in after years with such solemn exercises.

A characteristic passage in the Archbishop's life is one connected with a plot of some Jacobite fanatics to assassinate King William at the end of 1695. They were tried and condemned to death, and, though they gloried in their crime, three non-juring clergy gave them absolution according to the Church form. Thereupon fourteen Bishops who were then in London drew up at Lambeth a declaration that "the performance of this office of the Church without a previous confession made and abhorrence expressed by the prisoners of

the heinous crime for which they died, was extremely insolent, and without precedent in the manner, and altogether irregular in the thing itself; it being a manifest transgression of the Church's order, and profane abuse of the authority of Christ; since Mr. Collier, Mr. Snat and Mr. Cook must look upon the persons absolved as Impenitents or as Martyrs." This is surely reasonable. They were committed to Newgate, but Tenison, feeling that the protest which he and his brethren had made was sufficient for the purpose, begged them off from further punishment. On the other hand, when Sir John Fenwick was attainted of high treason, he having over and over not only publicly insulted the Queen, but after her death continued to attack her memory and the character of the King, Tenison voted for the attainder, though he did so with sorrow, and though Robert Nelson, who was in close friendship with him, besought him in Fenwick's favour. And here again, though he felt that to vote against the Bill would be to declare that he thought the man not guilty, yet he administered a sharp rebuke to Dr. John Williams, whom he consecrated just then Bishop of Chichester, and who rushed off at once to the House of Lords to vote for the attainder. "Brother, brother!" said Tenison; "you'll overheat yourself. What's the reason of all this pother?" "I was fearful, please your Grace, lest the Bill against Sir John Fenwick should be read before I could take my place in the House." "Fie, my lord!" said his Metropolitan, "you might have spared yourself that labour, since you had not an opportunity of hearing the merits of the cause at the first and second reading."

Once more we come to a work which gives us rest from controversy and brings us into the region of Christian practice. We had in the "Life of Tillotson" the royal proclamation respecting reformation of manners. In 1699 a like proclamation was made, and the Archbishop sent to the Bishops of his province a circular letter to be communicated to their clergy. After expressing his conviction that the present state of public morals is such as to threaten the welfare of the State, and also his thankfulness that he has seen in the clergy of London, among whom he has chiefly moved, a growing diligence in grappling with the evil, he presses for a greater zeal and carefulness, first, in the lives of the clergy and in the government of their families, "that they will make themselves Examples of a sober and righteous conversation. . . . Till that is done, no exhortations, whether in public or private, can either be offered with decency or received with reverence." Further than this, they should use gravity and calmness in their conversation. "Discreet caution in their words and actions will preserve them from those little imprudences that

are sometimes so sensible an obstruction to the good endeavours of well-meaning men. Persons in Holy Orders are not only bound in the conduct of their lives to consider what is lawful or unlawful in itself, but also what is decent or indecent in them with respect to their character and function; abstaining from all appearance of evil, and giving no offence in anything, that the ministry be not blamed." He then goes on to express a wish that the clergy would take especial pains to acquaint themselves with the defences of the Christian religion, now strongly assailed; and also with the other subjects of present controversy. And with this view he recommends that "the clergy of every neighbourhood would agree upon frequent meetings to consult for the good of religion in general, and to advise with one another about any difficulties that may happen in their particular cures; by what methods any evil custom may most easily be broken; how a sinner may be best reclaimed; and (in general) how each of them in their several circumstances may contribute most to the advancement of religion. Such consultations as these, besides the mutual benefit of advice and instruction, will be a natural means to excite the zeal of some, to reduce the earnestness of others to a due temper, and to provoke all to a religious emulation in the improvement of piety and order within their respective parishes; and these meetings might still be a great advantage to the clergy in carrying on the reformation of men's lives and manners, by inviting the churchwardens of their several parishes and other pious persons among the laity to join with them in the execution of the most profitable methods that can be suggested for these good ends." He expatiates at some length on some of the points which he has thus touched upon, and ends with a strongly expressed wish "that every one of the Parochial Clergy would be very diligent in catechizing the children under their cure; and not only so, but in calling upon them afterwards, as they grow up, to give such further account of their religion as may be expected from a riper age; that, being thus carefully instructed in the Faith and Duty of a Christian, they also may teach their children the same; and so Piety, Virtue and Goodness may for ever flourish in our Church and Nation."

Some very earnest endeavours had already been made in the direction indicated in this pastoral. Religious Societies had been founded in London as far back as the days of Charles II., and now that "for the Reformation of Manners" had been launched in 1691. Young men were holding weekly meetings for religious conference for mutual edification. Most of these Societies were directly connected with the Church of England, and their rules were drawn up in

accordance with the Prayer-Book. That for the Reformation of Manners, however, comprised both Nonconformists and Churchmen, and confined itself to putting the law into operation against "Profaneness and Debauchery." In the first Report of the Society for the Reformation of Manners the following vigorous preamble explains the need of it: "It is very well known that in the late times Profane Swearing and Cursing, Drunkenness, Open Lewdness and Profanation of the Lord's Day were generally discouraged and suppressed. And it is as well known, to our shame, that these sins have not only since revived among us by reason of the impunity of offenders, the countenance and preferment they have met with, and the contagion of great and ill examples, but have been committed with great impudence and without control, without either shame or fear of the laws, so that they were seen and heard at noonday and in our open streets; and, as if we were resolved to outdo the impieties of the very heathens, Profaneness and even blasphemy was too often the wit and entertainment of our scandalous play-houses, and sincere religion became the jest and scorn of our Courts in the late reigns. And thus Debauchery diffused itself throughout the whole body of the Nation, till at last our morals were so corrupted that Virtue and Vice had, with too many, changed their names; it was reckoned Breeding to swear, Gallantry to be lewd, Good Humour to be drunk, and Wit to despise sacred things; and it was enough to have rendered one suspected of Fanaticism, or an abjectness of spirit, and a matter of reproach, not to suffer one's self to be carried away with this torrent of wickedness and not to glory in those fashionable vices."

We have now seen the Archbishop calling not only for a national movement for Reformation and the repression of evils, but also for the positive teaching of Christian doctrine and practice. The immediate result, as we shall see hereafter, was the foundation of the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge.

W. BENHAM.

(To be continued.)

ART. II.—THE USE AND MISUSE OF RITUAL IN CHRISTIAN WORSHIP.

PART II.

I HAVE desired to make clear the distinction between a vain attempt to bring heaven to earth, which I regard as the misuse of Ritualism, and the raising of earth to heaven, which I believe to be the true aim of all really Christian ritual.

I desire now humbly to submit for consideration whether we may not have in this distinction that which may be regarded as the true account of the fact (which will hardly be questioned), that Christian art and Christian architecture were reaching their high-water mark just at the time when Christianity itself was sinking into the mire, reaching the bottom of the pit, wallowing in the very lowest depths of degradation. It was the close of the fifteenth century which saw a man (to use the words of a Roman Catholic writer), "whose fetid life should have excluded him from the meanest office in the Church, elevated to the supreme pontificate by gross and manifest bribery."[1] But let us turn our attention for a moment to a building near home. It may serve very well for an example—an example which may doubtless serve as a sample, we will hope not a fair sample—of a state of things prevalent throughout what was called the Christian world.

Our own abbey church of St. Alban's is a monument to the memory of a famous Abbot, William of Wallingford, under whose rule there rose on high "that magnificent pile of buildings," whose ruins (to use the words of Mr. Froude)[2] "breathe celestial music into the spirit of sentimental pietism." But under the rule of this same Abbot we are assured that the very aisles of this same magnificent structure were defiled with abominable orgies, with the mention of which the pages of the CHURCHMAN must not be defiled.

The heart of man was glorying in the things on earth which it called "heavenly." But where was the power to raise the human heart from things seen and temporal to the things unseen and eternal—the things which are "heavenly" indeed? It is sad to think of such things. Yet it is right

---

[1] See *Weekly Register*, September 23, 1899, p. 417.

[2] See "Short Studies on Great Subjects," Series III., p. 126, edit. 1898. Mr. Froude's condemnation of the religious houses in England (see p. 128) may be thought by some to be too sweeping and unduly severe. (See Trevelyan, "Age of Wycliffe," pp. 159, 160). But the fruits of the monastic system were undoubtedly known and felt to be evil. In the case of St. Alban's, the record of infamy is found in the letter of Cardinal Morton, whom Pope Innocent VIII. appointed to make visitation.

to take note of them. I speak this as myself an admirer of Christian art, and as having a very special delight in Gothic architecture. It is lawful for us to stand and admire, with great admiration, what Christian art and architecture have set before us. But in the midst of our admiration we must find room in our hearts for the acknowledging of the truth that Christianity has an aim in view and a work to do far too high to be greatly helped forward by the beauties of art or the depraved and secular enchantments of depraved and secular music.

In the midst of growing corruptions it may have been a true instinct which moved the Franciscans[1] (following herein the example of the Cistercians), in the beginning of their course of reformation (alas! it did not last long), while rejecting everything of the luxury of wealth, to refuse and cast away also every approach to ritual luxury of devotion, and to make their services bare and simple in the extreme.

Possibly the commendation which the ancient Fathers bestowed on the times of glass or wooden vessels and golden minds, and the depreciation by some of the costly decking and adorning, with the manifold furniture of vestments which came into the Church at a later date,[2] may be pointing along

---

[1] See Milman, "Latin Christianity," vol. vi., pp. 43, 44, and Kurtz, "History of Christian Church," vol. i., p. 396, E.T.

[2] See Bingham, "Antiquities of Christian Church," Book VIII., ch. ii.; Works, vol. ii., pp. 385, 386; and Griffith's edition of Homilies, p. 260.

When a rich present of plate was sent to the Carthusians for the use of their church, it was sent back as useless to them. See Mrs. Jameson, "Legends of Monastic Orders," p. 126.

At a later date, in De Rancé's institution of La Trappe, "not only all art and all ornament, but all literature, was banished" (*ibid.*, p. 167).

Augustine well says: "Pulchras formas et varias, nitidos et amœnos colores amant oculi. Non teneant hæc animam meam: teneat eam Deus qui fecit hæc, bona quidem valde; sed Ipse est bonum meum, non hæc" ("Confess.," Lib. X., cap. xxxiv., § 51).

The "godly and wholesome doctrine" taught in our Homilies (without pressing the language too closely) indicates very clearly what is the *general tendency* of the Reformed Church of England in her teaching on this matter. She denounces the "toys and trifles" of human devices, set up "to make a goodly outward show, and to deface the homely, simple, and sincere religion of Christ Jesus" ("Of the Time and Place of Prayer," Part II., p. 348, edit. Griffiths).

From this the change to be approved is thus set before us: "They see the church altogether scoured of such gay gazing sights as their gross fantasy was greatly delighted with, because they see the false religion abandoned and the true restored, which seemeth an unsavoury thing to this unsavoury taste; as may appear by this, that a woman said to her neighbour, 'Alas, gossip, what shall we now do at church, since all the saints are taken away, since all the goodly sights we were wont to have are gone, since we cannot hear the like piping, singing, chanting, and playing upon the organs that we could before?' But, dearly beloved,

a path of inquiry in which it may be found that, as a rule—not perhaps without exceptions—spiritual religion and real missionary zeal have made onward progress in inverse proportion to the care and pains and study bestowed on elaborate ritual, with attractive music and imposing ceremonial, with costly artistic surroundings of the service of the sanctuary.

I may be wrong, but I very much doubt whether any real support is to be found in the writings of the *early* Fathers for the principle which requires the accessories of Divine worship under the Gospel to be costly and exceeding magnifical. St. Augustin (misunderstanding, perhaps, the forty-fifth Psalm) says that "all the beauty of the King's daughter is *within*" (Ep. xxxvi., Op., tom. ii., c. 77; ed. Ben., Paris, 1689). And I question whether it can be well said that "the ceremonial of the New Testament has the stamp of Divine approval," as signifying that "the Temple is faithfully continued in the Church." Where—Temple worship rejected, and local centralization no longer approved—all true worship is to be essentially ἔν πνεύματι καὶ αληθεία, there "the beauty of holiness" must be inward and spiritual. And how otherwise are we to account for the fact that throughout the whole of the New Testament there is not a single precept concerning ritual, unless we press 1 Cor. xiv. 40 into the service?

