

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

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

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

THE  
CHURCHMAN

---

APRIL, 1893.

---

ART I.—ON THE “FORMATION OF THE GOSPELS” IN  
CONNECTION WITH SOME RECENT THEORIES.

AMONG the innumerable attempts which have been made from the earliest period of Christianity to trace the sources and mark the stages of the formation of the Gospel narratives, it may be safely affirmed that none has passed beyond the line of mere plausible conjecture, and few indeed beyond that of ingenious speculation. Every effort of the kind is at once confronted by the insurmountable fact of a unanimous reception of them by the Christian Church as representing the testimonies of four independent writers, whose individuality is marked both in the variety of the facts and the distinctions of style which are obvious to the most ordinary reader. Even those discrepancies in the narratives that are incapable of solution by the consideration of the different points of view in which the facts they contain presented themselves to the eye of the narrator, are invaluable (as St. Chrysostom observes) as proofs that there was no collusion between the writers; that they had not combined together to produce a history which should be so consistent in all its minutest features as to enable their adversaries to reject it on the very ground of its artificial accuracy.<sup>1</sup> Whatever may be the results of the process of disintegration which is being carried on in the books of the Old Testament, which confessedly belong to various ages, and in the earliest period are necessarily composite, there can be no ground for applying the same kind of anatomical dissection to contemporary documents which belong to a historic age, and were by that age received with unanimity as the genuine productions of the authors whose names they bear. To those who plead against them the obscurity of their origin and the

---

<sup>1</sup> Chrysost. in Matt., Hom. i.

difficulty of fixing their date or establishing their authorship, we may reasonably oppose the fact of their unanimous reception, and the instinct which led the universal Church—not its mere rulers and councils, but the *ecclesia dispersa*—to separate the authentic narratives from the numerous fictions and forgeries which ever accompany truth in order to hinder or disturb its reception. The origin of the greatest works, and of those especially which have had the most sudden and universal influence, has ever been clouded with great obscurity. It would seem as though the sources of Divine truth in regard to its promulgation were hidden from us even as the early life of Christ was hidden; lest we should rest our faith more on the subordinate parts of the narrative than on that great work of redemption which was the supreme object of it. The burial-place of Moses was said to have been hidden for a similar cause; and when some Maronite shepherds in the seventeenth century claimed to have discovered it in a wild rocky fissure in the Lebanon, and with great labour succeeded in opening it, they found it empty and without a single trace of any occupant.<sup>1</sup> It may well be anticipated that the labours of the new critics of our Gospels will end as fruitlessly. For when we look back upon the grand design of Christianity and the methods which were adopted for its first promulgation, we shall see a good reason for the obscurity which has been suffered to rest upon its earliest-recorded history. A religion of the heart and life and motives was not—like the letter of the law, or the revelations of the Koran—embodied in a written form until the necessity arose for it in the death of its first teachers. Up to that period Christianity was a *preached* and not a *written* faith. "Christ," observes Bishop Wessenberg, "incorporated His spiritual teaching in no written form. He put it forth that it might be proclaimed by the Holy Ghost through earthly organs to all nations in their several tongues."<sup>2</sup> The first assemblies of Christians had only the ancient Scriptures and the traditions of their Lord's fulfilment of them to guide their lives and to supply the means of their worship. They looked for the immediate return of the Saviour, and enjoyed in the meantime the preaching of the Apostles and their disciples while they were present with them, and their epistles when they were absent. Credner has justly observed:

"For the perfect written publication of this evangelical tradition, living as it did in the mouth and heart of the Chris-

<sup>1</sup> Vide Jäger, "Hist. Ecol.," tom. ii., p. 112 (Hamb., 1717).

<sup>2</sup> "Die grossen Kirchenversammlungen, des 15 und 16 Jahrhunderts," tom. i., p. 62.

tian, there could be no ground whatever in the beginning. The necessity for authentic writings of this kind remained long unrecognised, for the Christians expected no new religious writings from the Messiah, Who came only to fulfil the law and the prophets. In the Jewish schools the scholars were accustomed to preserve by memory the long instructions of their teachers, and the universal and joyful expectation of the near return of the Lord made a written Gospel superfluous. From this it must not seem wonderful that during the period which preceded the destruction of Jerusalem (A.D. 70) no proof of the existence of an authentic written account of the evangelical history is to be found. Only the private interest of individuals and the effort after a more perfect knowledge gave occasion to fragmentary records of the evangelical history."<sup>1</sup>

This last observation suggests to us a consideration of great importance in its bearing on our synoptical Gospels. Between the mere traditional teaching of the Gospel in the preaching and letters of the Apostles, and the systematic and orderly record of them in the four Evangelists, an important period is interposed, during which the words of the preacher and his testimony to the life of Christ became the subject of privately recorded memorials, to the existence of which the opening passages of St. Luke's Gospel gives us a clear testimony. This is strongly confirmed by the tradition of the origin of St. Mark's Gospel, than which none was more constantly or universally received in the Church. St. Mark (we are told), being with St. Peter at Rome, took down in writing the main points of his teaching. We read further that, though St. Peter (perhaps for the reasons already indicated) did not approve of this new method of propagating his teaching, he at last assented to it, and to this, it is said, we owe the present Gospel of St. Mark. Now, it is a curious fact that Papias describes a Gospel by St. Mark which in no respect can be reconciled with that we actually possess. For it is described as not having any systematic or orderly form, which our Gospel possesses in a very remarkable degree. May we not, then, reasonably conclude that the Gospel mentioned by Papias was the original form in which the Petrine narrative was recorded, while that which we possess is the reduction of it to a systematic narrative? In this view the two first synoptical Gospels may be regarded as the records of the teaching of the Apostles whose names they bear, while St. Luke's, according to its prefatory words, is an original effort to reproduce in the strictest order the incidents of the life of Christ, falling back (as a later

---

<sup>1</sup> Credner, "Einleitung in das N. T." (Halle, 1836), p. 193.

biographer would naturally do) upon those earliest events in the history of the Holy Family with which the previous authorities he indicates would doubtless have furnished him.

The transition period between the traditional and the written Gospel—speaking chronologically, between the ascension of our Lord and the destruction of Jerusalem—was naturally one of the greatest obscurity. The preachers of the Gospel were scattered, and its work carried on orally or by letters to the principal Churches. But as the living witnesses passed away from year to year, the necessity for a written record became more and more urgent. The return of Christ had become identified in the minds of his disciples with the destruction of the fated city, and not only the intermixture of both events in His final prophecy of them, but many other passages of His teaching, led them to this conclusion. The announcement to the Apostles (Matt. x. 23), the misunderstood words relating to St. John (John xxi. 22), the prophecy, "this generation shall not pass away," etc. (Matt. xxiv. 34)—everything pointed towards the same end. The anxiety of the Church at the close of what we may term the preaching age—the age of fresh and living memories of so momentous a past—is well represented by the words with which Papias, one of the most important links between the two periods, describes his own feelings: "I did not seek for the society of those who spoke much, as most do, but for those who taught true things; nor of those who remembered the teachings of others, but of those who taught the things enjoined to their faith by the Lord."

The notes and memorials of that Divine instruction which hitherto had had only a private and personal character now took a more definite and historical form. "Memory," as Credner observes, "needed arrangement and regular methods and points of connection. One had, in the connected narrative, to put together what was done in Galilee; what during the last journey to the feast; what, again, at Jerusalem. Thus the Gospel tradition obtained a form which can be none other than that which is presented in the synoptical Gospels."<sup>1</sup>

The first two Gospels, according to this simple and natural view, sprang out of the reduction of the *λόγια*, or memoirs, of their writers; the second representing the preaching of St. Peter, while the first has distinctive tokens of having been written in the spirit and for the benefit of the Jewish Christians in Palestine, which explains the ancient and generally received tradition that it was originally written in Hebrew. On the other hand, the Gospel of St. Mark justifies, both in its style and character, the equally primitive belief that it was written

---

<sup>1</sup> Credner, pp. 197, 198.

in Rome, and represents the preaching of St. Peter during his abode in that city.

The Gospel of St. Luke assumes a character altogether different from both, and professes to be compiled after a perfect knowledge, not only of the facts as declared by the eye-witnesses, but also of the records of them which had already appeared in many different forms. The Evangelist fulfils in this respect the description which Papias gives of himself, as a diligent student and inquirer, relying on the actual knowledge and experience of those who had preceded him. It would seem to have been his design to give a clear and chronological narrative by reducing into a regular order the *λόγια* which represented the teaching of Christ in a more occasional and irregular form, and also to correct any inaccuracies that might have occurred in former compilers. These being the manifest and professed objects of the synoptical Gospels, we might reasonably expect to find in them a clear individuality and evident tokens of a distinct personality. And in this expectation we are not disappointed. From many distinctive characteristics, for which the reader might be referred to the exhaustive treatise of Credner, the Gospel of St. Matthew represents the teaching of a native of Palestine directed to the Jewish nation specially. No less clearly indicative of its origin and design is the Gospel of St. Mark, which verifies in a singular manner the tradition of the earliest Christian writers. The description of the customs of the Pharisees (Mark vii. 3, 4) is a sufficient proof that his Gospel was written for Gentile Christians, and in a place where the Jewish law was very little known. But still more significant is the insertion of the words "of all nations" (Mark xi. 17), while St. Matthew and St. Luke merely write, "My house shall be called the house of prayer," leaving out the claim of the Gentiles to have a portion in it. The constant use of Latin forms and titles, as census, centurion, quadrans, grabbatus, legion, prætorium, etc., is so distinctive a characteristic of St. Mark's Gospel as to have led to the early tradition that it was actually written in Latin. The characteristic features both in style and diction of St. Luke's Gospel have been described by Credner so fully (pp. 131, 142) as to need only the reference to so exhaustive an argument. From all these considerations it must appear to every impartial inquirer that the strong individuality of the writers of the synoptical Gospels gives the most convincing refutation to those modern theories which represent them as deriving their narratives from the common source of an *Urevangelium*, or as having been pieced together out of Petrine or other original documents—a view which has been lately put forth with elaborate ingenuity by Mr. Badham in

his treatise on the "The Formation of the Gospels." Our greatest security in accepting them lies in the originality and independence of their testimony. This is St. Chrysostom's contention, who points out the inevitable danger of their rejection had there been an artificial agreement between them, involving the suspicion of collusion, and on this account he is not afraid of admitting the existence of discrepancies in their narratives. The admission of the theory of the *Urevangelium*, first advanced by Eichhorn, is entirely inconsistent with the fact of these discrepancies, and would render them inexplicable. For if the synoptical writers derived their narratives from the same source, they would exhibit that exact correspondence, and even identity, which St. Chrysostom deprecates and which certainly they do not present. Eichhorn is here hardly consistent with himself, as he recognises the individuality and independence of the Evangelists, and compares their several narratives with his imaginary original in the most elaborate manner. It is instructive to compare the great simplicity and consistency of the earliest traditions of the origin and authorship of the Gospels with the confusion into which their modern critics have fallen, everyone differing from another, and everyone giving as plausible reasons for his theory as those who have preceded him in the unsuccessful search. The explorers are like men fighting in the dark, armed with the most perfect controversial weapons, but without any clear light to give them a proper aim or direction. And, in truth, these records of our faith are like the "seed cast into the ground, which, while men slept and rose night and day, sprang and grew up they knew not how," and we should do well, instead of dissecting the Divine plantation in order to discover the germ, to make that practical and salutary use of it for which alone it was committed to the ground. This work of disintegration and dissection has had its most recent development in the treatise of Mr. Badham which we have just referred to. By a process of reasoning, or rather by a plausible assumption, he has improvised a Petrine Gospel which he alleges to be inserted almost *en masse* into the synoptical Gospels. The earliest Christian writers were content to recognise St. Mark's Gospel as the only authentic record of St. Peter's preaching, and, perhaps from a respect to this primitive tradition, he has not interpolated that Gospel with his supposed Petrine document, though he has divided it (like that of St. Matthew) into two distinct elements. Such a theory might well be termed (in the words of Herrmann on Bishop Blomfield's conjectural emendations of the text of *Æschylus*) a "dangerous innovation on no fixed principle." The interpolations occur chiefly in the earlier half of St. Matthew, while St. Luke's Gospel almost

perishes altogether under the new treatment. Yet the fragments that remain are so entirely disjointed that no connection whatever exists between the portions thus arbitrarily severed. In most cases we have to join together disconnected facts, and even broken sentences, in order to satisfy the requirements of a theory which certainly rests on no foundation either of reason or tradition. It would almost seem as though the new document had been suggested by that equally doubtful discovery, the "Priestly Code" of recent Old Testament criticism, which is so useful an element in the process of disintegration, and so ready an expedient to fall back upon when other arguments fail. It is difficult to see why St. Luke's Gospel, which has a distinctively Pauline character, should be made the special sacrifice to this Petrine ideal. Nor does the author explain the reasons which have led him to assign to Peter so large a portion of the evangelical narrative. It might well be asked, At what period of St. Luke's life was he brought into such close connection with St. Peter as to enable him to be the publisher of what would undoubtedly, if capable of identification, be the most valuable of all the documents of our faith? The preface of St. Luke's Gospel gives no such clue as this to its origin, rather deriving its authority from Apostolic men than from actual Apostles.

The manner in which the apocryphal Gospels and acts withered and fell away from the authentic ones, though almost coeval with them, furnishes a most important argument for the authenticity and originality of the four canonical Gospels. We are apt to assign too great an importance, in this separation of the true from the false, to the Church either in its representative or collective capacity. The apocryphal works perished from authority and from memory from their own inherent weakness. They had no real vitality; they did not represent the religion of Christ as it had been preached by its first proclaimers. Though the earliest published record of the reception of the four canonical Gospels as the true representation of the religion of Christ is rightly declared by Eichhorn to be that of Celsus on the side of its adversaries, and Clement of Alexandria on those of its advocates, we cannot doubt that their general recognition was much earlier. The passage of Celsus deserves a much more careful attention than any which has been hitherto bestowed upon it. "Some of them that believe," he writes, "go to such a length as to change the original writing of the Gospel three times, four times, and even many times."<sup>1</sup> Now, the limit of the three and four times appears to me to point to the recognition of the four

---

<sup>1</sup> Origen, "Con. Cels.," l. ii., c. 31.

canonical Gospels by the early Christians, the indefinite word *πολλαχῆ* referring to the numerous apocryphal writings which had so different a position. Instead of saying "twice" or "thrice," he says three or four times, indicating, we may reasonably conceive, the three synoptical Gospels as having a special character, and the fourth as completing the evangelical record. From the fact that his references are made exclusively to these four, we are corroborated in the view that it was not by mere chance that he used these numbers. At the same time, the passage indicates that the heathen opponents of Christianity believed in a kind of *Urevangelium*, which the Christians are charged with altering and modifying to suit the exigencies of their defence. The traditions which have been handed down to us on the origin of the Gospels by Papias, Clement of Alexandria, Irenæus, Origen and others, though sometimes not easy to reconcile, are far more reasonable and consistent than any of the recent theories which have been put forth to account for their existence.<sup>1</sup>

The labours of the older Fathers of the Church were devoted to the building up of the "City of God." The grand and unique work of St. Augustine which bears that honoured title has been the strength and the comfort of ages of devoted faith. Now, it would seem that the teachers of Christianity are labouring only to pull down and destroy the work of their predecessors, and to prove that the promise of Christ to be the Guide and the Counsellor of His Church to the very end of time has utterly and hopelessly failed. And, to establish the failure of the promise, we are urged to disbelieve the words of Christ which claim a knowledge of the past, and to admit that He merely yielded to a popular opinion when He declared that the Messianic Psalms were the work of David, and that His ancestor according to the flesh "wrote of Him." The doctrine of the Reformation was called "the New Learning"; but it never had any other object but to clear away the mediæval errors which corrupted and almost destroyed the very foundations of that reasonable faith which its Divine Author commended to the honest judgment of all His followers in the words, "Why of yourselves judge ye not righteous judgments?" Now, however, the very groundwork of our faith is being disturbed and broken up, and we may well ask with the Psalmist, "If the foundations are destroyed, what can the righteous do?"