At the time when, in the eyes of the world, the persecuted religion of Christ was arising from its low estate, and Emperors gloried in adorning its now magnificent temples,[1] and men's eyes beheld with admiration the marble walls and gilded roofs and exquisite beauty of Christian churches, there were doubtless those the thoughts of whose hearts were looking to the true Temple of God, and doubting whether all this earthly glory would tend to the edifying of the true Church of Christ, builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit.[2]

I am not wishing at all to question the sincerity of those who profess their desire "to establish a school of art, not meant to flatter the passions of the sons of Adam, but to guide and rule the feelings of the regenerated children of the Catholic faith." And I am not, of course, questioning for a moment (God forbid!) that Divine worship rightly claims from man

---

we ought greatly to rejoice and give God thanks, that our churches are delivered of all those things which displeased God so sore" (*ibid.*, pp. 349, 350).

[1] Justinian, when he had completed the rebuilding of the Church of St. Sophia at Constantinople, was heard to say: Νενίκηκά σε, Σολομών. See Bingham, "Ant.," Book VIII., ch. ii., § 3.

[2] It had been well said by one in earlier times: "Ecclesiam auro non strui, sed potius destrui." See Bingham, "Ant.," Book VIII., ch. ii., § 1.

that which is his *best.* I only mean that man's *best* here is not that which is outward and visible at all, and that the *best* of that which *is* material here is just that which best subserves that which is inward and spiritual. Still, it must not be supposed that such a view necessarily gives a rude dismissal to the service of all that can be called Christian art. It may find employment even for the highest art, in the truest and highest sense of the word—only for art which must be bidden, as a servant, to remember its place. Surely, blessed may be the use of Christian music and Christian song truly consecrated to the joyful service of our King. But I do rather question whether high art or high ritual, even when ordered humbly to minister to faith, is ever of so important a service as some imagine in assisting faithful souls to realize the truth that already we are come unto Mount Zion, the city of the living God. Those who have lived long under the shadow of St. Peter's at Rome may tell much of the imposing effect of gorgeous processions and magnificent ceremonial and delectable music. But some will tell also of impressions produced which were suggestive of association with the pomps and glories which belonged of old to the worship of pagans, and of dangerous resemblance to the pomps and vanities of this wicked world. It has been said by one who has deeply studied the subject of Italian art:[1] "The spirit of figurative art is always bringing us back to the dear life of earth, from which the faith would sever us." There is (or to ordinary minds there seems to be) such an exceeding contrariety between the stupendous solemnities and the beatific beatitudes of faith on the one side, and the littlenesses and prettinesses (which to some seem the puerilities and inanities) of many ritual *minutiæ* (not to say *ineptiæ*) on the other, that it is scarcely to be wondered at if those who have been deeply impressed with the one should manifest sometimes (perhaps too often) a disposition to be intolerant of—to think scorn of—the pains and travail so religiously and fondly bestowed by some on the other.

Man must have a religion. But the human heart finds it so hard to yield itself to the precept "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world," that it would fain degrade Christianity to the office of making this world a more desirable world to inhabit—making this mortal life better worth the living—and with this view making its ritual and the artistic accessories of its worship minister (in some sense and in some measure) to the lust of the flesh and the lust of

[1] See Wainwright, "Ritualism and Reformation," pp. 297, 302, 307 *et seq.*

the eyes and the pride of life, instead of obeying its call to seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God.

Is it to be much wondered at if those who have had real experience of the soul agony which comes of the burden and dominion of sin, and have found peace and victory through our Lord Jesus Christ, should be moved to ask—How can this excessive concern about the small things of ritual find place and lift up its head in the presence of the personalities of religion as seen in the light of the Gospel of the grace of God?

Of course, if once you admit the principle that ritual beauty and ceremonial worship are what God desires, and that with such sacrifices He is well pleased, then nothing that can contribute to outward splendour and attractive grandeur in His service may ever be despised; and then the heart's true devotion may be turned (as I doubt not it sometimes has been turned) into the channel of exceeding carefulness about such things as crosses and colours and fringes and flowers. But the important question for us is this—Does any such principle find real support or encouragement in the light of the unveiled glory of God as revealed to us in the New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ?

Let the answer to this question be sought by the devout and intelligent Christian first and chiefly from a general and comprehensive view of the teaching of Holy Scripture. In this view things will be seen in due proportion. And in proportion will be seen the measure of importance. But let special attention also be directed to one most instructive saying of our blessed Lord, our familiarity with which may perhaps have tended to deprive it of its full significance. It is the answer of Christ to the woman who would fain have turned from the heart-searching and sin-condemning word of Christ to the question about the true centre of worship—Gerizim or Jerusalem. "The hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship Him. God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth." I must not stop to dwell on the deep teaching of these words, though I must ask my readers to dwell upon that teaching in the heart-silence of profoundest reverence. I will only just ask attention for a moment to the words *true* (*ἀληθινοὶ*) and *truth* (*ἀληθεία*). We should be misunderstanding the constant use of such words in the Gospel of St. John if we were to understand them as standing only in opposition to what is *false* or *fictitious*. They rather indicate that which has to do with the *inward truth signified* as in contrast to

the *outward thing signifying*.[1] The *true* worshippers (ἀληθινοὶ προσκυνηταὶ) are those whose worship has not to do with carnal ordinances, which served for a time for an example and shadow of things heavenly and spiritual, but with the *reality* of which legal types were mere outward signs. The types, the shadows pass away. And the worshippers whose worship of old consisted in sacrifices and ceremonies at Gerizim or Jerusalem[2] are to pass away too, or to be transformed into those whose worship shall be inward and spiritual, who shall worship in spirit and in truth—in the *truth* foreshadowed by legal ordinances. And these will be the worshippers such as God, who is a Spirit, is seeking. These shall not have to go up to Jerusalem to worship: for these shall be the *true* worshippers, worshippers not in symbols belonging to a local sanctuary, but in the *truth* which belongs to the Jerusalem which is above, which is free, and the mother of all.

N. DIMOCK.

ART. III.—MOSES AND THE PHARAOHS.

PART I.

RECENT discoveries in Egypt have done much to increase our knowledge of the ancient country of the Nile, its people and their rulers, in those long bygone days before even the first books of our Bible were penned. In particular they have *settled*, we make bold to say, which of the Pharaohs it was who so severely and for so long oppressed the Children of Israel in Egypt, and also who the other Pharaoh was in whose

[1] So Origen: Ἀληθινὸς, *πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολὴν σκιᾶς καὶ τύπου καὶ εἰκόνος* ("In Joan," tom. ii., § 4). See especially Trench, "Synonyms of New Testament," pp. 26, 27. See also Godet, "Commentary on St. John," vol. ii., pp. 116, 117, E.T.

[2] See the excellent commentary of Chrysostom, "In Joan," Hom. XXXIII., Op., tom. viii., pp. 191, 192; edit. Montfaucon, Paris, 1728.

Cajetan well says: "Ecce exclusio cultus in templo. Et per hæc duo exclusa loca, intelliguntur exclusa omnia alia loca. . . . In *spiritu*, non in monte, non in Hierosolymis, non in loco aliquo, non cultu temporali, non lingua, sed interiore cultu consistente in spiritu" ("Evang. Com.," f. 153, edit. 1530).

There is nothing, of course, in our Lord's words condemnatory of suitable external signs of devotion. And none will contend that outward forms, such as bowing the knees and lifting up holy hands, may not be aids conducive to spiritual worship. But the truth remains that *the* worship of the New Covenant is, by our Lord's teaching, not outward, but inward. The presenting our *bodies* as a living sacrifice (our λογικὴ λατρεία) is an inward and spiritual act.

reign they made their great Exodus and started for the Promised Land.

A clear and succinct statement of the results of these discoveries seems very desirable. It may be remembered that some remarks made by a speaker at the International Congress of Orientalists held in London, in September, 1892, led to quite a considerable correspondence in the *Times* and elsewhere, as to which of the Pharaohs it was whom the Bible describes as the "King which knew not Joseph," and which of them it was who was the Pharaoh of the Exodus—some correspondents claiming the Pharaohs of one Dynasty, other correspondents claiming different Pharaohs of the same or different Dynasties. And one still hears contradictory voices not unfrequently; so little known and understood seem to be the more recent discoveries and conclusions of the science of Ancient Egyptian things.

Moreover, in these days when, alas! the authority of Moses is so grievously assailed, and when the authenticity of the books which are attributed to him in the New Testament, and which have been so attributed by the Jewish Church and by all Christendom (except a few moderns), is distinctly denied by some and "idealized" by other writers, we believe that a fresh statement of the facts and discoveries of Egyptology to which we have referred, and which in a remarkable manner illustrate and confirm the truth of one section of the history of the Book of Exodus, will be read with interest by the readers of THE CHURCHMAN.

I. Our first and most important point is to determine THE PHARAOH "WHICH KNEW NOT JOSEPH."

These words, which are used both in the first chapter of the Book of Exodus, and also in the dying *apologia* of St. Stephen, might truly describe the Pharaoh of the Exodus, as well as one, or probably more than one, of his predecessors; but it is better to take them as describing in particular one king who, *par excellence*, by long and severe oppression, made the lot of the chosen race so utterly miserable and intolerable in the land that had once welcomed them, that they were thankful indeed to escape from it.

"There arose up a new king which knew not Joseph," says the narrative, and then follows the reason assigned for his not looking with favour upon the posterity of Joseph's family: "And he" (*i.e.*, the Pharaoh) "said unto his people, Behold, the people of the children of Israel are more and mightier than we. Come on, let us deal wisely with them, lest they multiply, and it come to pass that, when there falleth out any war, they join also unto our enemies and fight against us, and so get them up out of the land" (Exod. i. 8-10).

The effect of this somewhat hyperbolical description, and appeal at once to the fears and covetousness of the Egyptians, was such as the royal speaker intended, and is told us in the next verse: "Therefore they [the Egyptians] did set over them [the Hebrews] taskmasters to afflict them with their burdens. And they built for Pharaoh treasure cities—Pithom and Raamses."

As the word "Pharaoh" here used is not a proper name, but the title of royalty in Egypt, from the earliest Dynasties to the Ptolemaic, it gives us no clue to the particular holder of the title of whom we are in quest; that is to say, of the Pharaoh under whose reign Moses was born and lived unto manhood, when—St. Stephen mentions that "he was full forty years old"—he visited his countrymen, beheld their bondage, and, his indignation thereat being kindled, he was guilty of an act of homicide. However, for that deed, we are told, Pharaoh "*sought* to slay" him. The word "*sought*" denotes that something hindered him from accomplishing his purpose, and Moses' high, adopted sonship (of Pharaoh's daughter) was at least one difficulty in the way of his doing so. Moses succeeded in escaping to the land of Midian, where he remained during the lifetime of the Pharaoh who had sought his life.

"And it came to pass, in process of time, that the king of Egypt died"; then the Lord began to look favourably upon his people, and to call Moses back to their deliverance.

"In process of time," more literally, "in those many days," is a phrase signifying that the Pharaoh died after a very long reign. Moreover, during all his reign, his despotic oppression of the chosen people was not lightened, for the verse continues, "and the children of Israel sighed by reason of the bondage, and they cried, and their cry came up unto God by reason of the bondage. And God heard their groaning."

After some hesitation and delay, lasting we know not how long, but probably for some years, Moses obeyed the call and returned to Egypt. He was four-score years of age, we are told (Exod. vii. 7), when he and Aaron appeared in the presence of Pharaoh to petition for Israel's departure.

Here we are come pretty nearly to the end of the information the sacred narrative affords us as to whom the Pharaoh we are seeking was, and, among other things to help us, we have gained this important evidence, namely, that *from the birth of Moses until the Exodus was eighty years, and much the larger part of that time* was occupied by *the reign of one king*, who sorely oppressed the Children of Israel—he was the Pharaoh "which knew not Joseph."

We must now turn to Egyptian history to find two Pharaohs

whose consecutive reigns lasted fully eighty years, the former of the two having a conspicuously long reign. And that we may know *whereabouts* to look for these in the long, long roll of Pharaohs, it will be well to determine, approximately, in which of the thirty Dynasties of ancient Egypt the kings we seek for ruled. We say "approximately," because we here enter upon questions of chronology, and the chronology of the East is always wanting in exactitude; it is so in that of the Bible; it is much more so, as we shall presently see, in that of the Pharaohs. In dealing with both systems, therefore, we have the difficulties of a double series of inexactnesses to deal with. Still, an investigation of the facts, so far as known in both histories, will bring us somewhere near to the time we want.

Before proceeding with this investigation, it may be worth while to enumerate the historical materials at our disposal for this purpose.

Besides the Bible we have certain Greek writers, notably Herodotus and Diodōrus Siculus, and the Epitomists of Manetho (about which we will speak a word later). Then, far more trustworthy, are the contemporary monuments of the different Pharaohs, inscribed and painted upon wood and stone, and written upon papyrus. Unfortunately for nineteenth century science, these records were not made in accordance with any system of chronology, and they determine the lengths of the reign of comparatively few of the kings. There are some four or five monuments which, however, are exceptions to this rule. They give lists of kings generally in historical succession, and sometimes the order of the Dynasties, and the number of years each king reigned.

These monuments are (1) the little "Hall of Ancestors," otherwise called the Tablet of Karnak, of Thothmes III. of the Eighteenth Dynasty; (2, 3) the two Tablets of Abydos; and (4) one of Sakkarah; and (5) by far the most useful of all, were it not now in such a sadly mutilated condition, the Turin Papyrus. The last four monuments all date back to the Nineteenth Dynasty.

But the most important of all our sources as a single "document," because the most comprehensive and systematically arranged, are the remains of a compilation of ancient Egyptian history which was written down in Greek by Manetho, an Egyptian priest of high repute, in the Court of the first Ptolemy—Ptolemy Soter—who reigned B.C. 328-285. Unfortunately, however, Manetho's books are lost, and until the hoped-for day when the spade of the explorer shall exhume some long-buried copy, we have to be content with those epitomes of the books which, in the way of lists of the Dynasties and

kings, have been preserved, in a nearly complete form, by Julius Africanus, Eusebius and George the Syncellus. These are sometimes spoken of as "the Greek Epitomists." There are, however, discrepancies in these three reproducers of Manetho, and we cannot now verify their quotations. There is, furthermore, the "Old Egyptian Chronicle," preserved by the Syncellus and Eusebius, being a translation of a tablet enumerating the mythical Dynasties and most of the thirty historical ones, with the number of the kings in each, and the number of years that each Dynasty lasted.

Such being our Egyptian sources of information, we resume our inquiry.

Our first *fixed* point in the two histories—the history of the Chosen People and that of Egypt—is the reign of *Shishak*, who, we learn from Scripture, was contemporary with the later years of Solomon's reign in Judah. With him, *Jeroboam*, afterwards the first king of the Ten Tribes, found refuge when he had to flee from Solomon.

Pharaoh Shishak—or Shishonk or Sheshenk—is well known from the Egyptian monuments. He was the first king of the Twenty-second Dynasty. He invaded Jerusalem in the tenth year of his reign, which was the fifth year of King Rehoboam, and this, according to the carefully calculated chronology of Archbishop Ussher (given in the margin of our reference Bibles) was B.C. 971. From this date, then, we have to work back to the time of Moses.

Now the date of the death of the king of Egypt from whom Moses fled into Midian (the Pharaoh "which knew not Joseph"), according to Archbishop Ussher's reckoning, was B.C. 1531—exactly 560 years before Shishak's invasion of Jerusalem.

We must now turn to our Egyptian authorities to find the Pharaoh—or at least the Dynasty—ruling over Egypt 560 years before the invasion of Shishak.

Referring first to the "Old Chronicle," and counting back the 560 years, we are brought to the end of the Eighteenth Dynasty.

We test this result by making the same calculation according to Manetho's list, and, comparing the result with what the monuments tell us, we find ourselves in a nest of difficulties. For, first, a strict reckoning of 560 years brings us to the reign of a certain Acherres or Achenchres, whom Petrie identifies with Rasmenkh-ka, successor of Akhenaten, or Khuen-aten, the "heretic king" of the Eighteenth Dynasty. But next, Manetho's lists give the third successor of the aforementioned Achenchres or Acherres the same name and as of the same Eighteenth Dynasty; but this second Acherres of

Manetho appears to be the Divine Father Ay of the monuments. There is considerable confusion in the rest of Manetho's list—as it has come down to us—of the remaining rulers of this Dynasty. The confusion is due partly to the compound names of kings containing some of the same elements; to kings gaining their right to rule through marriage; and partly, no doubt, to copyists' errors.

But of one other difficulty in Manetho's history here we must briefly speak. The first king of the Eighteenth Dynasty he names Amōs (the Aahmes of the monuments), and adds "in whose time Moses went forth from Egypt," meaning, we suppose, to the land of Midian. But it so happens that Josephus, the Jewish historian,[1] has preserved a long and curious extract from Manetho's writings relating to the Exodus, in which it is stated that the "unclean people of Moses" were driven out of Egypt by the Pharaoh and his son Rampses (or Rameses), who pursued the people of Moses—those they did not slay—"to the borders of Syria." There seems to be an odd garbling of the facts of the sacred history in what Manetho here writes; but the point of more importance to our researches now is that Amōs, in whose time he tells us Moses went out of Egypt (to Midian), was the first king of the Eighteenth Dynasty, while Rameses, the son of the reigning Pharaoh, and associated with him in the pursuit of the children of Israel out of Egypt, was the first king of the Nineteenth Dynasty, and the interval between the two, according to Manetho himself, was 260 years! So that, according to this story, Moses must have been some 300 years old when he led the Exodus of the Hebrews!

When we see that Manetho's remains give such impossible and contradictory results, when put to the test, can we wonder that writers who have built their identifications of the Pharaohs upon those remains have come to very different and unsatisfactory conclusions?

In a general sort of way, and occasionally in special details, Manetho is most helpful. Beyond this conclusion, all that we can safely affirm of his writings as they have come down to us and with respect to our present investigation is, that *the Pharaohs of the Oppression and Exodus of Israel must have belonged to the Eighteenth or Nineteenth Egyptian Dynasty.* We have previously learned, it will be remembered, from the Bible history that those same two Pharaohs reigned not fewer than 80 consecutive years, of which many more than 40 belong to the former of them, to the Pharaoh "which knew not Joseph."

[1] Not in his "Antiquities," but in his work "Against Apion," Book I., chap. xxvii.

For more light on the subject, and for a successful identification of the kings we seek, we must now turn to what is, after all, the most satisfactory evidence that secular history can give, namely, that applied by the contemporary monuments.

Of the two Egyptian Dynasties which now chiefly concern us—the Eighteenth and Nineteenth—there have, happily, been preserved an enormous number of monuments of different kinds, remarkable for the information they convey and for their beauty both of execution and of preservation. They tell us the names and succession of all the kings of both Dynasties, though hitherto, unfortunately, they have not told us how long some of these Pharaohs reigned. However, the dates that have been preserved to us by the monuments, compared with those of Manetho, and a variety of other evidence which the monuments afford us, do satisfactorily and conclusively meet our present inquiries.

What we still want, it will be remembered, is, in the Eighteenth or Nineteenth Dynasty, two kings reigning in succession not less than 80 years, the former of the two reigning much longer than 40 years, and, of course, both of them of character and circumstances suitable to the Pharaohs of the Oppression and Exodus respectively of the Children of Israel.

And first, as to the Eighteenth Dynasty. Concerning it, we would observe, generally, that this is scarcely the period in which we should expect to find severe domestic tyranny or the escape of a host of Egyptian subjects from their lord. It was the time of Egypt's greatest glory. Its kings, except a few obscure ones at the end of the Dynasty, were active, warlike men, full of foreign conquests and victories, holding their own subjects well in hand, and not imposing on them great building labours (as did the Pharaohs who oppressed Israel), although it was Egypt's Augustan age in literature and science.

Next, and more particularly, there was *only one* king throughout this Dynasty who reigned long enough to be the Pharaoh "who knew not Joseph"; this was Thothmes III., who (first in association with his aunt, Hat-shepsut, then solely) reigned 54 years. He was Egypt's very greatest and most glorious monarch. He made himself suzerain of the whole of Palestine and Syria, throughout their length and breadth, and unto their farthest confines. We cannot, therefore, for our part, look upon him as at all a likely Pharaoh for the tyrannical oppression of Israel. Moreover, other facts have come to light, as we shall presently see, which absolutely forbid us identifying him as such.

Thothmes III. was succeeded by two Pharaohs, who reigned

some 35 years between them, then by Amenhotep III., who reigned at least 36 years—long before whose death, therefore, the Children of Israel, if they had made their exodus during the reign of Thothmes III.'s successor, must have settled down in Canaan.

That the Hebrews had *not* settled down in the Promised Land by that time, recent discoveries (among the greatest ever made in Egyptology), shows us conclusively. For Amenhotep III. was succeeded by his son, Amenhotep IV., known as the "heretic king" because he worshipped only the sun's disc, or orb, and sought to enforce that worship on his subjects and allow no other. He changed his own name to Khu-en-Aten—"Glory of Aten" (Aten being the sun's disc, which he worshipped as a god). To make the break with the past more complete, he removed his Court from the ancient capital of Thebes to a new place which he built near Siût—half-way towards the site of modern Cairo—and called by classical writers Alabastron or Alabastra. This new city and capital scarcely outlived his reign, which lasted only 18 years: but the ruined heap representing it has long been known as Tel-el-Amarna.

Now—and this is the remarkable discovery we have just referred to—in the winter of 1887 there were dug up the diplomatic archives of Tel-el-Amarna, the letters, reports and correspondence of governors and tributary kings to Khuenaten.

The first marvellous thing to be noticed about this literature—though we cannot here dwell upon it—is that it is written almost entirely on tablets of clay (afterwards baked) in the *cuneiform* character, and, in the main, the language of Babylon—which language, we may add, would be substantially that of Abraham.

But the second notable thing, and the most important in its bearing on the present subject, is that many of these cuneiform tablets of diplomacy *came* to Khuenaten *from the land of Canaan*—from native kings of Palestinian cities (including Jerusalem), acknowledging Pharaoh's suzerainty over them; and also from *Egyptian governors* of cities in Palestine, reporting to their sovereign Pharaoh. The cities and places named in these despatches include the field of Bashan, land of the Hittites, of the Amorites ("on the north side of Palestine"), and "Canaan," Gaza, Gath, Gezer, Karmel-Judah, Hebron, Lachish, Ashkelon, Mount Seir of Judah (Joshua xv. 10—*not* that of Edom), Rabbah, the district of the Dead Sea, Jerusalem, Megiddo, Ajalon, Chesulloth, Hazor, Accho, Tyre, Sidon, and many more; so that districts and cities of North, South, East, West and Central Palestine, by their own kings or by resident

Egyptian governors, acknowledged Pharaoh as their sovereign, or, at least, as their feudal lord.

Of this lordship of the land of Canaan by Egypt, Scripture history, from the time that Israel crossed the Jordan onwards, is entirely ignorant.

Whence it follows plainly that *neither Thothmes III. nor any other predecessor* of Amenhotep IV. (Khuenaten) was the Pharaoh "which knew not Joseph."