---

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps the most difficult to reconcile with the rest is the tradition of Clement of Alexandria, recorded by Eusebius, that the Gospels containing the genealogies were written first—as that of St. Mark, from internal as well as traditional evidence, must certainly have preceded St. Luke's. But as the former was written in the last year of St. Peter's life, there may have been but a slight interval between the two Gospels.

Yet the prophetic promise still lives in all its first force, "The hands of Zerubbabel have laid the foundations of this house, and his hands shall finish it." The presence of the great Master-builder of the Church is still in His living temple, and will abide in it for ever. The walls of Jerusalem will yet be built again in all their first strength, and the zeal and watchfulness of the builders will be crowned with the success which they had in that earlier day, and will have to the very end, if we are but true to the cause of Christ, and to the ministry which He has called upon us to fulfil, through His Spirit and to His glory.

ROBERT C. JENKINS.

---

ART. II.—ARCHBISHOP MAGEE:  
HIS SERMONS AND SPEECHES.

IT was a day much to be remembered in the city of Norwich when, within the walls of her ancient cathedral, crowds were gathered to hear the great preacher of the Church of England plead the cause of the Christian faith.

For in 1871 the truth and authority of the Christian revelation was boldly and even coarsely denied. Nor was Christianity alone the object of attack. All faith in God, all belief in the soul, all conception of the power of prayer—in a word, all that stood between the soul and a bare materialism was attacked with a vehemence which had not yet subsided into the comparative dulness of Agnosticism. It is to the sermons delivered on this occasion that we shall in the first place call attention, not only on account of their intrinsic excellence, but because they are in so marked a degree characteristic of the preacher and of his style.

Those who knew the Bishop would understand how such a subject and such a scene would move him. He was called to a great effort, and a mighty cause seemed to hang upon his lips. That most sensitive frame would be strung up to the keenest anxiety as the moment of trial drew near. He would feel all this with a nervousness singularly characteristic of himself as he mounted the pulpit steps, and as the last strain of the organ ceased. But on this occasion his eye met a sight well calculated to arouse the combatant within him, for just in front sat Bradlaugh, the arch-sceptic of his own diocese, cynically cracking nuts. "Ah," said the Bishop to himself, "is Saul also among the prophets?"

How wonderfully calculated was all this to stir to the utmost his marvellous gifts! That trenchant logic which seldom perpetrated and never spared a fallacy, that brilliant

humour not untinged with pathos, nor indeed with sarcasm, which gave such sparkling clearness to his train of thought, were never more conspicuous, nor were an entranced audience more delighted and astonished.

Yet not entirely so : for later years, which but little blunted the edge of his weapons, added somewhat to the charm of his oratory, investing his style with a new tenderness, and giving a deeper spirituality to his thought, which some who loved him attributed to that terrible year in which he thrice stood face to face with death, which in him was to stand face to face with God.

In Norwich Cathedral the Bishop preached three sermons at that time upon Christianity in connection with Free Thought, with Scepticism and with Faith ; and in the close of the same year a fourth upon the Demonstration of the Spirit, which has often struck the writer of this review as the very perfection of logical irony. Eminently suited as were these sermons for that day, they are no less adapted to our own. The pride of human intellect is not lowered, nor is its claim to be the solé arbiter of all truth abandoned, though the sceptic may have made a somewhat cowardly retreat under the modest cover of Agnosticism. "Thought," said the sceptic, then as now, "thought is free as air. Who shall impose a limit upon its flight or dictate the regions into which alone it is to soar?" Yet the very air is limited by its own conditions. Unseen forces control its direction, secret attractions determine its speed, an invisible boundary defines its extent. And so with thought, for which men would maintain an equal freedom. It is not, it cannot be, absolutely free. It is strictly limited by the intellectual powers ; it is tinged, and that deeply, by the moral character ; it is affected, and that more powerfully than aught beside, by its environment. It cannot embrace the finite : how, then, shall it exhaust the infinite ?

It is upon the relation of Christianity to this supposed freedom that the Bishop dwells in the first of his Norwich sermons. With an irony peculiarly his own he shows that Christianity, so far from contracting within narrower limits the fetters upon thought, actually maintains its freedom by asserting its responsibility. It is they who deny a man's responsibility for his faith, "who say that he is no more answerable for his creed than for the colour of his hair or the height of his stature," who imperil his freedom, for liberty and responsibility, says the preacher, are convertible terms, and when there is no responsibility there is no freedom.

We conclude our notice of this sermon with an extract, in which the Bishop shows the absurdity of demanding a religion free from dogma and from theology : how theology, which is

indeed the science of man's relation to God, is essential to man's safety and happiness, as are the natural sciences which reveal his relations to the physical world:

Is there really room, then, for this free thought about God? And can we afford to dispense with any knowledge concerning this God, if there be one? Can anything show you more clearly the utter folly and absurdity of those words which I dare say many of you heard in the last year, "Let us have religion without dogma, without theology. By all means let us have religion, but no theology." Is that one whit more sensible than let us have sun, moon and stars, but no astronomy; let us have plants but no botany; let us have chemicals but no chemistry; let us have the earth but no geology? What is theology? It is the science of God. And if God be a fact—mark you, I say *if*—there must as certainly come a theology out of that fact, as there comes a geology out of the fact that there is an earth. . . . You may tell me that these (the statements of the Creed) are not facts—that is another question; but all we say is, if they be facts, you are just as much bound to think rightly concerning these facts as you are about any other facts; and you think respecting *them* under penalties just as much and no more than you think under penalties concerning other facts. . . . If you be doubtful, remember that while you are doubting time is passing; if these be facts, then you are imperilled if you think wrongly about them. There is danger in darkness as well as in light; if you tell us you are groping in the dark, then we say, Take heed how you grope, take heed lest these facts prove hurtful and dangerous to you if you come into collision with them. We cannot alter these facts. If they are facts, then they have a bearing upon your happiness just as much as facts in the natural world have.

From this topic he passes in the second sermon to the Relation between Christianity and Scepticism, and scepticism he defines as that temper of mind which demands proof of which the subject matter is not capable; and a sceptic as "a man who will not believe the truths of Christianity because they cannot be demonstrated as he would have them demonstrated." It is upon this definition that he proceeds to argue. But we are disposed to think that the definition might have been with some advantage enlarged; that there is a view of scepticism which has been unduly overlooked, and a sceptical habit of mind which deserves some tenderness at our hands, and which does discharge an office of no inconsiderable importance to truth. There is in most minds of strong intellectual calibre what may be described as a transition from an implicit to an explicit faith, a time in which the mind is forced to examine the meaning of much which hitherto it has accepted simply, and rightly, upon authority, as upon the authority of its parents or natural guides. And examining the meaning of these truths it is led to examine their evidence as well. To many minds such a process is inevitable, to some it is exquisitely painful, doubtless in all its innocence and its result are alike dependent upon the humility, candour and honesty with which its inquiries are made. But much also depends upon the patience and sympathy of those with whom the soul thus

tried is thrown, and with whose authority its convictions have hitherto been associated. To confound such inquirers as these with sceptics of another school, with men inflated with the pride of intellect—bold, arrogant and irreligious—is cruel as mistaken. We do not for a moment charge the Bishop with lack of sympathy or tenderness for souls so tried. The condition of mind to which we now refer did not directly come within his scope at the time, and to have diverged from his strict argument might have weakened its force; but it is an interesting fact that, at the time that these sermons were much in men's minds, a man meeting the Bishop in the street said to him, "My lord, I think you have forgotten one cause of scepticism in your discourse. There is the weariness and exhaustion of a mind overwrought, and which in its very faintness has no longer grasp of transcendental truth. Surely the medicine for that mind is rest." However, the Bishop deals with the subject with conspicuous power and sympathy elsewhere, quoting the cry of the afflicted father, "Lord, I believe; help thou mine unbelief." It may be observed that these critical periods occur not only in the lives of individuals, but in that of the Church itself. We are passing through just such a season of trial at this moment. May God give His Church light and guidance, and add that other gift, of which we spake but now—Rest!

From Free Thought the preacher passed on to Scepticism, from Scepticism to Faith. He presented faith as a high and noble quality of the soul—as necessary to enable it to realize any truth whatever; as elevating it to the acceptance of the very highest truth. That faith which the sceptic held up to contempt as a puny, effeminate and childish quality he portrayed as above all things ennobling the man and raising him to his loftiest, brightest and happiest conceptions. For all this we refer the reader to the sermons themselves, but we would specially direct his notice to the more subtle argument in which is shown the dependence of all morality, of all propriety and decorum, upon this same principle of faith. It is not perhaps sufficiently observed that all moral obligations rest not upon any reasoning process, but upon instinct or upon authority, which itself rests upon faith. Did a man ever succeed in the attempt to prove, by force of syllogism, the obligation to decency, to veracity, to honesty? The nearest approach to such demonstrative proof would be that of the utilitarian—the tendency of such and such action of happiness. Yet who does not see how vague and unsubstantial is such proof? Who shall define happiness, and what standard shall we adopt? That the first elementary rules of life, without which society or civilization would be impossible, should thus rest,

not upon reason, but upon intuition or on faith, has always seemed to us to convey the most remarkable rebuke to those who would make human intellect the judge and arbiter of all truth.

We have discussed the Norwich sermons thus at length, not only on account of the importance of their subject, but also because they were so characteristic of the man and of his style. Bishop Magee positively revelled in moral dialectics. His eye brightened and a ring of triumph sounded through his voice as he exposed a fallacy or tore into shreds a specious piece of cant.

It has been said of the Archbishop, that he was a very clever, but not a very learned man. This is true; but it is also true, and that without any great paradox, that he was in a certain sense the more able for not being a more learned man. His weapons were encumbered with no learned *dust*. He was very little given to dry disquisitions, or to anything remote from the actual life and the enormous interests into which he was thrown. His capacity for disentangling the complexities of a subject, and for picking out at a glance the master thread which commanded the whole was unrivalled. The practical bearing of a subject upon the faith and life was that which gave it its interest with him; but for all this, though he dealt but little in subtleties, he was by nature formed for moral philosophy, and men perhaps did not recognise his statements as philosophical because of their perspicuity. The stream was so clear that men did not perceive its depth.

We have already referred to a fourth sermon preached at Norwich, that on the Demonstration of the Spirit. In this sermon he gave free rein to a quality of his mind in which he certainly had no English rival. One or two there are among his Irish brethren who may rank as his competitors. Dr. Salmon is not less humorous, Bishop Reichel not less scathing; but we have never heard from English lips the like keen and polished irony in combination with a strict and merciless logic. To this the Celt contributed his logic and the Hibernian his peculiar humour. Indeed, the Bishop was fond of claiming for his countrymen the quality of logic, in which he was pleased to associate with them the Frenchman and the Welsh in right of their Celtic blood; and if perchance his hearer smiled at finding this orderly arrangement of thought attributed to his countrymen, he would answer, "Paddy is always logical, but the major premise of his syllogism is too often wrong." Certainly we never heard logic so clear combined with wit so pungent from an English preacher. In the pulpit

it had all the force of ridicule with none of its offence. Dr. South's humour, though frequently not less caustic, was almost always less refined, though distinguished by the same keenness and quickness of perception. The witty Canon was often coarse, sometimes scurrilous; the Bishop was never this. In the pulpit his almost irrepressible humour never transgressed the bounds of reverence nor indulged in personalities; but for all this its effect upon an opponent was most formidable. The logic crushed, whilst the wit transfixed him, and the clear sparkle of the humour made the victory transparent to all beholders.

The question arises, and that a very interesting one, How far is irony, and that irony at times not untinged with sarcasm, permissible in the pulpit? We believe that, under the limitations here indicated, it is a weapon as legitimate as effective. Until lately the sermons of the greater English scholars, and especially those of episcopal rank, had degenerated into essays, and when argumentative had almost invariably become dull; and as a rule the greater the scholar and the more dignified the ecclesiastic the duller they became. The ironical humour of the Bishop of Peterborough at least prevented this, whilst it added immensely to the perspicuity of the argument, and enabled very ordinary minds to follow the most elaborate reasoning.<sup>1</sup>

It was characteristic of the Bishop, for to that more familiar title we involuntarily recur, that in his mind were certain leading truths, which exercised a dominant influence, and which were constantly recurring, as they do in the sermons in these volumes. They were not the truths or opinions which occur in other minds, borrowed or accepted by them upon authority, or as parts of the system into which their theology has been cast; but they appeared, if we might so conjecture, to be original and independent thoughts, which had almost spontaneously occurred to him, as corrective or explanatory of the theological system in which he had been bred. Doubtless he had early imbibed the great Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith—a doctrine carrying with it undoubted truth, but, as some of us can remember, somewhat dryly and arbitrarily stated in our youth. Faith was proposed, and rightly proposed, as the primary and necessary condition of worship, of salvation. But it was not so frequently shown as

---

<sup>1</sup> Of course we except Bishop Samuel Wilberforce, who, but that he had begun to fail as Bishop Magee rose to his zenith, would have been his distinguished rival. Surely they were the two most brilliant preachers of the century. They were in most points markedly contrasted. As orators, it may be said of the former that he was the most persuasive, of the latter that he was the most convincing.

it should have been how great was the moral and spiritual value of faith, how great its transforming power, how unique and, so to say, how essential an element it was in the ennobling and elevation of the man. Hence, as preached in the days we speak of, there appeared something arbitrary and unreal in the place assigned to it in the popular system. "Only believe" became too often a formula as dry and arbitrary as the doctrine of good works or of ceremonialism, against which it was supposed to protest. The Bishop saw—and that no doubt long before he became a Bishop—that the lower nature could never be raised but by faith in a nature higher than itself, by faith in that which is true and noble in other men, and so by faith in the perfection of the noble and true, as existing in God and as revealed in Jesus Christ. Nay, he added that it was essential that the man should believe in that which was higher and better in his own self, higher and better than he was willing to believe of himself. This was a great and a pregnant thought. It appears and reappears more than once in these volumes; but seldom did the preacher speak with greater feeling or with truer eloquence than in the sermon upon Christianity and Faith. Mere extracts will give but little idea of the value of this sermon, and one perusal will not suggest the depth nor the wide and varied bearing of the truths which it propounds. Amongst other things is shown how inevitable are the difficulties which a lower nature must experience when it comes in contact with one much higher than itself; how inadequate must be its conceptions, how imperfect its judgments. It is no small merit of the Bishop's sermons that, whilst so clear and exhaustive upon a particular point, they are so suggestive upon others which lie beyond. In the present instance, a thoughtful mind on laying down the book may find matter for many and important suggestions. It is a great achievement thus to have elucidated the nature of faith, and to have shown not only its excellence, but its moral power, and so to have vindicated the position which it holds in the Gospel scheme.