To find that Pharaoh, therefore, we are now confined to the Nineteenth Dynasty. Of that Dynasty our choice is restricted to one of two kings—viz., to Seti I. (the Greek Sethos), *or* to Rameses II.

In favour of Seti there is to be said that Manetho's epitomists give him 51 years of rule, which, however, Dr. Birch tells us, the monuments do not confirm. I have not been able to find any reference to any monument of his dated later than his *thirtieth* year. It is therefore most probable that Seti did not reign long enough to be the Pharaoh of the Oppression.

It has, however, been further urged in favour of that identification that Moses says (Exod. i. 8) that there "arose up a new king which knew not Joseph," and that this expression signifies the first of a new line of kings; and although Seti was, it is true, the *second* Pharaoh of the new Dynasty (the Nineteenth), yet that his predecessor, the first one (Rameses I.) reigned so short a time, and Seti so long (51 years, according to Manetho), that it was not to be wondered at that the historian of the Exodus should pass over the actual but short-lived introducer of the dynasty.

The answer to this is that, as we have already pointed out, Seti I. did not reign anything like so long as 51 years; that we are agreed that neither he nor Rameses II. was actually the first king of the new line. Moreover, we shall all agree that the Pharaoh "which knew not Joseph"—whether Seti I. or Rameses II.—was altogether a different kind of man in relation to the Hebrews (an *heteros*, to use St. Stephen's word) from his predecessors, who had so justly appreciated the Children of Israel.

It will help us, however, to form an opinion as to the likelihood of Seti being the Pharaoh of the Oppression, as well as be in itself interesting, to look a little into the history of his reign, as the monuments reveal it to us.

In his very first year Seti had to chastise Shashu or Beduin depredators on the frontiers of Egypt, who had become audacious enough to attack the important fortified city of Zal. He easily routed them, and drove them back into the desert. This event may have caused a stricter watch to have

been kept on affairs in the eastern part of the delta, but the description of the event itself is not to be taken as a euphemistic way—from an Egyptian point of view—of describing the Exodus of the Children of Israel, because the Hebrews were not Shashu, nor roving robbers or Beduin.

Furthermore, Seti was a great and warlike king—at least, during his earlier years, whose events are recorded on the monuments. He recovered most of the conquests of the great Thothmes; reconquered Syria, dragging some Syrian chiefs in chains after his triumphal chariot; attacked and made a treaty of peace with the Khita or Hittites (now become a really formidable power in Palestine); received tribute of the Amorites, who were vassals of the Hittite king, from the Ionians or Greeks, and from the Troglodytes of North Africa; and re-established the Egyptian fleet on the Red Sea. He also built the famous Hall of Columns at Karnak (Thebes), and began public works in the east of the Delta, constructing, apparently, the Canal from the Nile to the Red Sea, passing Lake Timsah (Crocodile Lake). For these public works, doubtless, he would employ forced labour, in which in the Delta the Israelites may have had to share. But we must remember that it was of tasks of building work, and not excavating, that the Israelites chiefly complained, and Seti does not appear to have done much building here. Rameses II., his son and successor, did a very great deal.

So far, then, the evidence is very far from convicting Seti of the guilt, or of favouring any presumption that Seti was guilty, of that special and long-continued oppression of the Children of Israel, of which the Pharaoh we are seeking to identify was guilty, though it is quite possible—indeed, probable—that before his reign was over the Israelites did find that they had got "another king," and harder times than their forefathers had known.

There is one other argument which, if we could trust to it, would absolutely forbid us identifying Seti I. with the Pharaoh "which knew not Joseph." It is this: If the words of Psalm cxxxvi. 15, which tell us that the Lord "overthrew Pharaoh and his host in the Red Sea," are to be taken literally, as meaning that the king himself, in his own person, was thus and there destroyed, then, if Seti were the king "who knew not Joseph," Rameses II., his son and successor, would be the Pharaoh of the Exodus. But this he could not be if the verse of the Psalm is to be thus literally interpreted; for Rameses II. reigned an exceedingly long time. He was filling the valley of the Nile with his boastful inscriptions long after, had he been the Pharaoh of the Exodus, his bones must have been entombed in the depths of the Red Sea.

We are left, therefore, with Rameses II.—the Greek Sesostris[1]—as the great oppressor of Israel, "the king which knew not Joseph."

We have now to inquire whether the character of Rameses II. and the circumstances of his reign support the identification of this king as the great oppressor of the children of Israel in Egypt.

1. And first, as to the length of his reign. His father, Seti I., gave him high honours and titles which have been interpreted as meaning that he associated his son with him on his throne, even as a child. It seems unlikely, however, that he should really have made even a much-favoured child co-regent. At all events, Rameses' own monuments count only the years that he ruled alone (after Seti's decease). And they note his sixty-seventh year of rule—the longest reign the Egyptian annals can boast (with the solitary exception of Phiops—Pepi II.—of the Sixth Dynasty, which is far too remote for our present consideration). How appropriate, then, to Rameses II. are the words of Exodus ii. 23: "And it came to pass *in process of time* that the King of Egypt died"!

2. Secondly, as to the agreement of the years of Moses (born in Rameses' reign) with the years that Rameses ruled after Moses' birth *plus* the years of Rameses' successor at the Exodus.

According to Exodus vii. 7, Moses was eighty years old when he had his interviews with the reigning Pharaoh (him of the Exodus), after the Pharaoh of the Oppression was dead. Now, according to Manetho, Menephthah, the Pharaoh of the Exodus, and the son and successor of Rameses II., reigned 20 years. If we may depend upon this date, then—as Rameses himself reigned fully 66 years—if Moses was born in, say, the sixth year of the reign of Rameses II., he would be *exactly* eighty years old in the last year of Menephthah's reign, which would be the year of the Exodus, when Pharaoh's host (and perhaps the Pharaoh himself) was drowned in the depths of the Red Sea.

Thus, all the *chronological* requirements of the sacred history are met with full and most remarkable exactitude. The whole course of the Pharaonic chronology shows nothing to meet the required conditions as those of Rameses II. and Menephthah meet them.

3. Thirdly, Rameses II. was also—as is required of the Pharaoh of the Oppression—a great builder. An inscription on one of his colossal statues at Tanis (Zoan) states this in so many words, reading thus—"Rameses, the great builder."

---

[1] An extant papyrus shows us that Rameses II. was called also, during his own lifetime, *Sesura* or *Sustra*—hence the Greek form *Sesostris*.

He was such particularly in the part of Egypt that our history appears to require—viz., in the Eastern Delta. "This part of Egypt seems, in fact," writes M. Naville in his memoir on "Goshen," "to have been the favourite residence of the great Pharaoh. . . . His cartouche is found in most parts of the Eastern Delta—Tanis, Pithom, Sopt, Bubastis, Heliopolis, and the sites now occupied by the Tells of Kantir, Khataanah, Fakoos, Horbeit and Rotab." (The cartouche or seal of the king, sculptured on remains of edifices, signifies that he built more or less of the cities thus signed.)

4. Furthermore, we are not only told generally (Exod. i. 13, 14) that "the Egyptians made the children of Israel to serve with rigour: and they made their lives bitter with hard bondage, *in mortar* and *in brick*, and in all manner of service in the field," but we are also told particularly (Exod i. 11) that "*they built for Pharaoh treasure cities, Pithom and Raamses.*"

(*a*) The site of "Raamses" has not yet been certainly identified by modern discovery, but there is no doubt that the city received its name from the Pharaoh in connection with whom it was built, *i.e.*, Rameses.[1] From the first and second chapters of the Book of Exodus (*cf.* i. 11, 12, 15, 22; ii. 1, 2) we gather that the city began to be built before Moses was born, and it so happens that a tablet is preserved at Abu Simbel, in Upper Egypt, referring to this very place, and speaking of it as then "built." The words, which are represented as being spoken to Rameses II. are these: "Thou hast built a great residence to fortify the boundary of the land, *the city of Rameses.*" The date of the tablet is the thirty-fifth year of the reign of Rameses II.

The *name* of the city, "Raamses" or "Rameses," is in itself of considerable importance in giving a clue to the time of its erection. "The name of Rameses," says one who spake with the greatest authority on all subjects of Egyptian philology,[2] "points to a particular date. It is as significant of a celebrated historical personage as those of Alexandria, Ptolemais, Seleucia, Petersburgh or Washington." That historical personage is Rameses the Great. "The name itself," continues M. Renouf, "did not exist before the Nineteenth Dynasty. It is not formed like those of Thoth-mes, Hor-mes, Chonsu-mes, or

[1] We say "in connection with whom" rather than absolutely *by* whom, for the city might have been founded by him, but completed by his successor, and still have borne the name of Rameses (see below, p. 428). The particular Rameses, as we shall shortly see yet more evidently, was Rameses II., "Rameses the Great."

[2] M. P. le Page Renouf, in the "Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archæology," December, 1892, p. 61.

Ra-mes.[1] A reduplicated form of the last of these names was assumed by the first Rameses and by his descendants," of whom Rameses II. is by far the greatest.

Hence the city "Raamses" or Rameses built by the Children of Israel must have been built for one of the Pharaohs of that name of either the Nineteenth or the Twentieth Dynasties. The only possible Pharaoh of the Twentieth Dynasty was Rameses III., but as many weighty considerations quite exclude him, the only name—and that absolutely the most probable—is Rameses II.; and that he was the builder of it his own tablet at Abu Simbel tells us plainly.

(*b*) The foregoing considerations had long been considered by many Egyptologists as making Rameses II. the Pharaoh who oppressed the Hebrews. And the discovery of the second city which we are told the Children of Israel built in the bondage—the city of Pithom—has satisfactorily confirmed their conclusion. The site and ruins of *Pithom* were found and identified by M. Naville in his searches for the Egypt Exploration Fund in the spring of 1883. It lies on the south side of the sweet-water canal which runs from Cairo to Suez, twelve miles from Ismâîlia, on the railway line, and is marked by the disused railway-station to which the French gave the name of *Ramsès*. The Arabs call the site Tell el Maskhutah —"mound of the statue"—from a great granite monolithic figure of Rameses II., seated between the gods Ra and Tum, which lay there. On excavating, many monuments were discovered dedicated to the old Egyptian god *Tum*. It scarcely needed, therefore—what, however, were soon and repeatedly forthcoming—inscriptions to tell us that the name of the place was *Pi-Tum* (Pithom), "the abode of Tum."

That was its sacred name, but, in Egyptian fashion, it had also a secular or common name, which was Thuku, the Hebrew form of which is *Succoth*, a word which in Hebrew happens to mean "tabernacles." "Succoth, or Thuku," writes M. Naville in his memoir, "was first a region, a district, then it became the name of the chief city or capital of the district. . . . We have in the Papyri Anastasi [which were written during the reign of Menephthah, the Pharaoh of the Exodus] a good deal of information concerning the region of

[1] Hence, the argument of Canon Cook (in his valuable "Essay on Egyptian Words in the Pentateuch," appended to vol. i. of the "Speaker's Commentary," p. 487) that "Ra-mes" was the name borne by a son of Aahmes, the first king of the Eighteenth Dynasty, loses its force. It would scarcely surprise us if we met with Ra-mes, "child of Ra," even in the very earliest dynasties; but Rameses, with the double ending, is significant of a particular historical period in Egyptian history—that is, of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Dynasties.

Thuku. We hear that it was a border-land near the foreign region of Atuma, which was occupied by nomads . . . also that it contained the city of Pithom, near which were lakes and large pastures."

M. Naville unearthed the ruins and foundations of the city, and found them quite unlike those of other Egyptian cities. The south-west angle contained a small temple dedicated to Tum (the god of the setting sun). A much larger portion, probably *nearly the whole of the city, consisted*, not of public edifices, private houses and streets, but *of chambers*, well built of crude bricks, joined by thin layers of mortar. The walls of the chambers were two or three yards thick. The chambers did not communicate with each other, but were entered only from the top. They were, in reality, an enormous collection of granary and store-rooms. Pithom was therefore, just as the Bible describes it, a "treasure-," or, as the Revised Version translates the word, a "store-city"—a great warehouse of stores for the armies of the Pharaohs starting out on their expeditions north-eastwards. Enormously thick walls enclosed the city; hence the ancient Greek translation of the Bible, the Septuagint, describes these great depots as "strong cities."[1]

The Pharaoh who built Pithom was certainly Rameses II. M. Naville "did not find anything more ancient than his monuments,"[2] and his were numerous and on a great scale.

Here, then, we claim to have reached the point we have been searching for, and our conclusion may be formally stated thus: the Pharaoh who chiefly oppressed Israel made them build the treasure-city Pithom. But it was for Rameses II. that Pithom was built. Therefore, *Rameses II. was the Pharaoh of the Oppression, i.e.*, "the King which knew not Joseph."

And glancing back over the evidence that has been forthcoming, we may ask whether it is possible for monuments and chronology to witness more plainly for an identification (short of an express declaration, such as in this case it is idle to hope for) than they witness for the identification of Rameses II. as the oppressor of Israel?

In character Rameses II. was the proud, voluptuous and boastful despot we might expect. To his boastfulness we have already alluded. It will be sufficient to add another illustration of it from his own monuments, in one of which he declares that "the whole world has made way before the strength of my arm"![3]

As to the oppressiveness of his reign: at the conclusion of

---

[1] Πόλεις ὀχυράς. [2] "Pithom," p. 11.

[3] Lenormant's "Manual of the Ancient History of the East," vol. i., p. 252 of the English translation.

his wars, when he had subjugated more or less completely the Hittites, Syria and Asia Minor, then (again we quote M. Lenormant[1]) "captives were wanting for the works. Then man-hunting expeditions among the unfortunate negroes of Soudan were organized on a monstrous scale, unknown in former times. . . . Nearly every year grand *razzias* were made into Ethiopia, returning with thousands of captives of every age, and of both sexes, loaded with chains." Again, "all the foreign tribes of Semitic race, attracted by the policy of the predecessors of Rameses into the Delta to colonize the land reclaimed from the water (*i.e.*, from the marshes of the Delta), were subjected to the same oppression, to the same routine of forced labour, as the Hebrews. Even the indigenous rural population, Egyptian by birth, did not escape."

We may add, as a further and marked characteristic of the man, that he was exceedingly voluptuous. He had an enormous *harîm*. "During the 67 years of his reign," says Lenormant,[2] "he had 170 children, 59 of them sons. Considering himself superior to all moral laws, he even went so far (if the monuments are to be taken literally) as to marry one of his own daughters, the princess Bent-Anat."

So then, in character, as in the circumstances and chronology of his reign, Rameses II. was the great oppressor of Israel, the Pharaoh "which knew not Joseph."

W. T. PILTER.

(*To be continued.*)

ART. IV.—NATIONAL REPENTANCE.

I. REPENTANCE AND THANKSGIVING.

WHAT an inestimable comfort it is, when any great and signal mercy befalls us, to be encouraged to believe that it has not happened by chance, but that the Eternal Being, on whom we depend for life and breath and all things, has permitted our ardent wishes to harmonize with His omnipotent and omnipresent providence. To Him, at such a time, our minds turn, as the hearts of children to their father, with a gratitude deeply tempered with reverence and awe, and with all our soul we thank Him for His great goodness.

The delight of London on the good news from South Africa on March 1st was unprecedented, and it was only the type of the transports of happiness which thrilled through the whole

[1] Lenormant's "Manual of the Ancient History of the East," vol. i., p. 257 of the English translation.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 256.

Empire all the world over, as every part simultaneously heard the happy message by the uniting agency of electricity. London and the rest went almost mad with joy, so that it would be impossible to find words to exaggerate the genuine spontaneousness of the rejoicing. And there is no reason to be surprised at this: for with a true instinct the great mass of the people measured their gratitude by what would have been the depth of their grief and humiliation if the garrisons had fallen. No matter if some of the expressions of the general enthusiasm were grotesque and rough: it was all natural, sincere and heartfelt. The national pæan that rang from the bells of St. Paul's crowned a day of sheer gladness for which the coolest and most sober must admit abundant reason.

The people of the British Empire had been patient and calm through four long months of humiliation and sorrow. The Queen's territories had, for whatever cause—and this is not the place to discuss that cause—been invaded by a powerful, determined, and long-prepared enemy. The army of defence, with all its food and stores, had to be carried at enormous cost over 7,000 miles of sea. Three garrisons were speedily invested, and two hastily evacuated. The nature of the country was created for occupation; every hill could be made an impregnable fortress. In spite of heroic efforts, there were many checks, repulses, and defeats. People began to think ominously of our reverses in the American War of Independence. Philosophic historians were beginning to ask whether it was the beginning of the end. Foreign critics all over Europe derided our efforts, and prophesied the rapid decay of the all too-prosperous Great Britain. To relieve Ladysmith seemed an almost impossible task. Attempt after attempt failed. The suspense and strain were cruel. Two thousand of our bravest troops were imprisoned in Pretoria, and 17,000 were shut up useless, and nearing the point of starvation in the three beleaguered garrisons. Was our cause indeed the cause of liberty, equality, and justice? Was it indeed pleasing to God?

At the end of February came the turn. First our gratitude was stirred by the relief of Kimberley. In the lowest part of my vast Archdeaconry the news was first published by an announcement in the window of a public-house. Gradually the street filled. Before long there were 20,000 of the poorest and most miserable people in London, people living in what might be called degraded and sordid conditions, in communication with that message. They formed a procession. Tears were running down their cheeks. They sang along the whole line the National Anthem, which is to the people the one symbol of all loyal sentiment. Do you think

that this was a demonstration on behalf of selfish capitalists? I think I know the people, and I say it was a spontaneous tribute by the least fortunate section of the inhabitants of London, on behalf of the grand and truly Christian cause of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity.

Then we were thankful for the great victory of Paardeberg: and when this was followed closely by the relief of over 21,000 suffering and half-starved fellow-subjects at Ladysmith, there was good reason, I say, for any amount of exultation.

For our imagination did not surpass the reality. As Lord Dundonald and his bronzed and stalwart troopers rode down to the ford of the Klip River, the staff, the officers, the civilians, and the soldiers, all pale and emaciated, and on the verge of starvation, flocked forward to meet them. Women with children in their arms, their eyes streaming with tears, pressed forward to grasp the strong hands of their gallant deliverers. Sisters and brothers, friends and relatives, met once more. No wonder London rejoiced when she heard of it. Strong men at Ladysmith were moved to tears.

It was not hunger alone from which they had been suffering. For four long weary months their nerves had been tried and shattered by the bursting of bomb and shell all over the town by day and by night. Worse than all, as sickness advanced, the medical stores had failed, and when once a man was down he was lost. From the middle of January there have been 200 deaths from disease alone. During the whole siege 24 officers and 235 men have been killed or died of wounds; from disease, 6 officers and 340 men. Besides these, 70 officers and 520 men were wounded. No less than 8,000 fighting men out of 12,000 have passed through the hospital. Well might grown men and women dance on the London pavements when they knew that this disgrace and these horrors were at length wiped out of being.

You will remember that in January the united Bishops of England issued directions for constant prayer throughout this last year of the dying century. There were five groups of subjects, and one of them referred to the war. Amongst other points for intercession they suggested that we should pray that the gifts of wisdom and prudence might be granted to our leaders; for our soldiers, representatives and colonists, that they might maintain high character and honourable traditions; for the combatants, that no animosities might destroy mutual respect; and, finally, for a righteous and lasting peace. And the Bishops added that due prominence should be given to confession of sin in the matters which call for prayer, and thanksgiving for mercies already received. I think the petitions I have just mentioned are being filled

before our eyes; and in calling your attention to repentance and thanksgiving I am obeying this call.

The wisdom and prudence of our leaders in the field we recognise with affection and admiration. We think of the cheerful alacrity with which the beloved Commander-in-Chief went out at his Sovereign's command at the very moment he had suffered the irreparable loss of his heroic only son. His consummate strategy, his genius for sympathy and encouragement in the messages he has sent to the Chief Magistrates of London, Sydney, and Toronto for their patriotic efforts, his courtesy to the fallen General, his kindness to the prisoners, his consideration to all, show us that we still have commanders equal to the most glorious of the long line of their illustrious predecessors.

The reliever of Ladysmith had a far more difficult task. Line after line there towered between him and his objective those awful hills, with their skilful entrenchments and impossible defiles. We thank him for his determination to throw no life away needlessly, his persistent courage in the face of temporary misinterpretation in crossing and recrossing the river again and again to find the right passage through the hills, his coolness and caution in going back when going forward would have been needlessly costly of life. And it is an interesting remembrance to many to know that all the years he resided in London he was a regular worshipper at the Sunday morning service at St. Paul's Cathedral. No face was better known amongst the congregation.

When we turn to the rank and file of the army, we have no less reason to be grateful. Their patience, courage, cheerfulness, self-denial, obedience and readiness in the face of entirely new and terrible conditions of warfare have been brilliantly notable. By many an act of heroism and self-denial, many a deed of kindness to wounded prisoners, the British soldier has earned the undying love of his country, and has gone far to pave the way for reconciliation and brotherhood between the rival races in South Africa.

Of the fine and soldierly qualities of our colonial brothers from over the seas we cannot be too proud. At an hour of great difficulty, when our army was insufficient to meet its duties, they came forward with enthusiastic emulation, and our Government found that they could have as many brave and strong hands as they might require. The splendid daring and skill of the Canadians who finally won the victory of Paardeberg will be an imperishable page in the history of our race.

One more cause of thankfulness to the Almighty I may be permitted to mention. We had at the head of affairs a wise

and tender-hearted woman, with sixty-three years of unparalleled knowledge and experience in government, to whom all turned with instinctive and unhesitating loyalty. She has a genius for sympathy, and, what is more, for expressing that sympathy at the right moment and in the most touching terms. Her warm woman's heart would, if unrestrained, have bled day by day at the lists of her slaughtered and wounded subjects. But she felt that the nation and empire depended on herself for its tone of cohesion and courage, and with truly royal nerve she braced herself, and refused to give way to her natural emotions, and has been able on every occasion to interpret in the most felicitous terms the ideal feelings of her people. Who shall say what is owing at this time of real crisis to that wise and true woman of over eighty years?

Good comes out of evil: it is an old saying. You see there are many great and wholesome things which this unhappy war has been doing for us, into which we were so reluctantly dragged. It has taught us how real is the unity which binds together the scattered territories of the British Crown. The sympathy and loyalty of Indian Princes and Indian private soldiers, of Canada, Australia, New Zealand and the rest, in hastening forward to share the toils and labours of the peaceable old Mother-land, have done more to promote solidarity and federation than years of conferences or the wisest of laws. It has taught us how foolish, wrong, and, indeed, suicidal, it is to rest selfishly and idly on mere prestige and the supposed good-will of other countries, without a force sufficient for the defence of such territories as are open to attack. Depend upon it, the memory of the sorrows, humiliations and perils of the last five months will sink deep into the heart of the British nation; and the consideration of self-defence will in the future be one of the first duties of every citizen. It has shown us that, however outnumbered and overmatched by guns and rifles, the dogged courage and uncomplaining patience of the British soldier is as great as it was in the days of Agincourt, Crécy, Poitiers, Waterloo, or any other of our greatest victories, and that with happy unconcern they can take the part of heroes on the direst battlefield. It has shown us that our people at home, unspoiled by long commercial prosperity, in the face of difficulties and disasters to which they ought never to have been submitted, can remain tranquil, firm, determined, and trustful in God and in the right. It has discovered to us, in serious farewell services, in sincere responses to various calls to prayer, in many an office of heartfelt intercession, in the latent religious spirit brought out in our soldiers under roar of cannon and whiz of bullet, in the daily prayer meeting at Ladysmith, with its 1,000

attendants, how deeply the sense of the fear of God is planted in our people, notwithstanding our characteristic national appearance of coldness and indifference. It has shown us in a truly admirable manner how enthusiastic every section of society can be in bearing the burden of others, and so fulfilling the law of Christ, everyone contriving, with a universal emulation of kindness and self-denial, to provide for the sufferings and privations of all concerned in the war.