There were, of course, other subjects besides the evidential ones upon which the Bishop preached. A sermon upon Fore-telling and Forth-telling, which does not seem to us very happily named, provoked considerable criticism at the time. It was not open to the objection which we once heard seriously brought to one of his really great discourses, "that it lasted thirty minutes, and was all upon one subject." For in this case the Bishop dealt, and with great earnestness, upon three topics—one the nature of the prophetic office, the second the characters of the optimist and the pessimist, the third the distinction between morality as enforced by the State and

the moral code of the Church as inculcated by the Gospel. In the last division the sermon provoked considerable criticism, and there are those who are still disposed to differ strongly from his views. It is clear that the Bishop was in no way daunted nor convinced by his critics; for he repeated the sermon verbatim fifteen years later, on the occasion of the reopening of one of the most important churches of his diocese, and before a very large and distinguished assembly both of clergy and laity. Our own disagreement is with some expressions in the first part of the discourse; the more general disagreement was with the last. All must have admired the skilful portraiture of the optimist and the pessimist which came between these, and we are of opinion that not a few writers and speakers on this subject are indebted to this source for some of their most salient points. Upon the other two we will proceed to say a few words in their order.

In the first, then, we perceive some reaction from the feeble treatment of the subject of prophecy popular in the preacher's youth. Davidson was but little read, and the Dean of Canterbury and the late Archdeacon of London (Dr. Gifford) had not written; Keith and books of his calibre were in vogue. As the Bishop tersely puts it:

The idea which too many devout and believing students had, and still have, of the prophets of the Old Testament, was this—that a prophet was a man divinely inspired to foresee, and foretell to his countrymen, coming events, and that afterwards his predictions, with their fulfilment, should remain to us as proofs of his inspiration, and as reasons why we should believe the Bible in which they appear. To furnish predictions for the Jews and evidences for the Christian are the two chief, if not the only, functions with which most persons used, and many people still continue, to credit the great institution of Jewish prophecy."

No doubt this is a true, if a somewhat caustic, description of the once popular view of prophecy and of the prophetic office; and it is followed by a magnificent description of the office of the Jewish prophet as an instructor in righteousness, as upholding in the Jewish nation the sense of their relation to their Divine Governor, and to His worship and His law:

He was God's messenger to tell the Jews that they were God's people; that the land which they called theirs was, therefore, not their land, but His—that they held it upon strictest covenant of obedience; that Jehovah was their Lord, and not theirs only, but Lord of all the earth. He was to proclaim to Israel that the Lord God omnipotent reigneth. He was to tell it out among the heathen that the Lord was King.

All this is eminently true. The prophets were a very numerous body distributed in "schools" and colleges throughout the land, and their office mainly was the religious instruction of the people. In this respect they resembled the parochial clergy of our own day. But it does not seem right to restrict

the prophetic office entirely to this duty, and to eliminate altogether its predictive function. There were among them men of great eminence, in whom dwelt the Holy Spirit in very large measure. These men were the direct organs of communication between Jehovah and His people—the advisers or the strong rebukers of their rulers. They lived and taught in the most critical periods of their nation's history, and shall it be said that men like these, filled, as we have said, with the Spirit of God, and endowed with the higher degrees of inspiration, should not from time to time be gifted with visions of God's future purposes? Or shall it be said that in them the gift of foresight was "but a poor gift, which they might share with the witch or the wizard; that it is not always divine—it may be devilish, and its possession may turn men into devils"?

*(To be continued.)*



#### ART. III.—MODERN PREACHING.

THE universal extension of the art of printing has universally modified the influence of the pulpit. Much of what was formerly wont to come to man by hearing, now comes to him by reading. The journal and the book have, in the modern age, largely covered the space of public attention previously occupied by the harangue and the sermon. The newspaper has a daily congregation of tens of thousands; the preacher has a weekly audience rarely exceeding a few hundreds. For every thirty persons who habitually read journals and books, probably less than five habitually listen to speeches or sermons—so completely, in the modern age, has the written word usurped the throne once occupied by the spoken utterance.

It is, moreover, very noteworthy that this usurpation affects not sermons alone, but all spoken dissertations in general. In several towns rough calculations have been made of the numbers of persons attending the places of worship in those towns, and the aggregate of these numbers seldom amounts to one-third of the entire population. But if, in those self-same towns, a calculation were made, during a municipal or parliamentary election, of the number of persons attending the places of political meeting, the aggregate of these numbers would be still less imposing. Of course, upon great occasions, when the Prime Minister or some important political personage is announced to address a meeting, the concourse of listeners is multitudinous; but so is it also at Westminster Abbey or St. Paul's Cathedral when any famous divine is announced to

preach. From a census taken a few years ago in London, it was computed that no fewer than six hundred thousand persons attend the various churches and chapels every Sunday. And although this aggregate number is equal to only one-tenth of the population of the Metropolis, yet, on the other hand, it shows that congregations equivalent in number to at least one hundred great and rare political meetings, assemble in London alone for the ordinary purposes of religion every Sunday throughout the year. The scanty attendance at sermons is not, therefore, of itself a convincing evidence that the public interest in religion is on the decline, any more than the even greater scantiness of attendance at political meetings is a proof of the decadence of patriotism. In both cases alike the scantiness of attendance is only an evidence that, in the modern age, the sceptre of influence, once wielded by uttered speech, has passed into the hands of the printed page.

There are unmistakable and abundant signs in every direction that the hold which Christianity still retains, at the close of the nineteenth century, upon the intelligence and emotions of men, is intensely strong—indeed, altogether measureless. When, *e.g.*, in all the annals of publishing, has there been witnessed a scene comparable to that enacted in the year A.D. 1881, on the day of the issue of the Revised Version of the New Testament? For months beforehand the printers' presses wrought incessantly to provide a number of copies equal to the anticipated demand. Among all the English-speaking peoples of the world expectation rose to something like fever height, and on the day of publication the rush upon booksellers was a rush unparalleled in the history of literature. Four years later, on the publication of the Revised Version of the Old Testament, in May, 1885, the *Times* newspaper declared that "Christians have become more intent than ever on understanding the real meaning of the revelation upon which their religion rests. There is a craving for a renewed knowledge of the Scriptures. Never was there a period when English Christians were more eager for light on the lessons of the Bible."

Nor was this rushing interest a mere evanescent phase of ephemeral curiosity, due to the publication of a long-expected revision of the Holy Scriptures. The copies of the sacred volume annually circulated by the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, and by the British and Foreign Bible Society, are reckoned by hundreds of thousands. There is no department of literature so busy and flourishing as the department dealing with religion. The number of religious books and religious tracts sold every year exceeds the number of all other books and tracts put together. A Life of Christ goes

through fifteen editions in three or four years. Even journals and magazines which make no profession of being specifically religious, usually assign a prominent place to articles bearing upon religion. The notoriety of many a scientific man is due less to his researches in science than to his controversies with religion.

Even the growing antagonism to Christianity is a symptom of Christianity's growing power. Few persons become ardent in whipping a dead horse. There is no zest in such a recreation. A strong athlete requires a robust antagonist to put him on his mettle and to stir his blood. The fire and zeal of the giants who oppose themselves to Christianity could not be kindled by any adversary less gigantic than Christianity itself. The oppositions to Christianity, far from being a cause of despondency or dread, are a source of encouragement and hope. They unite with the fairer and more friendly tokens in attesting the strength of the grip which Christianity has fastened upon the heart and mind of the modern age.

If, then, as is alleged, the power of the pulpit is decaying, the decay is not due to any decadence in men's interest in religion. The very nature of the case is contrary to such a supposition. For man is essentially a religious being. He is as manifestly a creature of spirit as a creature of sense. His interest in spiritual phenomena is insatiable. The very falsities and monstrosities of the spiritual world wake him into a mood of examination. The Psychical Society, largely composed of men of learning, is ever ready to expend much patient and intense effort upon the investigation even of a ghost. Why should the prospect of the great wide sea please the beholder, and fill him with a sense of pensiveness, if he were not gifted with the eminently spiritual faculty of imagination? Why should the measureless dome of space, and the myriad lamps hung therein, have been to man in all ages an object of admiring, frequently of adoring, solicitude, if man were not intuitively religious? The fictions, the poetry, the sculpture, the music, the paintings, the philosophies, the creeds, the martyrs, the saints of successive ages of mankind, all combine in attesting the inextinguishableness of man's interest in spiritual phenomena, and man's endless anxiety concerning his own eternal destiny.

For practical purposes it counts but little that a few speculators either doubt or deny the essential religiousness of man. There have also been philosophic speculators who have asserted that the material world is a pure idea, and that the supposed perceptions of sense are all mere illusions. Yet in the latter instance not even the speculators themselves act on their speculations. Despite their speculations, these speculators.

act as if the world were material, and as if they themselves were gifted with faculties of veritable sense. In like manner speculations menacing to religion are practically impracticable. They are soon perceived to do violence to the essential constitution of man. They leave a void in his nature. For a while the ardour of perversion and the keenness of conflict may hold at bay the impulses of man's spirit; but at length, if man denies to his spirit the wheat of religion, he is ultimately compelled to feed it on the husks of superstition. Thus he who might have been a believer becomes a mesmerist, and he who might have been a saint becomes a spiritualistic medium. Even in its perversions and revenges, the unconquerable religiousness of man's nature asserts and vindicates itself. Violence may degrade, but cannot destroy, the indestructible spiritual element in man. The men of to-day are, by the obligations of their spiritual constitution, as naturally religious as were the men of the apostolic or reformation periods of the Church's history. They cannot help themselves. Either favourably or unfavourably religion *must* interest them. The human nature to which the modern preacher addresses his sermons is composed fundamentally of the self-same elements as the human nature to which St. Paul or St. Chrysostom, Luther or Whitefield, addressed their sermons. And consequently, if the modern sermon does not exercise an influence equal to the sermons of the former days, the cause is not to be found in any diminution of the religiousness, native and necessary to man.

Neither is the cause to be found in the monotony with which the lapse of ages is said to have dulled and encrusted theological and spiritual truth. The charge is sometimes brought against Christianity that it is unprogressive, and that there is about it an unexciting sameness. But about air-breathing and wheat-growing and bread-baking there is a similar sameness. Things vital and necessary are usually unprogressive. Not all the science of all the ages has changed one single element in the fundamental constitution of man's nature. The needs, the hopes, the fears, the difficulties, the aspirations of man are at this moment characteristically identical with what they were thousands of years ago. *It is not man himself, but merely man's environment, which has been modified by the inventions and discoveries of successive generations.* The chemical constituents of wholesome food, the physiological conditions of jocund health, the utilitarian requirements of social felicity, the basis of virtue, the consequences of vice, the spectre of dread ever haunting the guilty, the rainbow of hope ever encircling the good—none of these things are changed by the lapse of time, and the

advances of thought, and the achievements of enterprise. They are each and all stationary, unprogressive, fixed. To say, then, that Christianity is beset with sameness is only to place Christianity upon a footing similar to that which food and health, felicity and virtue, occupy. The very unprogressiveness of Christianity is one of the notes that it holds rank not among things optional, but among things vital. The accidentals and environments of life may vary, but its essentials and foundation continue ever unvaryingly the same. And it is because religion belongs to the foundation of man's nature, and is not a mere accidental of his environment, that it remains as stationary and unalterable as the essence of that nature itself.

The neglect of observing this cardinal distinction between the unchangeable foundation of man's nature and the ever-changing features of man's environment has largely contributed to the weakness of the pulpit in modern times. The modern preacher occupies himself too frequently with disquisitions upon the varying phenomena of man's environment, instead of concentrating his primary study upon the unvarying principles lying at the foundation of man's nature. The preacher looks around and sees mankind travelling at the rate of sixty miles an hour, telegraphing all over the world, printing newspapers by the million every day, and he rushes to the conclusion that everything is different from what it was in the days of the curfew bell, and the stage-coach, and the mutton candle. Thereupon he changes his Gospel to suit what he thinks are the changed circumstances of the case and the time. No opinion could be less philosophical, no course of conduct less profound. The spinning-jenny of to-day is different from the distaff of the ancient time, but the staple of the wool is just the same. The English ocean-liner is faster than the Greek trireme, but the waves of the many-voiced Mediterranean are not altered. The ideas of Aristotle printed on a copious page are identical with the ideas of Aristotle written on a crowded palimpsest. It makes no difference in the constitution of flour whether the wheat is ground by hand or by steam. Neither does it make any difference to the essential constitution of man whether he lived before or after the invention of the electric-light. *Cælum non animum mutant.* The inventions of science change the environment, not the essence of man. In kind, though not in surroundings, man is born just the same as if physical science were still unknown. His ideals of holiness are not altered from those of the earliest Christian age; the waves of his temptations and his difficulties remain as many-voiced as ever; the staple of his spirit changes not.

Not, indeed, that changes of environment work no corresponding change upon the habits and wishes and tastes of mankind. On the contrary, environment is a powerful factor in the shaping and colouring of human life. And in preaching it is just as necessary to take note of the changing aspects of man's environment, as it is to avoid confounding man's ever-changing environment with his never-changing constitution. As no preaching is powerful which neglects the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, so all preaching is enfeebled which arrays those doctrines in an archaic and out-of-date costume. What the modern age desiderates is not a new-made, Christless Gospel, but a Christ-full Gospel in a new-made dress.

Faith in the justice and mercy of God, and dependence upon the gifts of the Holy Ghost, are just as necessary to the salvation of man in a scientific age as they were before either of the great Bacons was born. Printing and steam and electricity have wrought no change in the facts of the Incarnation, the Crucifixion, the Resurrection, the Ascension, the Intercession of Christ, or of the redeeming virtue of faith in those facts. It is at least quite as hard to be righteous and holy in an age of science as it was in an age of miracle. The evil within man's heart, and about his path, is not diminished by any amount of invention or progress in the material world. On the contrary, it is even possible that the successes of science may augment the difficulties of being religious. For scientific successes multiply the commodities and the luxuries of life: and luxuries are not conducive to saintliness, or the abundance of commodities to the growth of heavenly-mindedness. The hardness of Christ is seldom found amid the softness of superfluities. The greater the ease with which the progress of science surrounds the life of man, the greater also is his danger of becoming slothful in spirit, slack in self-sacrifice, impatient of restraint, and forgetful of the Judgment to come.

An enervated age thus stands in need of a stimulating Gospel. But the modern pulpit is in danger of enervating its Gospel to suit the enervation of the age. Half the world's dose of weekly sermons consists either of diluted disquisitions on charity, or of unscientific attempts to reconcile the eternal revelation of God with the ephemeral theories of man, or of unphilosophic platitudes benevolently intended to obliterate punishment from the world. Hence the pulpit has no power. A Gospel of mere amiability is an impotent Gospel. The very people whom it intends to please despise its ineptitude. The pride of our age is great, its self-indulgence is great, its doubts are great, its reliance upon visible things is great; but greatest of all is its unacknowledged sense of inward need and inward weakness. And nothing is great enough to cope with these great charac-

teristics of the age, except the truths of Scriptural religion. Far from being an age unsuited for definite doctrines, it would seem as if there never had been an age in which definite doctrine was more needful and more acceptable. The pride of the age needs the corrective of the Nativity; its self-indulgence needs the corrective of the Cross; its doubts need the corrective of the historic Resurrection; its reliance upon visible things needs the corrective inculcation of death and eternity and the throne of God. Even in its enervation the modern age will give neither respect nor confidence to a pulpit whose teachings are as enervated as itself.