Comforts for the sick, support for orphans and widows, wives, children and others dependent; the equipment of troops, the provision of hospitals; prayers and intercession for those in such unusual circumstances—these things are worthy of all praise. Is there any other means of proving our sincerity when we cry to Almighty God for the continuation of His blessing on the land of our fathers?

Yes! For there is one thing more that the war has taught us, and that is, to look into our own conduct both as a people and as individuals, and to see what is amiss, with a sincere, honest, and resolute view to amendment. Such a result of this unhappy war, if it is taken in a serious spirit, and in no trifling, half-hearted, or temporizing manner, will be of incalculable value to the nation.

Such an inward question would be natural at any time after all that we have gone through since last October. Every face that week by week looks out at us so pathetically in the pages of the illustrated journals from amongst the ranks of the killed—faces bright and happy in resplendent youth, with the promise of life before them, faces that were all in all to those that loved them, faces that were the joy and pride of so many British homes, faces in which wife and mother and sister and sweetheart found all their human happiness, faces that will never again be seen on earth, faces to be followed by as many others lying low in the soil of a strange and distant country, without identification or memorial, dear kindly brotherly faces that remind us of the far greater number of the rank and file who have fallen, dying, as they said, like soldiers, and with no murmur on their lips, too humble themselves for illustration, but who have left just as cruel a blank in their lowlier homes—all call us to search out our ways, and see where we have been unwise and wrong, and turn and repent before God. "Why were you so unprepared?" say those noble and pathetic faces with their mute eloquence. "Why were you so vainglorious and heedless? Why were you so self-confident and careless? Why did you not fortify your African colonies? Why did you have no maps? Why did you pay no attention to the signs of the times?"

With a view to rousing ourselves as a people to self-exami-

nation and prayer, I thankfully joined with Lord Halifax, Lord Nelson, and many others of every shade of Christian thought in this country, in urging the people to make use of Ash Wednesday for humbly considering God's call to repentance. He is always calling us, but sometimes He lets His voice be heard more plainly. His voice is just as real in the soft breath of summer woods; but it comes to us with a more rousing and awful impressiveness in the rattle and roar of the thunder-storm. "In the midst of all the trouble and anxiety around us," we said, "many hear the call of the Lord to repentance. . . . The voice of the Lord, by the lonely seer of Patmos, seems to come down through the ages to us to-day, saying: 'I know thy works'; 'As many as I love I rebuke and chasten; be zealous, therefore, and repent'; 'Behold, I stand at the door and knock'; 'He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith to the Churches.' But whether on Ash Wednesday, or all through Lent, or at a time of national crisis, or at any other time, the call to self-scrutiny and heartfelt prayer, and the firm resolve for the better course, is always wholesome and helpful. 'As many as I love I rebuke and chasten; be zealous, therefore, and repent.'"

First, as a nation, we have certainly to repent of our vain-gloriousness. Would that my words could be read by all British subjects! For years we have been living in a fools' paradise, arrogantly satisfied with our prosperity, forgetful of the duties and burdens which that prosperity entailed, and blind to the jealousies it aroused. We have thought nothing was too good, nothing even good enough, for the British race; and if the private estimates of each individual as to what share in the good things of this world he ought to receive were added together, the whole wide world itself would not be large enough to settle the demands. We have thought too little of the legitimate aspirations of other peoples, and have been too determinately set upon our own. We have lectured other nations on their shortcomings, with a calm and self-satisfied arrogance that has driven them to cries of rage, fury and hatred. We have thought ourselves so good and immaculate that we need but stir our little finger, and a benignant and favourable Providence would be sure to bless our effort. This temper has been admirably sketched by a delightful ecclesiastical poet, the late Archbishop Trench of Dublin, probably when we were aroused out of the same absurd frame of mind by the Crimean War:

> Yes, let us own it in confession free,
> That, when we girt ourselves to quell the wrong,
> We deemed it not so giant-like and strong,
> But it with our slight effort thought to see

Pushed from its base :—yea, almost deemed that we,
Champions of right, might be excused the price
Of pain, and loss, and large self-sacrifice,
Set ever on high things by Heaven's decree.
What if this work's great hardness was concealed
From us, until so far upon our way
That no escape remained us, no retreat—
Lest, being at an earlier hour revealed,
We might have shrunk too weakly from the heat,
And shunned the burden of this fiery day?

Next, we can hardly help being aware that as a people we are extravagantly fond of money. The lust for money has taken hold of almost every class. For rich people we are ready to do anything; we surround them with servile honours. Riches are a great blessing from God when they are used for good; and the honest endeavour to improve your condition and to provide for your children none could blame. But none the less the love of them is poisonous to the soul. Not in vain does God warn us against it in His Word: "With what difficulty," said our Lord, "shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of heaven!" "They that will be rich," said St. Paul to Timothy, "fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts. For the love of money is the root of all evil; which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows." The belief that money can buy happiness is a most pernicious fallacy current among us. Money is the enemy of love, it prevents many a happy marriage, it degrades the mind, it materializes life, it brings multitudes of temptations, it leads to pride and selfishness. We, humbling ourselves this day for this popular worship of the golden calf, are bound to do all that lies in our power to destroy the idol, and to alter and raise the national ideal.

A third point closely connected with the last is the fact that the thirst for gold leads so many into rash and unreasonable speculation. Of course there must be a certain element of venture in all trade and commerce; but when the demon of speculation has seized man or woman, they become reckless and dishonest. The desire for rapid gains takes full possession of their minds, and they take advantage of the ignorance of others. The history of speculation is dark with failure, dishonesty, distress and despair.

Nearly akin to this is that spirit of gambling which is a mongrel compound of passion for excitement and eagerness for money quickly and lightly obtained. Oh, the pitiful stories our gaols could tell of lives that began honestly, led astray by this fatal fever to risk more than they possessed on far-off sports of which they knew nothing, with the usual result, not

less sad because it is so common, of robbing the employer in the false and delusive hope of paying him back! This is an evil which has come down to the very gutter of the street. We who are humbling ourselves before God this day must never cease our efforts, singly and in combination, to check and discourage by every possible means the spirit of speculation and the twin spirit of gambling.

There is another national sin for which we need repentance, from which we need to turn away. It is a want of candour and truthfulness. The habit of exact truthfulness is difficult, because we have to see things accurately as they are before we can express them in words; but at any rate we ought to aim always at saying the thing that is, and not the thing that is not. Now, when want of candour is known and tolerated amongst us we are morally in a dangerous condition. Every example of want of straightforwardness is dangerous; it encourages the same habit in those who observe it. And for other reasons there is always a strong temptation in all phases of society to untruthfulness, which needs no additional incitement. Truth is frequently difficult, and sometimes unpleasant. But there can be no sound life, public or private, without it.

I think all Christians should give their assistance and sympathy to some form of associated effort for the discouragement of profligacy, either that for the Promotion of Public Morality, or that for the Suppression of Vice, or the White Cross Society, or that for the Protection of Women, or the Rescue of the Fallen. I do not know that society is worse in that respect now than it usually is. It is an evil that is always with us. But an evil that is always with us is one that is ever tending to increase if it is not checked. It is more, perhaps, the acquiescence in evil that Christian people have to watch against than actual self-indulgence. As soon as it is understood that evil is notorious and receives no remonstrance from those who are trying to live as the servants of Christ, then the public moral declension is very rapid indeed. Look at the pernicious influence of the reign of Charles II., so soon after the high standard of the Puritan era, an influence which lasted on till the revival of religion by Wesley and William Wilberforce. Those who are genuine members of the kingdom of Christ can always do much to improve public opinion by union for that which is good. And meantime, especially among those who are still in the earlier half of life, there is always the temptation to what St. Paul calls "inordinate (or irregular) affection," foolish sentimentalities straying beyond the circle of home life, and, though not necessarily leading to actual evil, still unwise and morbid, and disturbing to the moral equilibrium. There is constant need to seek earnestly

the guidance of Almighty God, who alone can order the unruly wills and affections of sinful men. "As many as I love I rebuke and chasten; be zealous, therefore, and repent."

The source of much of the tendencies about which I have been speaking is unbelief, and disregard of God's law revealed in His Holy Word. Unbelief in one form or another has always surrounded the Christian Church, and although it is now more openly avowed than formerly, and has taken more hold of the literary and scientific classes, there certainly is not more of it than in previous ages. Rather, I should say that there is more genuine religion about amongst us than for many an era. But unbelief is a weakness to any people; what we have to do is to make our belief reasonable, to study the grounds we have for it, to be able to speak about it wisely, firmly and humbly to those who doubt, and, above all things, to recommend our own creed by our consistent practice and holy life.

I propose to follow up the subject of national repentance in two more papers. In the meantime we should remind ourselves that, however great our reasons may be for returning thanks at this time to the Almighty Ruler and Governor of all things, there is still supreme need for watchfulness and prayer. The wonderful thing about prayer is that the more serious and consistent our own lives are, so much the surer will be the answer to our genuine heartfelt petitions. God grant that the issue of this present season of distress and trouble, may be a moral and religious regeneration for the English people, a thorough and penetrating revival of religious principle in our own hearts and lives!

WILLIAM SINCLAIR.

NOTE.

IN the CHURCHMAN for January last, on page 196 ("Polychrome Isaiah"), Mr. Flecker says: "It would have been interesting if he had given some reasons," etc.; throughout the article he assumes that the work under review stands alone. But on page 209 he might have read these words:

"A full statement of the evidence for this view of the origin of the Book of Isaiah, with indications of the points which are obscure or doubtful, has been given in an 'Introduction to the Book of Isaiah' by the present writer (London, 1895)."

He might also have read, on page 5, "The translation is based throughout on the new, critical edition of the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, published under the auspices of the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore." That this edition is in progress, and that Isaiah has appeared in it, most English Hebrew scholars hardly need to be reminded.

T. K. CHEYNE.

Reviews.

The Pastoral Epistles. By J. H. BERNARD, D.D. Cambridge: at the University Press, 1899.

THIS admirable book should supply a distinct want—that of a manual edition of the Pastoral Epistles in the Greek, with an introduction (*Einleitung*) and notes, which are on a level with the best and most recent scholarship—in fact, the volume strikes us as so thoroughly trustworthy, and so eminently useful, that we believe it will rapidly become a recognised text-book in all examinations preparatory to ordination.

The book is excellently arranged. It consists of lxxviii pp. of introductory matter, 16 pp. of text, 163 pp. of notes, and 9 pp. of a really admirable "Index Græcetatis," in which the words are marked by different signs to show which are peculiar to the Pastoral Epistles, which are peculiar to the Pauline Epistles, which are not found in the LXX., etc.

If there is one addition more than another which, we think, would have added to the completeness of the book, while hardly at all increasing its bulk, it would have been to have printed, either after or opposite to the Greek text, the Vulgate Version—the text printed in Tischendorf's edition of 1853 being sufficiently accurate for ordinary purposes.

The introduction is divided into five chapters, the first of which deals with "The Literary History of the Pastoral Epistles." Here by admirably chosen quotations—given in the original—from early Christian writers it is shown that traces of these Epistles are found in Gaul and Greece in A.D. 177, in Rome in A.D. 140 (possibly in A.D. 95), and in Asia as early as A.D. 116. In the second chapter it is shown that no place can be found for these letters in the life of St. Paul, so far as it is narrated for us in the Acts, while there is no reason, in the face of the testimony of early Christian tradition to the contrary, to maintain that St. Paul's ministry did close with his first imprisonment. In the third chapter we have an admirable treatment of "The style and vocabulary of the Pastoral Epistles"; it is, we think, in this chapter, and in many of the notes, where Dr. Bernard is discussing the *language* of the letters, that he shows himself at his best. After the question of difference in vocabulary, that of "the difference of syntax and structure of sentences" is considered, and here it is shown that if between the Pastorals and other Pauline letters there are great differences, at the same time, the likenesses and similarities are no less evident. In the fourth chapter "The heresies contemplated in the Pastoral Epistles" are considered. Everyone knows how these letters abound in warnings against heretical teachers, but it is not easy to discover the exact nature of their heresies, for the allusions to them are casual, the letters being "not controversial treatises, but

semi-private communications written for the guidance of friends." Dr. Bernard's conclusion as to the nature of the heresies combated is the same as Bishop Lightfoot's, viz., that they were a phase of "Judaic Gnosticism," or "Essene Judaism," according as they were regarded from the Gnostic or Judaic point of view.

It is, perhaps, to the fifth chapter of the Introduction—"Bishops and Presbyters in the Primitive Church"—that most readers will turn with more particular interest. The necessity for a discussion of the origin and nature of these offices, in connection with a study of the Pastoral Epistles, is stated in the first sentence as follows: "An investigation of the date of the Pastoral Epistles cannot leave out of account the nature of the ecclesiastical organization which they seem to contemplate . . . thus we are constrained to attempt here a brief summary of the existing evidence as to the growth of the several orders of the Christian Ministry during the first century of the Church's life." Dr. Bernard's treatment of the subject is, as it should be, strictly historical; all kinds of preconceptions and assumptions are rigidly banished, while every available statement in any degree bearing upon the subject is impartially examined. To take two instances of common assumptions which, he shows, are not borne out by facts: (1) "That the significance of the Episcopate in the continuous life of the Church is bound up with its monarchical or diocesan character; (2) that there is anything 'inherently repugnant to the idea of the Christian episcopate in the presence of several bishops at one time in a Christian community.'" We cannot follow Dr. Bernard through the twenty closely-reasoned pages of which this chapter consists, but must again content ourselves with showing how he believes the "bearing of this discussion upon the date of the Pastoral Epistles may be summarised." "They show us," he says, "the episcopate in a somewhat early stage of its development. The bishop's office is not yet so distinguished from that of the presbyter that he does not take part in the instruction of the faithful. The bishop of the Pastorals must be apt to teach" (1 Tim. iii. 2). Again the monarchical episcopate of the days of Ignatius is not yet established. However we describe the office held by Timothy and Titus in their own person—and that it included that of Bishop seems tolerably certain—we could not infer from the instructions given to them that there must be only one bishop in each community, which very early became the common practice of the Church. And though the bishops of the Pastorals must not be greedy of money, there is no such formal assignment of the duties falling to them as administrators of Church alms as we should expect in a second century pastoral letter. They are to be "given to hospitality" (1 Tim. iii. 2); but their office as representatives of the Church in its external relations does not come into the prominence that it assumed at a later period. Some of these indications may be trivial, but taken together, they do not permit us to date the Pastorals later than the first century. But if the Pastoral Letters are first-century documents, there is no adequate reason forbidding us to acquiesce in their own claim, confirmed by the unbroken

tradition of the Christian Church, that they were written by the hand of St. Paul.

The sixth, and last chapter of the Introduction is upon "The Greek Text." A very brief account of the chief Uncial and Cursive Greek MSS. is given, and to this is appended a list of the principal ancient versions, with their approximate dates. [Dr. Bernard draws attention to our loss in these epistles from their being wanting in the great Vatican Codex B. (There are also two great gaps in C.) He also notices how in these epistles—as in the other letters of St. Paul—the Vulgate Version differs but little from the præ-Hieronymian Latin.]

* * * * * *

Of Dr. Bernard's notes it is difficult to write briefly. Speaking generally, we may say that they strike us as being sufficiently full without being unduly prolix—a not too common merit in these days. His hints upon translation and grammar are usually most helpful, and his illustrative quotations, not only from the New Testament and the LXX., but from Patristic sources and from the Classics, are generally most wisely chosen, while the practical teaching which he deduces, and the lessons he suggests are almost always extremely sensible. It is difficult to choose examples to prove the truth of these assertions, simply because the examples which suggest themselves are so many; but the following, taken from the first few pages, may be regarded as typical.

1 Tim. i. 2: Τιμοθέῳ . . . ἐν πίστει: *To Timothy, my true child in faith.* Timothy (see Acts xvi. 1-3) might fitly be so described; ἐν πίστει expresses the sphere of the relationship between him and St. Paul (see Titus iii. 15). The older man was to him, as we say, "a father in God." *Cf.* the parallel phrase in Tit. i. 4: γνησίῳ τέκνῳ κατὰ κοινὴν πίστιν, and 1 Cor. iv. 17. Timothy was thus a recognised representative of his spiritual father. The young men among the Therapeutæ (Phil. *de Vit cont.*, 9) are described in like manner as ministering to their elders καθάπερ υἱοὶ γνήσιοι.

1 Tim. i. 5: ἐστὶν ἀγάπη *is love, sc.*, to men, not to God, which is not here in question. On the other hand, the fanciful ζητήσεις of the false teachers bred strife (2 Tim. ii. 23). As "love is the fulfilling of the Law" (Rom. xiii. 10), so it is the aim and purpose of the Gospel ethics, as the greatest Christian grace (1 Cor. xiii. 13). The word ἀγάπη has been described as "foreign to profane Greek," and as an ecclesiastical word, first appearing in literature in the LXX. But we find it in Egyptian Greek, in a letter, *e.g.*, of the second century B.C.; and it is probable that the LXX. only took over and consecrated to high uses a word already current in the popular speech of Greek Egypt.

1 Tim. i. 12: διακονίαν. The word διακονίαν is used here, not specially of the function discharged by a διάκονος, but in the general sense of "ministry." St. Paul frequently speaks of his apostolic office as a διακονία and of himself as a διάκονος . . . διακονία, in short, originally meant service of any sort . . . and is continually used throughout the Pauline Epistles in a wide and general sense. By the second century the words διακονία, διάκονος were generally restricted to the third order of the Christian ministry, and the beginnings of this specialization of meaning may be traced in the New Testament. *Cf.*, *e.g.*, Rom. xvi. 1; Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 8-12 (where see notes). Thus the use of the word here to denote the apostolic office is in favour of an early date for the Epistle. No writer of the

second century (by which time the distinction of Orders was fully recognised) would have used a term then significant of the lowest grade in the ministry for St. Paul's ministerial work. *Cf.* 2 Tim. iv. 6.

We most heartily commend this book—whose size is certainly no measure of its value or usefulness—to all who would study the Pastoral Epistles to their own personal advantage and with a view to the improvement of their ministerial work.

W. EDWARD CHADWICK.

HENRY DRUMMOND.

The Life of Henry Drummond. By GEORGE ADAM SMITH. Hodder and Stoughton. Price 6s.

Henry Drummond was, in the best sense of the word, one of the most attractive men of his time. There was a freshness and originality about his books, his addresses, and his whole nature, which was extremely winning. He has found a highly sympathetic biographer in Dr. George Adam Smith. The "Life" is being widely read, and will command a yet larger circulation, both on account of the charm of the subject, and the ability with which it is handled. To most people in England Drummond is chiefly known by his books. They are all eminently readable. The success of his first book, "Natural Law in the Spiritual World," was quite phenomenal. Seven thousand copies were sold in eight months; the sales have now reached 123,000 in Great Britain alone, besides which it has been circulated in France, Russia, Germany, Scandinavia, and the United States. The chapter of his biography which tells of its fame and usefulness, will make as deep an impression on the reader as any part of the book. Many wrote of the spiritual good they had obtained by its perusal. It is impossible to read it without finding stimulus to thought; and we have a striking proof of this in the fact that it elicited at least a dozen books criticising its main positions, most of them characterized by considerable ability.

Evolution, which many of us think to be not proven, was the underlying thought in most of Drummond's observations on science, and also the password in many of his addresses to students on spiritual religion. Of his other works, "Tropical Africa" is viewed by many as the most valuable, and freer than any from debateable matter.

Almost all his books, and especially his shorter pamphlets, were severely attacked in Scotland and elsewhere, more largely for what they omit than for what they contain. It is fair that we should remember his own answer to these criticisms, which was that "ninety per cent. of the religious literature of the day was expressly devoted to enforcing what he was accused of not enforcing, *i.e.*, the fundamentals of Christianity; so he endeavoured to bring forward what was not being said otherwise."

But the part of the biography which has the deepest and most living interest is that which deals with his evangelistic labours. Moody (whose

knowledge of character was so acute and true, and whose recent removal we so deeply deplore) discerned in him rare gifts for reaching the masses, and, above all, for winning young men. When barely twenty-two, and before he had finished his college career, he followed in the wake of that great evangelist, and, in compliance with his request, he gave addresses in several of the principal towns in Scotland and England, and afterwards in Ireland; while later on he made tours for the same purpose in various parts of the United States.

It is evident that he was largely blest to the conversion of souls. When we remember how hard it is to win men for Christ, and especially to reach those who are in the first flush of youth, with strong passions and keen intellects, determined to place all doctrines into a scientific crucible, we have great cause to thank God for the marvellous success vouchsafed to His servant. Many of the best years of his life were devoted to labouring for the students of Glasgow and Edinburgh; the hold he had over them was unparalleled, and we believe that in many cases the results were permanent.

Nor must we omit to notice the self-sacrificing labour and the marvellous skill he manifested in his dealings with individual cases. Hundreds of men came to him, unfolding their doubts, their difficulties, and their sins, and nearly all obtained strength and comfort by his wise counsel.

The addresses he gave at Grosvenor House and other drawing-rooms startled London society, and drew men of science and position who were rarely seen at religions services.

As we peruse the interesting chapters of this instructive biography, we are drawn to the conclusion that Henry Drummond was raised up of God to do a work which hardly any other man has attempted.

We may not be able to endorse all his sentiments or his methods, but we thankfully admit that he was one of the most unselfish, pure-minded, and intense men for generations; he won for Christ men who had hitherto ignored His claims, and all his attainments were unreservedly laid at the feet of his Master.

JAMES GOSSET TANNER.

Short Notices.

The Trial of Jesus Christ. By A. TAYLOR INNES, Esq., Advocate. T. and T. Clark. Pp. 123. Price 2s. 6d.

CHRIST standing at the world's bar is a picture the pathos and import of which command the attention of all men. Within modern times there have been several noteworthy attempts to justify the action of our Saviour's judges from the standpoint of legal necessity. This present work examines the two trials, the Hebrew and the Roman, from a strict standpoint of the legal procedure of those times. The conclusion reached is that in both trials the judges were unjust, the trials unfair in many particulars, yet that the right issues were substantially raised—Christ had been treasonable to God, or else He was God; He had been treasonable to Cæsar, or else He was King of kings. He was condemned by those who denied His divinity and rejected His sovereignty. And on these two issues He awaits the verdict of every man's choice to-day.

History of the Captivity and Return of the Jews. By the Rev. E. J. NURSE. Elliot Stock. Pp. 83. Price 2s. 6d.

The literature concerning this period of history has grown enormously of late years. But it presents insuperable difficulties to ordinary readers of Holy Scripture. It is the object of the writer of this small book to give a comprehensive picture of the chief events of the period. Contemporaneous psalms are usefully interjected in the account, and there are good chronological arrangements. The reader should be able to gain from these pages an accurate and clear knowledge of the period under discussion.

The Holy Land. Vol. I., Geography (pp. 96). Vol. II., History (pp. 136). By TOWNSEND MACCOUN, M.A., etc. S. W. Partridge and Co.