All the phenomena of the Christian world combine to attest the verity of this opinion. Why does the Roman Church hold sway over so large a part of Christendom? Among other causes may be placed the positiveness of its doctrines and the assurance with which they are preached. No half-persuaded preacher has a fully-persuaded congregation. To convince others a man must be first convinced himself. Soulless doctrines, soullessly expressed, do not inspire men with devotedness and zeal. Eliminate from the New Testament the historic doctrines upon which the creeds are built, and the New Testament will differ little, either in character or force, from the maxims of Aurelius. Christ Himself, be it reverently said, did not attempt a revival of religion, apart from the announcement of definite doctrines of eternal moment. Why were St. Paul, St. Chrysostom, St. Athanasius, St. Augustine, St. Ambrose powerful preachers? Not only because they were eloquent, but because their eloquence, as their writings prove, was instinct with positive Scriptural truth. Archimedes is reported to have said that, if only "he had a fulcrum," he could by a single lever move the world. It was upon the fulcrum of a single doctrine—the doctrine of justification by faith—that Luther succeeded in moving the world of his day. The power of Wesley and Whitefield lay in arousing, by the instrumentality of doctrine, the conscience of their auditors to a sense of accountableness, and in bringing individual souls into personal communion with the personal God. Wonder is sometimes expressed at the strength and vitality of the Oxford Movement of nearly fifty years ago—the movement connected with the honoured names of Newman and Keble, and Davison and Pusey. But in reality the movement was less strange than necessary—necessary according to the fundamental needs of the soul of man. Part of the English Church of the time had fallen into a state of slovenliness and semi-scepticism and sloth. Neither in fabric nor furniture did Church buildings minister to man's instinct of reverence. The sermon was in many instances a species of ethical or courtly or mundane discourse. The entire spiritual

nature of large numbers of men was starving with hunger, and in the eagerness of famine it began to devour unwonted kinds of food. What evidence could be stronger of the craving of man's nature—the best nature of the most intellectual men—for clear and definite doctrine than the havoc which the dearth of it played in our Universities fifty years ago? Strong, persuasive, definite preaching in Oxford in the first half of our century might have delivered us from much sorrow and loss in the century's second half.

Among all sorts and conditions of men, in all ages of the world, human nature and human needs are fundamentally the same; and the power of a sermon consists in its capacity for dealing with that nature and satisfying those needs. The first business of the preacher is, therefore, to study to understand that nature with all its taints, its passions, its weaknesses, its powers, its aspirations, its mysterious majesty, its divine similitudes; and then to study to apply the means which have been provided for the cleansing of those taints, the ennobling of those passions, the strengthening of those weaknesses, the development of those powers, the spiritualizing of those aspirations, the unfolding of that majesty, the perfecting of that similitude. No pulpit whose aims fall below this standard will succeed in being a pulpit of abiding power. By devotion to these two branches of study—the nature of man and the means supplied for the rescuing and uplifting of that nature—Mr. Spurgeon contrived for more than a quarter of a century to make his single pulpit an energy, not in London only, but throughout the whole of Christendom.

But while the fundamental nature and the profoundest needs of man are unchangeable—and the means for redeeming that nature, together with the truths for satisfying those needs, are unchangeable also—yet the environment of man, particularly his physical and intellectual environment, is incessantly changing; and the problem before the modern pulpit is the adaptation of the ever-varying mutations of environment to the never-varying foundations of doctrine. The preacher who has respect to both these elements is strong; he who neglects either of them is weak. Essential doctrine is ever necessarily the same, but the manner of expressing that doctrine may from age to age be prudently and effectively modified. The reigning controversies, the general interests, the directing line of thought, the *calculus* of each succeeding age is peculiar to that age. An epoch of œcumenic councils for defining creeds is distinct from an epoch of world-embracing associations for discussing science. An audience maddened to crusading zeal by tales of Moham-medan aggression is different, in temper, from an audience friendly to Foreign Missions out of peaceable devotion to the

Cross. An age insulted by the vending of Indulgences needs different treatment from an age palsied by irreverence and indifference. Even in the self-same age the vesture of the sermon, its diction, its illustrations, its method of delivery may be wisely fitted to suit the different understandings of the different audiences to which it is addressed. Upon Good Friday or Easter Day the central topic of all sermons is probably identical; but who would think of treating the topic at a Church Army gathering in the same style or fashion as at Westminster Abbey or the Temple Church?

Great preaching consists not in metaphysical profundities, or scientific disquisitions, or controversial philippics, or political orations. "Our Creator," says Cardinal Newman, "has stamped great truths on our minds, and there they remain in spite of the Fall." And it ought to be the first object of preaching to bring out these intuitive truths, and awaken them to practical life. "One thing," said Mr. Gladstone in a recent interview, "I have against the clergy. They are not severe enough on their congregations. They do not sufficiently lay upon the souls and the consciences of their hearers their moral obligations, and probe their hearts and bring up their whole lives and action to the bar of conscience. The kind of preaching which men need most is also the kind of which they get least. The clergy are afraid of dealing faithfully with their hearers. There is not enough of searching preaching in any of our pulpits." Searching preaching is, of course, very different from scolding preaching. The preacher should never sink into a mere scolder. Scolding is commonly a symptom of vanity and ill temper; it is heat and bitterness of tongue. Of scolding preaching every age has had more than enough. But searching preaching is deep and spiritual and calm. It first probes the preacher himself, and then his hearers. The great lack of modern preaching is that it is not deep enough. It does not search; it is not spiritual.

No doubt all preaching, like all piety, should affect the concerns of common daily life. But the surest way of reaching conduct runs always through the conscience and the spirit. Even worldly persons are best influenced by spirit-kindling sermons. Moreover, the preacher will do well to remember that he is speaking to those within his church, not to those outside. And he may reasonably assume that those who come to church, whatever be their social or intellectual rank, are, for the time at least, chiefly interested in their spiritual relationships and concerns. The business man probably knows more of business, the scientific man more of science, the politician more of politics than the preacher can be expected to know. But the one theme upon which the preacher may be rightly

supposed, by reason of his studies, his addictions, and the consecration of his life, to have superior knowledge, and for the sake of which single superiority alone, those who are his betters in every other way are contented and grateful to sit at his feet and to hear his words, is the commanding and all-hallowed theme of revealed and spiritual knowledge. It is a source of weakness to the modern pulpit that it fails to give due weight to this important consideration. Instead of striving to lift their congregations up, preachers seem too often bent upon levelling their pulpits down. They sell the ordination right of their ministerial office for a lecturer's mess of secular pottage—pottage which they seldom have the least idea how to cook. Instead of copying the sermons of apostles and prophets, and fathers and saints, preachers too often imitate the style of essayists and investigators, of magazine-writers and journalists.

In every age the best preaching is the preaching which best ministers to the changeless needs of the human heart—needs which neither the advance of secular knowledge nor the developments of science can either obliterate or satisfy. Whatever changes may be effected in man's surroundings, man himself remains practically the same. The savage in the forest is more gross than the doctor in the schools; but seminally they are most near akin. By cultivation the savage, in a few generations, may be refined into the doctor; by neglect the doctor will speedily revert into the savage. There is no impassable gulf of generic difference between the two. And if the distance between the extreme poles of human nature be so small, how little is the essential difference which degrees of income, or degrees of knowledge, make among the different grades of civilized men. Neither the brain-power nor the spiritual discernment of the men of the modern age is appreciably different from that of the men to whom Christ and His Apostles so powerfully preached. The modern age has, indeed, its own methods of criticism—methods which are being rigorously applied both to the sacred documents of Christianity and to the dogmatic formation of Christian opinions. But methods of criticism, however greatly they may affect the scaffolding of Christianity, can no more affect those unchangeable laws of religion which govern man's conscious relationships towards God than the methods of criticism, which have from age to age modified the doctrines of physical science, can affect the unchangeable laws of the material universe.

The essential characteristics of modern preaching, therefore, should in nowise differ from the essential characteristics of Apostolic preaching, seeing that man is in nowise fundamentally different in the modern age from what he was in the age of the Apostles. And as the aim of the Apostles was to kindle

in men a spiritual sense of present personal communion with God, and present individual contact with the unseen universe, and after-death accountability before the judgment-seat of Christ, so should a like quickening of the spiritual sense in man be the principal aim of the modern preacher. But while in fundamental purpose and essential aim modern preaching should be practically identical with the preaching of Apostolic times, yet, in outward appearance, in phraseology, in illustration, modern preaching may wisely strike out new paths of its own. It should present old truths in new lights, and cast a glow of fresh, modern interest around ancient and eternal truths. For as all preaching is weak which overshadows the momentous and abiding issues of eternity with the fleeting topics of the transient age; so all preaching is strong which illuminates the current topics of the age with the light which beams down from the abiding suns of eternal truth.

JOHN WILLIAM DIGGLE.

---

ART. IV.—CHOLERA.

*Notes of "Lectures on Cholera" delivered at Gresham College.*

BY E. SYMES THOMPSON, M.D., F.R.C.P.

II. AN EPIDEMIC OF CHOLERA.

IN the first article was given a *résumé* of the history of cholera, and it was shown how, starting in Lower Bengal, where it is endemic, the disease spreads with more or less rapidity westwards along the lines of commerce and of congregations of human beings. In the present article we must consider an epidemic of cholera in more detail, showing more exactly the mode of its spread and the effects that it produces in the regions that it attacks, while at the same time a few words will be said about the ultimate cause of the disease, and a brief description will be given of the symptoms in a patient. As, of course, THE CHURCHMAN is not a medical journal, this last, as well as the medicinal treatment, will not by any means be given in full, but in a later article the most important form of treatment, viz., the preventive, we shall consider at some length, inasmuch as not only is prevention better than cure, but it is also a great deal easier. For our purpose we shall confine our attention principally to epidemics that have occurred in our own country, and especially to those of 1854 and 1866, for not only are these epidemics of more interest to us as Englishmen, but also better and more detailed information is available. Nevertheless, it will be necessary to travel beyond the confines of the British Isles in order to gain a con-

ception, however inadequate, of the meaning that is conveyed by the expression "an epidemic of cholera" to those unfortunate inhabitants of towns where such an epidemic is raging or has raged. Partly from its insular position, and partly from the fact that, though very far from perfect, England has always been some distance ahead of other nations in sanitary arrangements, our country has never known the *full* significance of a cholera epidemic, in spite of the fact, which we fully bear in mind, that in the 1848-51 epidemic it killed over 50,000 persons in our islands. Those who recall to mind Charles Kingsley's description in "Two Years Ago" must remember that that description is true of a small village only, and that the distress does not increase in direct ratio with the population, but far more rapidly.

It is important, moreover, to note that a very considerable difference obtains when the disease affects persons of various nationalities. Though the cool-headed Englishman and the phlegmatic Dutchman become panic-stricken in the presence of an epidemic, yet they manifest that condition of mind in a very different way to that in which the ignorant and fanatical South Russian or Tartar manifests it. Compare, for example, the two following extracts, both of which describe occurrences in the 1892 epidemic. The first is from a letter written September 11th, 1892, by a volunteer nurse at the Eppendorfer Hospital, Hamburg, and appeared in the *British Medical Journal* of September 17th, 1892. She said :

The city was panic-stricken, the citizens were fleeing in all directions, and a terrible gloom lay over everything. . . . As I drove along it looked serenely quiet, the streets being strangely empty, giving the impression that the inhabitants were sleeping or had gone in a body to church. Several cabmen, on learning my destination, shook their heads and declined to take me ; no one, they decided, would go willingly to the Eppendorfer Hospital unless already infected.

The other extract is from the *Times* of July 15th, 1892, and was written by the correspondent of that newspaper at St. Petersburg. It is as follows :

A repetition of the horrible cholera riots at Astrakhan has taken place at Saratoff. On the 10th instant the populace, which is said to have been infuriated by a preposterous belief that cholera patients were being buried alive, attacked and pillaged one of the police-stations, the house of the chief of police and the lodgings of several doctors. They then proceeded to the temporary cholera hospital, whence they dragged seventeen of the cholera-stricken inmates. The mob also did violence to the doctors, the attendants and many private individuals, killing two persons. At last troops were summoned from the camp, and fired on the rioters, killing three and wounding four.

A disease that can lead to scenes such as the above must be a formidable foe !

The two chief causes that lead to this panic are the rapidity

with which the disease runs its course in an individual, and the high rate of mortality that accompanies it. There is something singularly awful in sudden or very rapidly supervening death. To speak to a man in perfect health on Friday, and hear that he is dead on the following Sunday, is appalling; but when such events follow upon one another with the rapidity that they do in a widespread epidemic, two results are sure to follow—general panic and general unbridled license—and it is difficult to decide which is the more terrible in its effects. As far as the mortality is concerned, a very large proportion of English men and women cannot have the slightest conception of what an epidemic of cholera means, for the last epidemic in our country was in 1866, and consequently the younger half of the population only knows of it by hearsay; but it may assist us in some degree to understand it if we compare the unknown with the known, and place side by side what happened in Hamburg in 1892, what happened in England in the early part of the same year as the effect of influenza, and what resulted from the very extensive epidemic of scarlet fever that prevailed in the autumn also of 1892 in London generally, but particularly in the western portion of it. The highest death-rate during the last influenza epidemic was 60·9 per 1,000 at Brighton; the highest death-rate during the prevalence of scarlatina in London was about 16·9; but the *cholera* death-rate in Hamburg during August was at least 130, and for one week—August 28th to September 3rd—it was over 250 per 1,000. It is impossible to tell the proportion of deaths to patients attacked with influenza, but in the cases of scarlet fever and cholera we have a means of comparison. On September 3rd 3,280 patients were suffering in London from scarlet fever, and 62 deaths occurred during the week ending on that date from the disease; but in Hamburg, according to the official returns of the total number of cholera cases from the outbreak of the epidemic to September 24th, 1892, 17,157 persons were attacked by the disease, and of these 7,339 succumbed. In a word, a patient's chance of recovery if he have scarlet fever is about 23 times as good as if he had cholera. Lastly, let it be remembered that the population of London is about nine times as great as that of Hamburg, and then an idea will be obtained of the dimensions of an epidemic of cholera. What disease, other than cholera, has come under our notice, except as a matter of history, to which the following words written by a correspondent to the *St. James's Gazette* on September 28th, 1892, could be applied? He is speaking of the Hamburg cemetery, and writes:

The ground is laid out in oblong spaces some seventy or eighty yards wide, and trenches have been cut right across from path to path. These

are about four feet deep, and wide enough to take two rows of coffins set foot to foot. Here they are laid side by side, as close as may be, all along the trench, perhaps about 200 in each. . . . Trench after trench has been dug, space after space occupied, and still it goes on. One hundred and fifty gravediggers have been at work here night and day for weeks. At night they work by flaring gas-jets supplied by portable hand-reservoirs on iron rods that can be carried about and stuck into the ground. It is a weird scene. Many of the trenches are already filled up, and the long mounds levelled; others are still being dug by gangs of diggers; others, again, are half filled with coffins, and the men are already shovelling earth on them at one end, while fresh ones are being brought up to complete the tale at the other. Even now comes one. The funeral attendants step hastily over the ground, carrying it by the handles like a portmanteau, drop it in its place without a word, and hurry off: there are so many others.

Such is the effect of a cholera epidemic upon communities, and we have strenuously avoided giving any descriptions that could in any way be regarded as extravagant, principally because an enemy is better grappled with if we neither underestimate nor over-estimate his strength. But certainly enough has been said to put people on their guard against neglecting those precautions which, if taken early, will save them from the disease when it comes, or at all events will put them under the best possible conditions to withstand it should they be attacked. We learnt from influenza the importance of not neglecting the early days of an attack, and it will be well for us if we apply our experience to the case of cholera.

We will next briefly consider cholera as it affects the patient, and the chief points of interest, apart from the actual symptoms, such as vomiting, severe diarrhoea, cramps, and collapse, none of which it concerns us here to dilate upon, are the suddenness of onset and the rapidity with which the disease runs its course, and terminates either in death or recovery. It is unnecessary to go into the question of the danger to life further than we already have done when considering the effect of a cholera epidemic upon a community, for our object is not that of writing a medical essay. Our purpose is to present cholera to the readers of *THE CHURCHMAN* as it was the purpose of one of us to present it to the audience at Gresham College, in the light of an intensely interesting and important subject. The subject of capital punishment is highly interesting and important, but we do not all of us consider it with the mental feeling that it may one day, perhaps, personally interest us. There is one point, however, in both cases that is of the utmost personal importance to each and every one of us, and that is the question as to how we are to act so as to avoid the penalty in either case. Hence the preventive treatment of cholera is the most important part in any consideration of cholera, just as the preventive treatment, so to speak, of capital punishment—that is

to say, the improvement of morals—is the most important point in any consideration of capital punishment. Nevertheless, in order to make that portion of our subject fully intelligible, information on a few details is necessary.

In the first place, then, the incubation period of cholera is very short. In a series of 64 cases the periods of incubation were as follow :

In 11	the incubation period was under 1 day.
„ 35	„ „ from 1—2 days.
„ 11	„ „ „ 5—7 „
„ 6	„ „ „ 8—12 „
„ 1	„ „ „ (?) 24 „

Thus in over 70 per cent. of the cases the disease showed itself within two days from the entrance of the poison into the body. It is interesting to note in this connection that typhoid fever, which in many other respects bears a great resemblance to cholera, is in this point very different from it: the incubation period of typhoid fever, though irregular and uncertain, is to be reckoned by days, whereas that of cholera is to be reckoned by hours. Moreover, the same difference may be observed in the course of the disease: a typhoid patient rarely dies until he has had the disease for over a fortnight; a cholera patient may die after being ill only twelve hours. And supposing they both recover, the typhoid patient will pass many a weary week before he is fully returned to health, whereas the rapidity with which cholera patients recover is peculiarly and strikingly noticeable :

They seem to get well all at once, scarcely anything of their terrible pain and exhaustion remaining. This is due, one would suppose, to the short duration of the illness, there being no time for radical deterioration of strength and constitution. But it is difficult to believe that the woman who to-day is walking about the wards, assisting a little with its domestic duties, is the same who for four days before lay prostrate and comatose, vomiting violently every ten minutes, painfully purged almost as frequently, her face pinched and dusky, her limbs and body shrunken, her eyes sunken and black-ringed, praying only for speedy and merciful death. Her whole appearance was so absolutely changed that her nearest relatives might scarcely have recognised her. One can hardly credit that any but a prolonged illness could so alter the aspect.

We will now turn our attention to considering what is the ultimate cause of cholera. This will be, chronologically, an anticipation of the subject-matter of the next section, for it was only after the actual mode of spread of the disease had been so well worked out as to become almost a mathematical certainty that scientists knew where to look for the cause, and had an idea of the direction in which it would probably be found. It was only in 1883 that Dr. Robert Koch, of Berlin, made known the fact that he had discovered a bacillus which he asserted was the real cause of cholera. It is unnecessary here to enter

into any discussion of whether this is so or no, but it will be sufficient to state simply that the greater number of medical men by far recognise in the bacillus described by Koch that specific cause which was being sought for on all sides. The "comma bacillus," as it is called, from its greater or less resemblance to a printed comma (,), is something less than one twelve-thousandth part of an inch in length, while it is only about one-third of that length in width. Like all other bacilli, it is a kind of fungus, and has its position right at the very bottom of the vegetable kingdom; it is provided with a kind of whip-shaped extremity, with which it lashes the liquid in which it finds itself, and so executes rapid movements across the field of the microscope when under observation. It very rapidly increases in numbers, and reaches the height of its proliferation in a few days. When it is remembered that it multiplies in geometrical progression, and consequently doubles its numbers every few minutes, it is conceivable how in the course of a few days the excreta of one cholera patient, themselves containing probably many millions of bacilli, can provide the means of infection for a whole community, even if only an infinitesimally small quantity finally succeeds in effecting an entrance into other persons. In point of fact, we can only wonder that under the circumstances the spread of cholera is so limited as it is. Such being the case, it is easily intelligible that drinking-water should be the chief mode whereby one case infects a multitude; for drinking-water is usually supplied to a large number of persons from one source, and if that source be infected, then the rapid and extensive spread of the disease is possible, and even probable, while each of these secondarily affected persons in his turn becomes a source of danger to other members of the community in exactly the same way. The cholera bacillus is never found but in the intestines or in the intestinal dejecta of a patient suffering from cholera, and it is not difficult to understand how, when sanitary arrangements are not of the best—and especially in such cases as occurred in Hamburg, where the town-sewage is poured into the Elbe, and the drinking-water is taken out of the Elbe—that wide-spread epidemics of cholera should occur. Nor must we hold up our hands in horror at the disgusting idea of drinking-water that is contaminated with sewage; unfortunately, that is by no means unknown here in England, and there are rivers not very far removed from the "healthiest city of the world" which serve to supply us with water for household purposes, and which also serve as receptacles of our drainage. Admit cholera to England, and let it have a week's full play, and our population would be decimated.

A couple of examples of the mode in which this spread

takes place will be of interest, and we will take them from the epidemics of 1854 and 1866.

In 1854 the death-rate from cholera in the district of St. Ann's, Golden Square, was at the rate of 128 for every 10,000 persons, the general death-rate of the Metropolis being only 60 to the same number.<sup>1</sup> It seems that at 40, Broad Street (St. Ann's), a child having been ill for three or four days, died from cholera on September 2nd, her excreta having during her illness been emptied into a cesspool only three feet from the well supplying the pump used by the people in Broad Street. The contents of this cesspool drained into the well, as was subsequently discovered. On the night of August 31st cholera broke out among the inhabitants of Broad Street, the greater number of cases occurring on September 1st. "Nearly all the persons who had the malady during the first outbreak drank of the water from the Broad Street pump, and very few who drank of this water during these days escaped having cholera."

In the weekly return of deaths for September 9th the following was recorded as occurring in the Hampstead district: "At West End, on September 2nd, the widow of a percussion-cap maker, aged 59 years; diarrhoea two hours, cholera epidemic sixteen hours." Dr. Snow was informed by this person's son that she had formerly resided in Broad Street, but had not been in the neighbourhood for many months. A cart went from Broad Street to West End every day, taking out among other things a large bottle of water filled from the pump in Broad Street, the lady in question preferring this to any other water. The bottle of water was carried out to Hampstead as usual on Thursday, August 31st, and she drank some of it that evening and more on the following day. She was seized with cholera on the evening of the latter day, and died on Saturday. A niece who was on a visit to this lady also drank this water; she returned to her residence in a high and healthy part of Islington, was attacked with cholera, and died. There was no cholera at the time either at West End or in the neighbourhood. Besides these two persons only one servant partook of the water at Hampstead West End, and she did not suffer, or only to a slight extent.

In 1866 the parts of the Metropolis mainly affected were the eastern districts, and Mr. Netten Radcliffe, who investigated the matter for the Privy Council, found that there

---

<sup>1</sup> The death-rate is usually calculated for every 1,000 persons living, but as this and the following paragraph are taken from the "Report of Committee for Scientific Inquiries into the Cholera Epidemic of 1854," we have thought it advisable to adhere strictly to the text and make no alterations, beyond condensation.

was a great preponderance of cases among persons whose water, supplied by the East London Water Company, had passed through the reservoirs at Old Ford, whereas comparatively few cases occurred among those who received water supplied by the same company, but pumped directly from the filtering-beds at Lea Bridge into the mains. Now, shortly before the epidemic in East London began, a man and his wife, living in Priory Street, Bromley, near the banks of the Lea, had died of cholera, and their evacuations had entered the river at a part which was, in fact, a canal with locks, and received a large quantity of sewage, so that it was a little better than a cesspool. Now, all the water supplied by the East London Water Company was intended to have been filtered at Lea Bridge, but some of that which was stored in the Old Ford reservoirs was sometimes drawn from two other reservoirs, which differed from the rest in being uncovered, and which freely communicated by soakage with the contaminated portion of the river Lea above mentioned. So that the two primary patients infected the river Lea, the river Lea infected by soakage the uncovered reservoirs, which in turn carried infection to the Old Ford reservoirs, and so led to an epidemic which affected 27 of every 10,000 persons who drank this water, whereas in other parts of London only 5 in 10,000 persons were attacked by the disease.

To sum up, therefore, there is a small bacillus which multiplies with inconceivable rapidity, gains access to water, is taken into the bodies of hitherto healthy persons, produces in them a series of symptoms always alarming and very frequently fatal, passes with their intestinal dejecta again into water, and thus causes a wide spread epidemic of that disease which we designate Asiatic cholera. No case of cholera arises but from some other case of cholera, and every case of cholera which is not isolated and watched with the utmost care is a source of infinite danger to the whole community in the midst of which he is situated.

E. SYMES THOMPSON,  
WALTER S. LAZARUS-BARLOW.

---

#### ART. V.—THE CHURCH IN WALES.

THE Church in Wales was originally a part of the Church of Christ planted in the Roman Province of Britain about the middle of the third century, which gradually extended itself over the length and breadth of the land south of the Firth of Forth. When the English tribes conquered Britain it is well known how the British race retired fighting before them until

they were at length able to hold their own, and maintain their independence, at least for some centuries longer, in the western peninsulas of Wales and Cornwall, and in the districts of Strathclyde and Cumbria, extending from the Mersey to the Clyde.

While the English were establishing their seven or eight kingdoms, the Britons of the Welsh peninsula were dividing themselves into four principalities, in each of which a separate see was established. Bangor was for Gwennydd; Llanlwy or St. Asaph's for Powys; St. David's for Menevia; and Llandaff for Gwent. The date of the actual foundations of these four Welsh sees is unknown. Daniel, the first Bishop of Bangor, died in 584. St. David died in 601. St. Kentigern, the probable founder of St. Asaph, died in 612. In 612 also died Dubric, the founder of Llandaff. The four dioceses varied in extent with the conquests and re-conquests, the victories and the losses, of the several princedoms.

From 400 to 700 the Church of Christ flourished in Wales. It had intercourse with Ireland and with Brittany. In the sixth century St. David, St. Gildas and St. Caradoc greatly influenced the Irish Church, and revived and spread the faith in that island of saints. To the Welsh school in Ireland belonged St. Columba, the Apostle of Scotland. Neither in Cornwall nor in Ireland were there a greater number of holy men and women, in proportion to the population, who were honoured by the acclamation of their fellow-countrymen with the title of saint.

The Church in Wales, like the Church in Ireland and the Church in Scotland, was originally wholly independent of the Church of Rome. They had peculiar and distinctive customs of their own quite incompatible with the idea of Roman obedience. The history of the gradual recognition by the Welsh Bishops of the jurisdiction of Canterbury, and through Canterbury of a closer connection with Rome, is obscure in detail but quite simple in principle. As the Norman kings extended their sovereignty over Wales, they appointed Norman bishops to the vacancies which occurred in the Welsh sees. These bishops were accepted, not at first without reluctance, by the Welsh dioceses, and they carried with them the recognition of the jurisdiction and customs of Canterbury. The clergy and people disliked the appointment of Norman bishops, just as they were disliked by the English, but they submitted with as good a grace as they might to what could not be resisted. The recognition of Canterbury was not probably felt to be any hardship by either bishops, clergy, or people; for in those days the sentiment of ecclesiastical unity was not unpopular. Thenceforward the history of the Church in Wales is blended

with the history of the Church in England. To the Welsh congregations Latin was not more unintelligible than it was to the English.

It was not till two hundred years after the Reformation, or about one hundred years ago, at the time of the great religious upheaval inaugurated by the two Wesleys and by Whitefield, that the modern form of Christianity, which has become so popular in Wales, was preached and popularized amongst that fervent race. In many ways Welsh Christianity had been very cruelly treated. In the time of Oliver Cromwell, absolutely the whole of the Welsh clergy had been evicted from their parishes, and it had been determined that the wants of the four dioceses and of the whole population could be supplied by twenty-four itinerant preachers, six for each bishopric. The people were naturally so dissatisfied that they were described as ready to become Roman Catholics or anything to enable them to give expression to their religious feelings. Nowhere was the restoration of the Church more heartily welcomed than in Wales, so that the Welsh people became a stronghold of Church loyalty. When the Stuarts gave way to the House of Hanover it became the deliberate policy of the Whig ministers of those days to discourage this loyalty by sending Whig bishops to the Welsh sees, who knew no Welsh, and who scarcely ever lived in their dioceses. They looked on them only as stepping-stones to higher dignities in the Church. Can we wonder that under the circumstances Methodism took a stronger hold of the Welsh people than any others? Calvinist Methodism is in the proportion of two to one to the other Nonconforming denomination, such as that of the Baptists, the Independents, and the Wesleyans. The founder of the Welsh Calvinist Methodists was Mr. Howel Harris, of Trevecca. He had intended to take orders in the Church of England, but was turned from his purpose by what he saw amongst the students at Oxford, who seemed to him to be wholly given to folly and impiety. On his return home he began to preach to his neighbours, and in the surrounding parishes. This was in 1735. Great attention was excited. Numbers collected to hear him in every place where he preached. At length local societies were formed, which were placed under the superintendence of men of experience. The preaching of Mr. Harris was not only successful among the people at large, but was also followed by several clergymen. They gave up their parishes, and joined themselves to Mr. Harris. George Whitefield lent them the help of his wonderful eloquence, and in return obtained from them many of his most powerful preachers. But it was not till the year 1785, when it was joined by the Rev. Thomas Charles, Rector of Bala,

that, owing mainly to his zeal and exertions, the movement was organized into a regular body. Since that time till about twenty-five years ago, the numbers and resources of Calvinist Methodism were steadily on the increase both in North and South Wales. There was hardly a village in the Principality where one of its churches was not to be found. The doctrines held by the members of the movement are of the strongest type of Calvinism. Their form of Church Government inclines to the Presbyterian. But many practices are encouraged amongst them which the more sober minds of the Presbyterians would condemn. They utter excited and exciting exclamations of desire or exultation during prayer. They leap and throw themselves into violent postures under the excitement produced by the eloquence of the preacher. They have lay-preaching, and some of their most popular orators are of this class. The sermons of their preachers are generally delivered in a slow and thrilling recitative, interrupted by quick and startling appeals, sudden questions and musical intonations. Even on those who are ignorant of the language in which the address is uttered this peculiar mode of delivery is productive of a powerful sensation. We are not surprised, therefore, that on those by whom the whole is understood, and who can enter fully into the highly figurative and impassioned style of thought which is usual to the Welsh Methodist preachers, the most singular effects should be produced. It is no unusual thing to see whole congregations convulsed, and thrown into the most violent agitation, almost instantaneously, by some well-managed appeal to their feelings; and this once accomplished, it is not very difficult to keep up the excitement, until both speaker and hearers are ready to sink to the ground from pure exhaustion. But in spite of these hazardous and passionate excitements, which cannot really be helpful to the true understanding of the kingdom of Christ, we should be very ungrateful as Christians if we did not recognise that the labours of these preachers did, in a time of great deadness and coldness, tell most widely and most beneficially on the religious and moral improvement of their neglected countrymen. The real misfortune is that they have left behind them a tradition of separation.