We have never seen anything to equal the special features of these two small volumes. When it is said that they contain no less than 145 plates of maps, charts, and diagrams, it will be understood how completely they illustrate the geography and history of the Holy Land. Everything here is on a small scale, but it is perfect in its way, the relief maps being particularly good. Concise letterpress, based upon the most credited results of recent Biblical criticism, explain and add value to the maps. The price of these volumes will bring them within the reach of the average Sunday-school teacher, and they will help him greatly in his preparation. But they will certainly have a permanent place on the shelves of the more advanced theological student.

Aspects of Protestantism. By the Rev. A. H. GRAY. Hodder and Stoughton. Pp. 149. Price 1s. 6d.

Five lectures delivered to a Presbyterian congregation upon the growth of Roman Catholic doctrines and practices in England. The

discussions are rather by positive teaching than controversial negations. Faith, priesthood, authority, ceremony, the present opportunity are dealt with in an original manner. The book is soon read and is well worth reading.

Scripture Teaching, illustrated by Models and Objects. By the Rev. J. G. KITCHIN, M.A. Church of England Sunday-school Institute. Pp. 288.

The Church of England Sunday-school Institute has for some time possessed an excellent museum of objects and models illustrating the Holy Scriptures. The teacher who uses such articles possesses a very special power to interest and impress the minds of the children instructed. This book seeks to increase the number of such teachers by dealing with a wide area of subjects, in which model objects may with advantage be used. Suggestions are made for the manufacture, the purchase, and the hire of models. There are many good illustrations in these pages which will stimulate those who seek to make their teaching vivid and realistic.

Notes for Boys (and their Fathers). By an Old Boy. Elliot Stock. Pp. 213.

It is given to few books to reach an eighth edition. A glance at these pages, however, reveals at once why they have achieved the unusual. They are full of manly, stimulating, "straight" talks to boys on just those subjects on which the "long, long thoughts" of youth most need unaffected and God-fearing direction. It is particularly suitable as a gift for public school boys. They will smile at it here and there as a little old-fashioned or maybe old-fogeyish. But they will read it, and it will help their lives.

Letters of Archdeacon H. H. Dobinson. Seeley and Co. Pp. 231.

"He was a steady, reliable forward, who could always be depended upon to do his own work well, and to keep a side together," so wrote one who knew him in the Repton football fields. It was true of him in the greater game of life. His friends at Brasenose College thought it was "an almost shocking waste of good material his resolve to volunteer for the Church's service abroad." But from the year 1890, when he first went out to the Niger Mission at the age of twenty-seven to his death, seven years later, the expenditure of his life was as that ointment poured by the fragrant hand of love upon our Saviour's feet. The effects of his noble, holy life will not perish, and these manly, devoted letters will inspire many a young missionary in coming generations.

In the Twilight. By RUTH LAMB. R.T.S. Pp. 191.

The series of talks to girls which compose this volume first appeared in the *Girls' Own Paper*, where they were greatly appreciated. They are somewhat condensed here, and in book form will find an honoured place

on many a young lady's bookshelf. An excellent birthday present or confirmation gift for girls.

I Believe. By the BISHOP OF CALCUTTA. R.T.S. Pp. 93.

When Bishop Welldon was headmaster of Harrow he found everyday language the best to convey the truths of theology to the minds of lads. This book, which is dedicated to old pupils, speaks simply, but by no means superficially, of the great doctrines contained in the Apostolic Confession of Faith. If the Bishop's name were not on its title-page it would yet command attention by reason of the able simplicity which tells of wide reading and matured thought.

Temperance Readings. By Various Writers. C.E.T.S.

Those who conduct temperance meetings, parish entertainments, and similar gatherings are often at a loss for something to read aloud which shall be at once lifelike, pointed, and profitable. This is a capital selection of pathos, humour, wisdom, and home-thrusts, and will be appreciated by working-class audiences.

Stories on the Apostles' Creed, etc. By the Rev. E. J. STURDEE. Church of England Sunday-school Institute. Pp. 199.

None are quicker than children to find out and to repudiate mere lay figures in story-books. They will welcome the characters in these stories because they each have an individuality of their own. The lessons on the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Duty to my Neighbour, which spring naturally from them, will be remembered long after childhood's days are passed.

Masters of To-morrow. By W. J. LACEY. R.T.S. Pp. 224.

Samuel Smiles has had a host of imitators since his "Lives of the Engineers," "Character," and similar works first saw the light. Such writings undoubtedly appeal to a wide circle of readers in all countries. "Men have always delighted to scrutinize instances of fame and prosperity." In the present book a host of striking sayings and doings of famous men are collected in a really striking and harmonious mosaic. Mr. Lacey has a breezy optimism, a conrageous outlook on the world, and he will not make young men selfish and self-centred in his endeavour to give them high aims and strenuous motives. The concluding chapter specially urges the duty of putting God first, and the sad failure made by those who seek to get on merely to gain glory for themselves.

The London Diocese Book, 1900. Edited by Prebendary INGRAM. Price 1s. 6d. Pp. 396. Rivingtons.

This very useful diocesan publication already exhibits a marked improvement on former issues; and it is plainly evident that when the new Editor has had the necessary time in which to effect other useful changes he has in view, the book will be what it *ought* to be—indis-

pensable. We cordially recommend it to the attention of every clergyman, churchwarden, or other church official in the diocese, as a book they cannot afford to be without.

The Clergy List for 1900. Kelly and Co.

The publishers are much to be congratulated on the admirable edition of the Clergy List which has just appeared. It is about the same size as last year's, and has only a continually increasing accuracy to offer. The labour of so continually altering the details in such a mass of matter must be immense. It is an invaluable handbook to the Church of England and its allies.

The Month.

IF most of our notes this month have to do with religious societies and their anniversaries, that will be appropriate to the season. But there are certain other subjects so absorptive of public attention just now that it may be well to begin with them.

We will, however (having space), ask whether any of our readers ever see a monthly periodical entitled *Things to Come*. That it deals much with the subject of unfulfilled prophecy its title suggests. So it does. And on that subject we may reasonably expect careful and devout students of the Word to differ considerably. But there are also to be found in it most valuable articles on the Epistles of St. Paul, and on other Scriptural and seasonable topics. Another useful feature is this: Questions may be asked on Scriptural difficulties, and answers are supplied. When Dr. Ginsburg is one of the answerers—to name him only—it may be supposed that able answers are likely to be given.

The three out of the four "sore judgments of God" which have so long been upon us are upon us still: war, pestilence, famine.

As to the last, it may be questioned whether the amount contributed to the Lord Mayor's Fund be at all adequate to the necessities of the case.

As to pestilence, not only is India still suffering, but Australia is being touched, Mauritius too, and even Europe. At Cawnpore, of mournful celebrity, a "plague riot" has taken place. There the segregation camp has been destroyed by the mob, who killed four constables, and threw their bodies into the burning plague camp. Troops were called out, and ten persons were killed. In Australia recourse is being had to humiliation and prayer.

Well worth reading is a letter addressed by the Rev. A. A. van der Lingen, pastor of the Dutch Reformed Church of Harrismith, in the Orange Free State, and at one time a candidate for the Presidency, to the *Cape Times*, regarding the war. What adds to its emphasis is the fact that "it is said that nearly every minister of the Gospel in South Africa, numbering over 600," cordially endorses the sentiments of that letter. It is too long to reproduce here; but it might be well to reprint it, fortify it with proof of the support it has, and circulate it far and wide.

At all times important is the consideration of the work, position, and anniversary arrangements of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews. Its diligent secretary, the Rev. W. T. Gidney (it would be more correct to say one of its secretaries), has just been supplementing his two volumes, "Sites and Scenes," by a third (but quite distinct), "At Home and Abroad." Since this volume—for which only 1s., or, by post, 1s. 3d., is charged—offers not only an account of the Society's own missions in this country and on the Continent—or Continents—but also a general account of efforts at Jewish evangelization "for the past 1,800 years," with forty-two illustrations and two maps, besides other interesting historic matter, it should have a wide circulation, and be of very great use, in these closing days of the "times"—or "opportunities"—of the Gentiles.

It is with thankfulness that we find that by the end of February £6,234 16s. had been received toward the liquidation of the Society's debt of £11,087 13s. 11d., of which March 31, 1899, told. May we hope that May 4 will be able to tell that the debt is wiped off altogether?

An announcement appeared lately in a London daily paper, headed: "LARGE RELIGIOUS BEQUESTS." Particulars follow. A Mrs. Margaret Tyers Weller-Poley, of Brandon House, Brandon, Suffolk, daughter of the late Rev. Prebendary Tyers Barnett, Rector of Attleborough, Norfolk, and widow of the Rev. William Weller-Poley, of Hartest, Suffolk, leaves a sum of £30,000 to be applied, but not till after a certain death, as follows: To the Colonial Bishopric Fund, £4,000; to the Incorporated Church Building Society, £5,000; to the Additional Home Bishoprics Endowment Fund, £5,000; to the Additional Curates' Society, £3,000; to the National Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Church of England and Wales, £4,000; to the S.P.G., £2,000; to the S.P.C.K., £2,000; to the Corporation of the Church House, £5,000.

Very gratifying it is to know that, in spite of all the calls upon purses which Africa and India have lately made, and are still making, the Church Pastoral Aid Society is able to report, as to income, "an increase under every heading except legacies, while even legacies were £860 above the septennial average." "On the whole, there is an increase of £4,449 over last year."

Moreover, the number of grants has increased: increased from 893 to 925, the largest number on record; and the population benefited is rapidly approaching 6,000,000, or one-third of the industrial population of the country.

The choice of the Right Rev. James Johnson, Assistant-Bishop of Western Equatorial Africa, as preacher of the Annual Sermon of

April 30, is striking; as this is said to be the first time that important function has been discharged by a coloured clergyman.

The party of missionaries which is headed by Bishop Tugwell, and is making its way to Kano in Hausaland, is reported to have left Jebba, on the Upper Niger, on March 5. The proposal is to strike inland by way of a place called Daba, where there is a post attached to the new British Nigerian Government. The distance from Jebba to Kano is 500 miles, and the venture is almost as much a journey into the unknown as was the mission to Uganda in 1876.

These references to the C.M.S., however, bring us back to the Indian famine; for they would not be adequate without some notice of what that Society is doing for the relief of the victims. The committee has already sent out about £5,000 for this object. The mission of this Society which feels the distress most acutely is the Bheel Mission in Rajputana, where the Rev. C. Stewart Thompson is already, according to the last report, feeding 2,500 children daily. The committee has arranged to place all famine funds at the direct disposal of the corresponding committees in India, so that necessities may be immediately relieved.

And what necessities there are! Enclosed with an appeal to which a very mingled set of names is appended—an appeal which bears at its head the words "For His Name's sake"—comes a paper containing some brief accounts of "Famine Scenes," by "Eye-witnesses." Take a paragraph or two: "A high-caste Christian lady has over 300 high-caste widows—many of them children—in a training home, gathered from the last famine, and has already taken many more from this famine." "We go out for a walk every morning, and wherever we find a child lying by its dead mother, we, of course, bring it back with us. Yesterday morning I saw sixteen dead bodies within 200 yards from our door."

Now, this appeal says that, in 1897, about £1,000,000 was raised "by charity" for the famine; whereas now the donations to the Mansion House Fund are likely to fall far short of that amount, though the area of distress is greater. It may be well to add that contributions may be sent to F. A. Bevan, Esq. (Barclay and Co., Ltd., 54, Lombard Street), who will transmit the fund as "Christian Offering" to the Central Committee of the Famine Fund, Calcutta.

After so many sad passages, it is refreshing to turn to a more pleasing topic. "On Wednesday next," says a leader in the *Standard* for April 18, "a century will have elapsed since the death of William Cowper." In these days of memorials, it is but natural that this event, too, should have its "centenary observances." Olney, where the poet lived for some thirty years, will appropriately be the centre of these observances.

We should like, finally, to call attention to a most able pamphlet on Isaiah just issued by Dr. Bullinger. Its evidence for the unity of authorship is most cogent.