For Christ our Lord prayed that His followers all might be one; and to this unity the separation into different churches, denominations, and sects is a grievous hindrance. In the course of time party spirit springs up, and mutual understanding becomes extremely difficult. Now that the Church in Wales is once more thoroughly awake, now that no bishops are appointed to her sees to whom Welsh is not a native and familiar language, now that discipline is being restored

amongst her clergy, now that her churches are being repaired and Christ is being zealously preached in all His true simplicity, there is no reason at all for schism and dissension.

There is, however, as I said in the *Review of the Churches* for May, 1892, no use in attempting to minimize the undoubtedly strong feeling which exists amongst the Nonconformists in Wales, for the Disestablishment and Disendowment of the ancient organization of Christianity in that country, as settled anew at the time of the Reformation. There are some thirty-one constituencies where a majority are in favour of these forcible measures, against three where the majority is the other way.

And yet this Parliamentary preponderance must not blind us to the fact that in each constituency there is a strong, and in many cases nearly equal, minority on whom the proposed measures would inflict a hard and lasting grievance. Those adhering to the ancient organization are thought to be hardly on the whole less numerous than those who dislike it. In many cases no doubt the dislike is active, the adherence passive.

To find 1,500,000 of our fellow-countrymen divided on a burning ecclesiastical question is lamentable indeed for all Christians. And even if there were no active propaganda for Disestablishment and Disendowment, it would be the desire of all thoughtful and statesmanlike minds to bring the discontent to an end.

It may help the solution of the question if we first attempt to analyze the causes of the alleged failure of the ancient organization in the past.

1. First we must again mention the intrusion by the Norman kings of Norman bishops on Welsh sees. It was intended as a policy of unification: but it did not tend to strengthen Welsh Christianity.

2. Next must be recapitulated that other political mistake: the deliberate appointment of Whig bishops of worldly, unspiritual mind, during the long Whig supremacy, with the view of checking Welsh zeal for different principles.

3. The notorious lack of discipline in past times in the Welsh Church, and the alleged need, even in the present day, in certain parishes, of stricter powers for the correction of irregularities.

4. The lack of sympathy amongst former Welsh clergy for the evangelical revival in Wales.

5. The appointment of men who could not speak Welsh to parishes where Welsh was spoken.

6. The habit of looking to England for bias and inspiration rather than of encouraging an individual life amongst the Welsh people themselves with their strongly-marked characteristics.

These faults have, certainly during the last quarter of a century, and probably even before, been counteracted by a policy of truth, justice, and wisdom. And as a result the cause of the ancient organization has been rapidly gaining ground. But the errors of the past have left a very difficult legacy, in the fact that half the population have formed religious systems of their own, not differing in the important doctrines of Christianity from the ancient organization as reformed, but with a strong feeling of resentment against that organization, and vigorously calling for its disestablishment and disendowment.

What is it that the Nonconformists could gain by these forcible measures?

a. The four Welsh bishops would no longer sit in the House of Lords.

b. The vicar or rector would be no longer chairman of the parish meeting.

c. £118,000 a year, the net receipts of the Welsh clergy in tithes, would be paid, as now, by the landlords, but to some such purpose as education. That would surely be a very small triumph for such a commotion! The Welsh Church is, far from being very rich, exceedingly poor. Most of the appeals to clerical charities come from Wales.

d. The estates of the four bishoprics, and of the four chapters, and the poor little glebes of the Welsh vicars, would be swallowed up in the same way as the £118,000 of the tithes, without visible result on anybody whatever.

On the other hand, these things would remain:

(i.) The four bishoprics, the deaneries, the archdeaconries, the local clergy, with just the same prestige of association from an immemorial past, the common inheritance of all those churches which have retained the common form of church government which we find prevalent immediately after the days of the Apostles.

(ii.) The feeling of resentment against those who would be regarded as the authors of a very bitter and painful change terribly accentuated, and religious peace further removed than ever.

Is there no remedy for this religious disunion except that one half of the population should inflict on the other half what would be felt as an intolerable injustice?

The ideal course would be for the Welsh bishops, who, say what anybody may, are really the representatives of the ancient organization, to confer with the leaders of the Nonconforming communions, and to receive lawful authority to make recommendations to the Convocation, to Parliament, and to the Crown, as was done at the Hampton Court

Conference in the reign of James I., at the Savoy Conference in that of Charles II., and as was attempted by the commissioners of 1689 in that of William III. Is it absolutely out of the question that the Welsh should become once more one harmonious religious community? As I said before, the Welsh Nonconformists hold all the main doctrines of Christianity, and room might easily be made for their specific forms of local government. The bishops, and leaders in this ideal scheme, would be guided by the wishes of the people, as they were at the time of the Reformation, and at those other epochs, keeping within those great simple fundamental principles which are truly catholic. But that is entirely out of the region of possibility. I only mention the proposition in order to put it aside. The feelings and traditions on both sides are far too strong.

But, apart from that, would it not have been wise in past times, in order to undo the mischief of Normanizing a Celtic Church, in order to counteract the long and poisonous series of bitter doses of Whiggery;—might it not, when the storm is over, still be wise on the part of our rulers in Church and State to make the Welsh Church a separate province, in the same position as the Province of York? It is quite likely that the ancient organization in Wales might take developments and adaptations which would be suited to the Celtic Welsh character, and not at all to the English. The Scots have a Church of their own, notwithstanding the union with England; and the differences of race and character between Welsh and English are greater than the differences between English and the majority of Scots. The Welsh would feel more interest in the ancient organization if it was wholly Welsh and indigenous than they do when it is everywhere asserted that the Welsh Church is the same as the English, one and indissoluble. It is mere pedantry to insist on exactly the same ecclesiastical forms as best suited alike to all nationalities. We are beginning to drop that pedantry in the colonies, and this is an opportunity not to be despised for dropping it in Wales. Welsh nationality is sufficiently marked to have its own province, its own ecclesiastical ideas, its own customs and adaptations. The proof of it is seen in the abnormal and unparalleled development of fervid Celtic Nonconformity.

In a notable speech made during the recent debate in the House of Commons on the Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Welsh Church by Mr. A. J. Williams, the member for South Glamorgan, considerable light was thrown on the question by the following statement:

“Those small shopkeepers, peasants and farmers who have

built their chapels, and raised £400,000 a year to keep up, very inadequately, the worship of their heart and conscience, see all the wealth, all the social influence, used in favour of this small church. . . . A constant sense of injustice is stamped on the hearts of the Welsh people by seeing this endowed Church supported out of what we maintain is the property of the people. The social disadvantages I will show by an illustration. A farmer's son, who might be a dull and stupid peasant, with just enough in his head to be ordained, directly he becomes a curate is immediately recognised by the country squire and all the country gentry, and is taken on to a social footing with them all. On the other hand, you may have one of the ablest young men in Wales, who may proceed from an elementary school to the University College and be ordained as a Congregationalist or Baptist, and though he be the brother or cousin of the farmer's son, he would not receive the same social recognition. We want to get rid of this injustice, and to put every religious body in our country on one common footing, without privilege."

Here are exactly what have always seemed to be the two great factors in the Disestablishment and Disendowment movement: supposed support through the payment of tithes, and social advantages. The support through the payment of tithes is in reality only supposed, because every species of land has from the very beginning of our national history had this charge, and in every possible relation of the land it has always been taken into account. Still, the payment seems to the Nonconformist to be direct. The great majority of the tithes are now paid by the larger landlords; and the remaining difficulty and cause of disunion would be at once ended by a steady determination on the part of the Church authorities to redeem, as speedily and strenuously as possible, all those that are paid by small Nonconformist owners of land.

As to the social grievance, the end desired would be really gained, not by Disestablishment and Disendowment, but by quite an opposite scheme. Disestablish and disendow as much as you please; but the country gentry and the local squire would only show the greater courtesy and friendliness to those who in their eyes would have been harshly treated. Far from being more ready to cultivate social relations with the Nonconformist clergy, they would strongly resent the injury which they would have caused to the Church to which the squires *ex-hypothesi* belong. If, on the other hand, you could persuade Her Majesty, the Lord Chamberlain, and the Prime Minister, to give a distinct social precedence to the ministers of registered and recognised Nonconformist communions, the difficulty would be at an end. At present, in lists of those

presented at Court, the clergy come before the army and the navy. The clergy are not really particular about it, because their position as enriched by associations coeval with Christendom is well assured, and because it is not their business to set much value on such distinctions. But it would be highly desirable to give to ministers of important Christian communities a similar indisputable standing in country social life. However lofty and democratic the view of the Nonconformist minister may be as to his spiritual office, he cannot help being at the same time a citizen—and every citizen should have his standing assured, so that he never need be troubled about it, either in the way of excess or defect of consideration. The social recognition which is here advocated would have little effect in towns, where Nonconformist ministers have abundant honour amongst their own people; but the speech of Mr. A. J. Williams shows how real would be its operation in the country. It cannot be too clearly stated that, as far as social standing is concerned, Disestablishment and Disendowment would make the position of the Nonconformist minister far worse than it is, for it would be very difficult for the country gentry to forgive what they would regard as a grievous and wanton injury.

Nonconformists have in the past generation had several grievances removed. Cemeteries have been opened, they may bury their dead in churchyards, church-rates have been abolished, tests swept away, the universities and public schools thrown open, Nonconformist children protected by the conscience clause in every public elementary school in the kingdom. Is it not possible that in Wales the religious disunion calls for a few more measures of the same kind? If it is a grievance that the Rector still has the churchyard as his freehold, let all churchyards be closed, and God's acre be laid out on some neutral ground under a local trust. Doubtless it would be greatly in the cause of health. If it is a grievance that he should still preside over secular business, let that purely secular office be given up cheerfully and willingly, and let the chairman be elected. Often the Rector would be replaced by suffrage. If it be a grievance that he has something like sole management of his school, let the parents of the children attending the school elect representative managers. It is impossible not to believe that in these, and other like ways, the aspirations of the Nonconformists, religious, social, and political, might be satisfied.

Get rid of the ancient organization you cannot, though you can injure and maim it. The advocates of forcible measures protest that they do not wish so to injure or maim; but whether they wish it or not, the result of their measures cannot be avoided. Many would agree that considerable concessions

ought to be made in proportion to the measure of the past errors and the consequent disunion; but the worst thing that could happen for the peace of religion in Wales would be those forcible measures which could not destroy the ancient organization itself, but would leave (such is human nature) an indelible rancour.

It is melancholy to be told, by friends on whom reliance can be placed, that to find true party spirit in all its bitterness you must go to Wales. There are faults on both sides; the Nonconformists do not understand the position of an ancient Episcopal Church, and they certainly use unmeasured language, habitual exaggeration, and indeed, every weapon of party warfare. Of happiest augury would it be if there were ground to believe that the Church clergy never retaliate; but there is credible information that such retaliation is not uncommon. For example, an Englishman at a Welsh watering-place last year attended church regularly, and every sermon he heard was directed against Nonconformity. That is not the way to conciliate, disarm, or win to friendship. Believing, as all English Churchmen do, in the truth and justice of the position of the Church in Wales, it is most earnestly to be desired that the Welsh clergy should preach the Gospel, do their glorious work as ministers, and leave the Nonconformists altogether out of their sermons. That is the true way to prove superiority of Christian grace, if such proof is desirable. The position for them is very difficult; but if they could unanimously control their vexation, the weapons of meekness, humility, and gentleness would be irresistible.

Resistance to the great injustice and harsh cruelty of the Suspensory Bill, so obviously a mere bargain for votes, will clearly be vigorous throughout the length and breadth of England. But besides that, it would appear wise to consider some such conciliatory measures as these:

1. Immediate redemption of tithe from small or Nonconformist owners of land, to remove a grievance felt, though sentimental.

2. The grant of solid and indisputable social standing from the Queen, as fountain of all honour, to the ministers of registered religious communions.

3. The retirement of the Rector and Vicar from all purely secular business. In England, where the Church is in a large majority, that position is recognised, and often welcome. But the *ex-officio* presidency in Wales gives ground for dislike and jealousy.

4. The universal formation of cemeteries and burial boards.

5. The representation of the parents of children on school management committees.

6. The absolute cessation on the part of the Welsh clergy of all reprisals on Nonconformist attacks. Churchmen have no right to offer advice to the Nonconformists; but if that policy could be zealously and enthusiastically adopted, there can be no doubt which would be the winning side.

7. The universal cultivation of friendly relations on the part of the clergy towards all the Nonconformist ministers, no matter how bitterly they may feel their conduct. "In honour," all Christians are bound to "prefer one another." Love is the real conquering element, not war.

8. The recognition by the clergy that the great upheaval of the Reformation, necessitated by the degradation of the Catholic Church in previous ages, brought consequences which cannot now be undone, and of which it is the true Christian policy to make the best; asserting the Episcopal principles of Hooker, Jewel, Andrewes, Cosin, Bancroft and Hall rather than those of Cyprian.

9. Restitution to the Welsh dioceses of the status of a distinct province, so that, while still remaining, like the Province of York, an integral part of the National Church, they could reorganize some of their customs and institutions freely on indigenous needs and principles. Small national churches or provinces were common in primitive times.

10. A wise and vigorous application of discipline for the correction of any irregularities, which may possibly here and there remain.

God grant that all His people may serve Him in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace, and in righteousness of life!

WILLIAM SINCLAIR.



#### ART. VI.—THE GENUINENESS OF THE PENTATEUCH.

THE dismay occasioned by the publication of Dr. Driver's book on Old Testament Criticism, and its acceptance, not only by the leading experts at both Universities, but by the representatives of one great theological school among us, is rapidly subsiding. This is the result of the appearance of such books as Professor Leathes' "The Law in the Prophets," Mr. F. Watson's treatise on Genesis, the Bishop of Bath and Wells' volume on Chronicles, and, above all, Professor James Robertson's "Early Religion of Israel," beside a vast number of articles and other contributions to the literature of the subject. It is sufficiently clear that the critics *par excellence* are not to have the field entirely to themselves. They will be subjected to a criticism as unsparing as that to which they

have subjected the Books of Moses, and they are not likely to come out less damaged than the Pentateuch itself from the ordeal. The theologians, too, who have been in such needless haste to come to terms with them, will probably be inclined to repent of their rashness. The *Church Quarterly* for January has shown the danger of these premature reconciliations. The idea of special creations, it tells us, was at first broached by geologists, but was eagerly taken up by theologians and erected into an article of faith. A similar course has been unwisely taken by many in regard to evolution. But it is even worse when we are introduced to a serious modification of the accepted belief in regard to the two natures in Christ in order to pave the way to the acceptance of a critical theory, which every man endowed with foresight must have known to be already doomed. As the book to which this article refers<sup>1</sup> plainly points out, the critics are men of one idea. They devote themselves to the discovery of contradictions, and in a book composed under such conditions as the Pentateuch, it would be a wonder if they did not find as many as they wish to find. There would doubtless be plenty of roughnesses, irregularities and blemishes in a *chef d'œuvre* of art, did one but examine it with a microscope; but such a process would be very ill adapted to discover its true character. And so a microscopic criticism can discover all kinds of discrepancies and variations of style in a book, the truth, beauty and harmony of which, from a higher point of view, have for centuries been the wonder of the world. The explanation of the favourable reception this criticism has obtained at the Universities is a simple one. University teachers are rapidly developing—or shall we say retrograding?—from theologians into specialists. But theology in its true aspect is designed to touch and guide the human heart. Isaac Williams, in his "Autobiography," says that no man is a good theologian who has not also been a parish priest. And certainly, how much favour soever they may obtain at the Universities, the dry bones of a disintegrating criticism, though they may alarm, unsettle, confuse, will never be able to gain a hold on the hearts of the present or any future generation.

Mr. Spencer's book, though written in a rather abrupt style, and though a little deficient in arrangement, is learned and acute. If he sometimes fails to dispose satisfactorily of his adversaries, that is due rather to the ingenuity of their methods than to the weakness of his cause. It is difficult to confute an antagonist whose theory is deliberately framed in order to avoid

---

<sup>1</sup> "Did Moses Write the Pentateuch after all?" By F. E. Spencer, M.A., Vicar of St. Paul's, Haggerston, London. Elliot Stock.

coming to close quarters. It is impossible, for instance, to show that Ezekiel quotes the Law of Moses when it is ingeniously assumed (for in such matters, it should be remembered, anything like proof is out of the question) that the *materials* of the Law were in existence in Ezekiel's time, but that they were not put together until after it. But Mr. Spencer does not fail to point out that the theories he combats rest, for the most part, on the purest conjecture. In his Preface (p. vi.) he makes the timely observation that "in every department of inquiry, we, in this nineteenth century, need a good deal to be withdrawn from the worship of authority to the worship of fact." He reminds us (p. 2) that as "it is a question of science" we are called upon to discuss, our methods must be "strictly inductive." If the traditional school (p. 3) reposes too blindly on the verdict of past ages, the "British school of critics leans too much upon a German authority, which at its source is tainted with prejudices." He deprecates the "intellectual terrorism" (p. 4), which tells us, in the pages of Professor Robertson Smith, how "almost every scholar of mark is on the side of Vatke and Reuss, Lagarde and Graf, Kuenen and Wellhausen." It may be so, but if the criticism identified with these names will not stand examination by the test of common-sense, so much the worse, in the long run, for the "scholar of mark." Mr. Spencer goes on to deprecate the ignoring of tradition. He quotes Frederick Schlegel (p. 6) as saying of historical tradition that "as soon as, in the investigation of ancient history, we let slip that thread of Ariadne, we can find no outlet from the labyrinth of fanciful theories and the chaos of clashing opinions."<sup>1</sup> Traditions about individuals are no doubt very often untrustworthy, but national and literary traditions are usually authentic in the main. Accretions may gather around the original story, but it is, to say the least, unusual to find a nation handing down a mistaken account of the *genesis* of its own institutions, or to find a book which has been universally assigned to the wrong author. For, as Mr. Spencer remarks, we have first to explain how the work came to be so attributed, and next, there would appear, in most cases, to be no motive whatever for fraud.

He goes on (p. 11) to show that, even if we are convicted of setting too much value on the authority of Ezra and the men of the great Synagogue in the matter of the Canon of the Old Testament, this does not dispose of the question even of the Mosaic authorship, still less of the early origin and authenticity of the Pentateuch; for we still have to account for the

---

<sup>1</sup> "Philosophy of History," sect. i., p. 81 (Bohn). The great thinker's metaphors seem here to be a little confused.

fact of its reception as authentic and homogeneous history. And then he avails himself of an argument which Professor James Robertson has used with great effect in regard to the earlier Prophets. To conceive of a Moses as he is handed down to us involves a condition of things capable of appreciating him. Again, we ask, how did such a conception arise? His position as lawgiver and writer of the Law rests upon evidence which, in "any other literary history" would be "decisive" (p. 15). Why, then, is it not credited in this particular case?

The answer is, that a careful examination of the documents discovers (1) such discrepancies and discordances in their account of events, and (2) such marked distinctions in style, that we are compelled to regard them as a compilation in later ages of documents written at an earlier period by various hands. If these earlier documents were themselves authentic, this contention would be a matter of little consequence. But when we are told, first of all, that the narrative is compiled from accounts altogether inconsistent with one another, and next, that the earliest of such accounts is of a date far later than the events described in it, we naturally feel that the correctness of our histories, as histories, is seriously impugned. It is no answer to tell us, as we are frequently told, that they are unexceptional in their moral and religious tone. We want to know whether or no they are true. And in order to determine this question, we are bound to subject the theories in question to a rigorous examination. This Mr. Spencer does for us with much learning and acuteness.

"Five compilers," he tells us, are supposed to have been "discovered, denoted severally as J, E, P, H, and D." "The algebraical nature of the symbols employed," he continues, "indicates that these compilers are no historical personages, but that they are an inference grounded, we are told, on cumulative historical probability that they may or even must have been" such. In point of fact, however, they are not compilers but "sources," and Mr. Spencer here again points out the studied vagueness of phrase, which makes it difficult to grapple with the theory in argument. But although *we* are forbidden to call them compilers, the supporters of the theory are permitted to do so whenever it suits them. Thus Dr. Driver repeatedly mentions each of them as "he" or "him"; enlarges on the characteristics of "his" style; applies the term "author" to more than one of them. But the method by which these conclusions are reached seems not a little open to objection on scientific principles. We have all heard of the "vicious circle," and it is usually supposed to mark the lowest depths of weakness in an argument. But, as Mr. Spencer says,

it is difficult to give any other name to a process in which "you allot to J all passages where certain words and phrases occur, and then use those words and phrases as among the proofs of the existence of J." There is a remarkable instance of this in Dr. Driver's "Introduction," which, if it appeared in a treatise on any other subject, would have effectually disposed of the writer's claim to attention. He first of all effects the severance from the narrative of Korah's rebellion of everything which occurs in Deuteronomy, assigning these portions to P, and then points out how Deuteronomy is based on the narrative of J E, and how the writer of Deuteronomy is entirely ignorant of the contents of P. It is obvious that on these principles a conclusive argument is derived for the priority of Deuteronomy to P. But on such principles as these what is there which cannot be proved?

Mr. Spencer next insists on the fact that the age of Moses must have been one of literary activity, and cites Ewald in support of his views. The "ten Commandments," says that original thinker, "which, taken alone, are a mere dry skeleton, when considered with reference to their intrinsic character and significance, imply a religion originally taught with a perfect living fulness." Then Mr. Spencer shows how the "homogeneousness" of the contents of the Pentateuch, and the "pictures of moving and popular life," "eludes the dissector's knife" and makes it quite impossible that the story could have been strung together out of "fragments differentiated by difference of age and of standpoint." Canon Cheyne's "gibe at the 'common-sense' of the 'plain Englishman'" is met by the crushing rejoinder that "science which cannot recommend its main ultimate results to the ordinary understanding is no science at all." But whether this be so or not, it is with the common-sense of the average Englishman that the decision must ultimately rest. There are not wanting signs that the conclusions of the critical school are too high-pitched or too fine-drawn, or both, for the "homely wits" of the Bible-reading public. "Science" may retort with a sneer, but the Church at large will in the end effectually reply by leaving the critics to themselves—as critics in the past have been left to themselves—until they are forgotten. As Mr. Spencer goes on to say, there may be *something* in their theories. There is no reason to deny that various historical materials may have been used, or that the histories may have gone through a process of editing. What is denied is that the conclusions of the critical school now before us give us an accurate account either of the process itself, of the materials used, or of the date at which the various narratives were composed.

Four long and useful notes are appended to the first chapter;

the first on the value of Wellhausen's judgment, the second on "the critical *ipse dixit*," the third on the character and phraseology of P and the general character of the supposed sources, the fourth on the "historical colour and accuracy of the Pentateuch." The disintegrating theories are carefully and learnedly analysed, in a manner that will repay perusal.

The second chapter on the Mosaic legislation does not appear either so interesting or so conclusive. But the third chapter strikes on a vein which it is to be hoped will be thoroughly worked. The criticism of the Pentateuch, it may seem a bold thing to assert, is as yet in its infancy. It is going through the same process as all other scientific inquiries. First of all, there is the period of foregone conclusions, when certain arbitrary principles are laid down, and we are bidden humbly to accept the doctrines our authorities are pleased to impose on us. Old Testament criticism is at present in this position. The Aristotles of Biblical criticism are the German scholars, who lay down the postulates that there can be no miracle, and that there can be no prophecy. Its Rabbis, to borrow a simile from Jewish literary interpretation, are the English school, who tell us that the "critics have proved," or, in Jewish phraseology, that Rabbi Graf and Rabbi Kuenen have spoken, and whose Hillel and Shammai are Dillmann and Wellhausen. Even they themselves have an uneasy conviction that the first stage of the inquiry only is reached. Wellhausen laments that Hebrew knowledge is yet in its infancy, and others have echoed his lament. Another and a more scientific era is at hand, when facts will take the place of theories, and will be investigated without previous theological bias of any kind whatever. It may be safely affirmed that the first condition for genuine investigation will be the entire sweeping away of the whole paraphernalia of J's, E's, D's, P's, and post-exilic redactors, and the examination of the phenomena afresh from a rational and logical standpoint. It is to Mr. Spencer's praise that he has boldly ventured upon this as yet untrodden ground. It is premature at present to express an opinion on his investigations. The subject requires much more time and thought than is at our disposal. But he has at least proved that the linguistic features of the Pentateuch are capable of a different treatment from that accorded to them by the analytic criticism. That criticism, as Mr. Spencer shows on Dr. Driver's own admissions, commences by ignoring certain facts on which the older grammarians are agreed. Dr. Driver admits that the Pentateuch, alone of the prose-writings of the Bible, contains certain presumably archaic forms. He evades, rather than disputes, the proposition that in the poetic books these forms may fairly be regarded as poetic archaisms. He takes no

notice of the fact that sometimes these forms occur in a quotation of the Pentateuchal narrative in its present shape. Other peculiarities of the Hebrew of the Pentateuch he passes over. No scientific observer would deny that such facts supply a strong presumption in favour of the theory that the Pentateuch is the oldest collection of books in the Bible. Mr. Spencer illustrates its relation to the later Hebrew by the influence of the Authorized Version on the English of later times, and the comparison is an apt one. He goes on to contend that the Pentateuch, like the Authorized Version, has its archaic expressions, which are not met with in the subsequent books. Other words found in the Pentateuch, he further argues, have modified their meaning in later times. There are special words in Genesis, again, which are not met with elsewhere, except in obvious quotations. תהו ובהו, for instance, may be very fairly regarded as one of these. The words occur in a passage ascribed to P, which is supposed to be of later date than Isa. xxxiv. 11 and Jer. iv. 23, the only places where the phrase is to be found elsewhere. It is obvious enough to every candid mind that the probability is very much greater in favour of the view that the prophets were quoting the well-known narrative of creation than that the contrary was the case. Mr. Spencer appears to have clearly established his statement that words are to be found in the Pentateuch which do not occur in the later books, and that other words occur in the later books in a different sense to that in which they are used in the Pentateuch. He does not notice the fact that in the later books words occur which are not found in the Pentateuch at all. Thus, in the Book of Judges, which describes the life of the Israelites when settled in Palestine, we are introduced to a large number of new words, describing a life of quite a different kind to that in which they had previously lived in Canaan, in Egypt, in the wilderness. The Books of Kings introduce us again to a number of fresh words. And the fact has never been faced that, though we are told that the Pentateuch is a post-exilic compilation, the words admitted to be peculiar to the books of the post-exilic period are never found in the Pentateuch at all.

It would be premature, of course, to draw any conclusions at present from these facts. But it may fairly be asserted that it is impossible much longer to ignore them. When coupled with other facts, such as the peculiar *naïveté* and simplicity of the language and ideas in the earlier chapters of Genesis, and Dr. Watson's demonstration that in Genesis we are in the presence of a set of religious conceptions widely differing from those to be found after the sojourn in Egypt, we may go so far as to declare that the first scholar who boldly

casts aside the "traditions" of the critical "elders," and adventures himself, unencumbered with their weight, into the study of the linguistic features of the earlier books of the Old Testament, will reap a rich reward. To Mr. Spencer, as a pioneer of the much-needed research in this new direction, all lovers of the Bible will offer their congratulations, and it is to be hoped that a large number of our younger scholars may be encouraged to follow him.

J. J. LIAS.

---

## Short Notices.

---

*The Churchman's Household Prayers.* The Bishop of Ripon. Pp. 142. Price 3s. 6d. Nisbet and Co.

This volume provides a short liturgical form of prayers for family worship, morning and evening, during a month. The scheme is that each short service should begin with a response and answer from the Psalms, followed by a collect and the Lord's Prayer; then follows a lesson, the collect for the day, two or three more collects and a blessing. The revised table of lessons comes at the beginning, and the collects from the Prayer Book at the end. There are also prayers for special occasions. Those short prayers in the volume which are not from the Prayer Book are taken from ancient and modern writers, and the Bishop expresses his particular debt to Canon Bright for the graceful translations of his excellent collection from ancient sources. The volume is compiled with the charming taste and delicate feeling which are native to Dr. Boyd Carpenter, and will be a very agreeable variety in the round of household prayers. There is, of course, a special value in the family prayers of Thornton, Oxenden, Bourdillon, Vaughan and others; but if the same volume is always used the words become too familiar. The Bishop of Ripon's addition to our treasury of devotion is sure to be popular.

*Christ Mystical.* Bishop Joseph Hall. Pp. 174. Price 3s. 6d. Hodder and Stoughton. 1893.

This is the second volume in Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton's Devotional Library. It was reprinted from a copy presented to the Rev. H. C. Wilson by General Gordon. The marks at the side of the pages are those made by General Gordon in his own copy. There is a preface by Mr. Wilson on the theology of General Gordon. This treatise consists of eight short chapters in the style of the "Imitatio Christi," and it is at once a help to the spiritual reception of the Holy Communion and a corrective to material views of that sacred ordinance. It continually points out that there are other means of grace, though all may no doubt be summed up in that most solemn hour. The tone of the argument may be seen from the following passage: "My son, if ever thou look for sound comfort on earth and salvation in heaven, unglue thyself from the world and vanities of it; put thyself upon thy Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ; leave not till thou findest thyself firmly united to Him, so as thou art become a limb of that body whereof He is head, a spouse of that husband, a branch of that stem, a stone laid upon that foundation. Look not, therefore, for any blessing out of Him, and in, and by, and from Him

look for all blessings. Let Him be thy life, and wish not to live longer than thou art quickened by Him. Find Him thy wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, redemption; thy riches, thy strength, thy glory." The printing is by R. and R. Clark, of Edinburgh, and is an agreeable specimen of the art.

*The Official Year Book of the Church of England for 1893.* Pp. 718. S.P.C.K.

This marvellous work is at the present time absolutely invaluable. Without the slightest attempt to boast or to exaggerate, it places within easy grasp of even a careless student a conspectus of the extraordinary varied energy of the living Church of England. It reflects the greatest credit on Mr. Burnside and all who have co-operated with him. Many members of Parliament have expressed to influential ecclesiastics the great importance of this work with reference to the misunderstandings and misrepresentations which are current amongst the opponents of Christianity and of the Church. It is divided into three parts: Historical Records, Statistical Records, and the Offices and Societies of the Church. The first chapter is on Training for Holy Orders, with a very valuable section on Organizations for the Assistance of Candidates. The second chapter has fourteen exhaustive sections on the Home Mission Work of the Church. Chapter III. is on the Educational Work of the Church—Elementary, Sunday and Higher. Excellent accounts of the foreign mission work of the Church follow in Chapter IV. Chapter V. is the official statement of the Church's work in the Colonies, India and missionary dioceses. Then come the official reports of the Church of Ireland and the Episcopal Church in Scotland in America. A valuable record is given in Chapter VII. of the work of the Councils of the Church during the past year, and the first part concludes with chapters on the Home Episcopate Church Choral Associations, Clergy Pensions, Endowments and Charities, Work for Young Men, Church Defence, Chronological Record, and a review of recent Church literature.

*Alone with God.* Rev. F. Bourdillon. Second series. Pp. 212. S.P.C.K. 1893.

Mr. Bourdillon's name is a household word in the region of simple, devotional writing. His books of family prayers have been a help to the godly life in innumerable quiet households, and his Bedside Readings have brought comfort to great numbers of sick persons in the stillness of their rooms. The present volume contains forty appropriate meditations on texts of Scripture, suitable to a time of illness, and shows a truly pastoral understanding of the thoughts and needs of those who are thus afflicted. It should be in the hands of every parish clergyman and district visitor. The type is large and clear.

#### MAGAZINES.

*The Thinker* contains an interesting account of Professor Harnack's review of the Gospel and Apocalypse of Peter. He says: "I am not able to see how Justin's acquaintance with this Gospel can be disputed." This would place it in the first third of the second century. In the first half of the second century he places the Apocalypse of Peter. There is also an admirable page on the standard of veracity amongst the Jews. Professor Max Müller reviews favourably Bishop Copleston's work on Buddhism. "We are truly grateful," he says, "to Bishop Copleston for what he has done; but we should have felt more grateful still if he had rendered his excellent account of Buddhism, past and present, more complete by a chapter on the branching off of Bodhism in the first century of our era.

*Blackwood* contains an exquisite translation by Sir Theodore Martin, of

Schiller's "Lament for the Gods of Greece." It suggests how important would be the benefit to mankind if some great Christian poet would exhibit the beauty of nature from the Christian point of view. There is a pleasant article by Sir Herbert Maxwell on mid-winter in Thessaly, and a capital reduction to absurdity of the Home Rule bubble.

In the *Newbery House Magazine*, Mr. W. H. Jewitt has an imaginative and poetical paper on the Mystery of the Holy Incarnation, illustrated by woodcuts from the great masters, and by mediæval carols and other verses. The Rev. J. Sheepshanks writes on Shamanism, the oldest heathen religion; and the Rev. Alfred Gurney on the meaning of Mr. Burne Jones' pictures at the New Gallery. The "Layman's Recollections" take the form of a pilgrimage in the South of England, passing Hursley and Lavington, and ending with John Mason Neale, of East Grinstead.

*The Cornhill Magazine* gives some unpublished letters of William Wordsworth. The "Son of the Marshes," who writes in *Blackwood*, contributes a paper on "Life in an English Forest." There is a pleasant and suggestive paper on "Useful People."

In *The Leisure Hour*, Dr. Macaulay provides a biography of the illustrious scientist, Sir Richard Owen. The "City's Housekeeping Series" gives the Butlery and the Medicine-chest of Paris. In the "Days of Our Age," Prebendary Harry Jones arrives at the Justice. Mr. Pinnock, writing on the Black Country, describes its superstitions; and Dr. Edkins, of Shanghai, writes on the Polynesian myth of Creation, of which he says that it is evidently founded on the traditions of Western Asia, and there is in it the echo of early beliefs and of Divine teaching.

In *The Sunday at Home* there are notices of some saintly Quaker women of the past; a thoughtful paper on "Sight and Insight," by the Rev. W. J. Smith; on the "Usefulness of Some of our Police-birds," by F. A. Fulcher; an amusing paper on "American Graveyard Curiosities;" and an important meditation on the Basis of Our Lord's Teaching, by Dr. Robertson.

In *The Quiver* the Bishop of Ossory, the Dean of Canterbury, and Dr. John Brown, of Bedford, supply thoughtful theological papers; Mr. Murdoch Johnstone writes suggestively on "Character"; and A. K. H. B. undergoes the same process to which he has subjected so many well-known persons. This magazine would be much easier to read if the pages were all even.

*The Religious Review of Reviews* provides a beautifully illustrated paper on the Chicago Exhibition and the way to reach it. We quote with sympathy an important sentence from Mr. Compton Reade's paper on Anglican Church Music: "What are termed bright, hearty services too often degenerate into gabble and shindy; being, in fact, bad art, and worse religion." Accounts are given of the Poor Clergy Relief Corporation, the Church of England Society for Providing Homes for Waifs and Strays, the British Home for Incurables, and the Bridge of Hope. Sketches are given of papers by Canon Bevan on the Church in Wales, by the Rev. Peter Lilly on Religion in Persia, by Lord Meath on Religion in America and Australia, by Mr. Bartlett on the Relation of Dissenters to the Catholic Church, by Mr. Barrett on Poor Law Reform, and by the Bishop of Bedford on Urban Populations.

In *Cassell's Family Magazine* may be noticed the paper entitled "Through London on a Barge"; one on Corpulence; an interview with Sir George Reid, the President of the Royal Scottish Academy; and an illustrated article on Football. The insertion of a duet for violin and pianoforte is a happy idea.

*The Church Missionary Intelligencer* has important papers on the Brahma-Somaj, the Bombay Missionary Conference, Lord Rosebery's

Instructions to Sir Gerald Portal, and Notes on Uganda. It also prints Archdeacon Moule's Sermon before the University of Cambridge, and the Bishop of London's Address to the London clergy.

We have also received *The Church Sunday School Magazine*, *The Expository Times*, *The Boys' Own Paper*, *The Girls' Own Paper*, *Good Housekeeping*, *Little Folks*, *The Bible Society's Reporter*, *The Evangelical Churchman of Toronto*, *The Cottager and Artisan*, *Friendly Greetings*, *The Church Missionary Gleaner*, *The Church Worker*, *Light and Truth* (Reformed Church in Spain and Portugal); a special number of *Church Bells*, containing Archdeacon Farrar's Sermons on the Lord's Prayer; *The Child's Companion*, *The Boys' and Girls' Companion*, *Our Little Dots*, *Awake! Light in the Home*, *New and Old*, *The Dawn of Day*, *The Child's Pictorial*, *The Children's World*, and *The Vegetarian*. We have also received a penny booklet by Agnes Giberne, *A Pretty Kettle of Fish* (S.P.C.K.); *Hannah More*, the R.T.S.'s new Penny Biography; *The Sacrifice of the Mass*, C. H. Leet, F.R.C.S.; *Dr. Pfander*, the new number of Nisbet's brief sketches of C.M.S. workers; *In Mid-Air* (S.P.C.K., Penny Library of Fiction), by G. Manville Fenn; *Rome Rule in Ireland and England*, and *The Catholic Truth Society Exposed* (Protestant Alliance); and from the S.P.C.K. ten useful tracts: address to working lads by Mr. Winnington-Ingram, of the Oxford House, Bethnal Green; two on Confirmation by Canon Hammond, of Truro; and two on Good Friday and Easter Communion, by the Rev. W. H. Jackson. *Partnership* is an eloquent address by the Archbishop of Canterbury on Christian Co-operation. *Evolution, Creation, and the Fall* is an address to men by Archdeacon Wilson. He describes the story of the Fall as not a fable, not an illusion, still less a mere fiction; but a temporary and figurative mode of expression. The Seventy-first Annual Report of the Scripture Readers' Society for Ireland is, at the present time especially, deeply interesting. We regret to notice that whereas last year's income amounted to £3,588, a balance is due to the treasurer of £97.

Lack of space compels us to reserve for notice: *Christ in Modern Theology* (Dr. Fairbairn); *The First Book of Kings* (Archdeacon Farrar); *Sir John Stevenson* (J. S. Bumpus); *Hebrew Idolatry* (Higgins); *A Metaphysical Octave*; *Essays on Vegetarianism* (Hills); *Unity and Order* (Kennion); *Clews to Holy Writ*; *Apologetics*, or *Christianity Defensively Stated*; *The Hidden Mystery*; *The Question of Questions*; *Poems in Petroleum*; *Cross Bearing*; *Faith*; *Thoroughness*; *Some Australian Sermons*; *Memoir of W. M. Falloon*; *Prayer Thoughts*; *The Pillar in the Night*; *Expository Lectures and Sermons*; *Home Weal and Home Woe*; *The Biblical Museum*, vol. x.; *The Class and the Desk*; *Bible-Class Expositions*; *Nineteen Centuries Ago and Now*; *Fruit Farming for Profit in California*; *Women of the Bible*; *Men of the Bible*; *Moule's Holy Communion*; *Gladstone's Romanes Lecture*; *Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress*; *The Decalogue*; *Some Lights of Science on the Faith*; *Twofold Life*; *Ryle's Ezra and Nehemiah*; *Hibbert Lectures, 1892*; *The Incarnation:—A Revelation of Human Duties*, being the Bishop of Durham's Charge; *Out in the Sunshine*; *The Smaller Cambridge Bible for Schools*, *Judges*; *Robinson's Catechism on the Book of Common Prayer*; *Dr. Jessop's Doris*; *Child's Church and Science*; *Arcana in the Ruwenzori*; *Bishop Westcott's Gospel of Life*; *The Lenten Opportunity*; *Talks in a Hospital*; *The King of Sorrows*; *Poems* (Edward Templeman); *Seven Lamps of Fire*; *Bible Class Expositions*; *The Creed or a Philosophy*; *University and Cathedral Sermons*; *The Scientific Study of Theology*; *The Sacrifice of Praise*; *The Life of Love*; *Commentaries on the History of England*; and *The Sacramental System*.

## THE MONTH.

THE Bishop of London has appointed to the vacant prebendal stalls at St. Paul's Cathedral the Rev. C. H. Turner, of St. George's-in-the-East, and the Rev. H. W. Webb-Peploe, Vicar of St. Paul's, Onslow Gardens. The Rev. C. H. Turner was Scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Tenth Wrangler. He was for seven years Resident Chaplain to Bishop Jackson, and gained a wide reputation in the diocese for his business habits and his sympathy with the clergy. From 1877 till 1882 he was Vicar of St. Saviour's, Fitzroy Square, where he erected a new mission hall. At St. George's-in-the-East he has built two large mission halls and a mission house; reunited the forlorn district of St. Matthew's, Fell Street, to the parish of St. George's; completed the decoration of the church; erected swimming-baths and washing-houses, as a memorial of the Queen's Jubilee, and made his large parish a model of organization. It was on his recommendation that Mrs. Turner, of Liverpool, has devoted £10,000 to the Clergy Pension Fund, Central Office, and similar sums to the dioceses of Liverpool, Ripon and York. Prebendary Turner, who was a pupil of Dr. Vaughan, belongs to no party in the Church.

---

The Rev. Hanmer William Webb-Peploe was educated at Pembroke College, Cambridge, and has held the Vicarage of St. Paul's, Onslow Square, for seventeen years. He is known as the ablest Evangelical preacher in London, and one of the chief Evangelical leaders, and has a large and enthusiastic congregation. His culture and earnestness are generally recognised, and he has taken an active part in the London Diocesan Conference.

---

An important meeting was held at the end of last month at the Mansion House to call attention to the lamentable spiritual destitution still existing in the Metropolis. In the Archdeaconry of Middlesex, twenty-three new churches are required, besides additional clergy. In the eastern part of the diocese of London, fifty-nine more clergy are wanted to bring the number officiating up to the very inadequate proportion of one to four thousand; besides several churches and numerous mission halls. The Bishop of Rochester and the Bishop of St. Albans also made appeals for the vast Metropolitan districts of their dioceses.

---

The Archbishop of York has promised £1,000 a year for three years as a subscription to the fund for distressed clergy in the diocese of York.

---

The voluntary offerings for Church work in the four Welsh dioceses amounted to £219,038 and upwards, 10 per cent. of the parishes not having sent in returns. The net income of the clergy for the same period was £196,300.

---

Professor Sanday has begun a most important series of Bampton

Lectures at Oxford. His subject is "The Early History and Origin of the Doctrine of Biblical Inspiration."

Mr. John Lane, of Highgate, has bequeathed £1,000 each to the London Hospital and the Aged Merchant Seamen's Institution. £500 each to the Chest Hospital, Victoria Park; Sea-Bathing Infirmary, Margate; Hospital for Incurables, Putney; Merchant Seamen's Orphan Asylum; and the Bishop of London's Fund. £300 to the St. Pancras Alms Houses; £150 to St. Ann's, Brookfield; and £500 each to North Moulton, Devon, and St. Ann's, Limehouse, for the benefit of the poor.

The gain of the seat at Grimsby by the Rt. Hon. Edward Heneage, with a majority of 964, making a transfer of 1,700 votes, is a strong encouragement to the Constitutional Party.

The depression of trade is indicated by the fact that last year there were 4,144 more recruits for the army than in the previous year, and 9,206 more in the militia.

The justice of the claims of the Unionists, that the second reading of the Home Rule Bill should be postponed till after Easter, in order to give the country the opportunity of considering so prodigious a constitutional change, has very properly prevailed.

Enthusiastic meetings are being held all over the country, both local and diocesan, to protest against the iniquitous injustice of the proposed Welsh Suspensory Bill. A great united meeting will be held in London after Whitsuntide, at which will be present the Upper and Lower Houses of the Convocations of Canterbury and York, the Houses of Laymen, and ten churchwardens elected from each archdeaconry. It will be preceded by a great service at St. Paul's Cathedral. It is very desirable that, while meetings and addresses should be as frequent as possible, the subject should be kept out of the pulpit.

One of the heroes of the mission field, Bishop Horden, has passed to his rest. He had been forty-two years at work in the Great Lone Land. He was born at Exeter on January 20, 1828, and had hardly completed his 65th year.

A Declaration has been signed on the Lincoln Judgment by fifty leading Evangelical clergymen, including the names of Deans Fremantle and Lefroy; Dr. Perowne, Master of C.C.C., Cambridge; Archdeacons Farrar, Blakeney, Richardson, Clarke, and Hughes-Games; Canons Bernard, Gibbon and Tristram; Principals Moule and Chavasse; Canons Bell, Brooke, Calthorp, Christopher, Girdlestone, Jenkins, McCormick, Stewart, Stowell, and Wilkinson; and the Revs. Walter Abbott, W. A. Chapman, H. E. Fox, Gilbert Karney, A. J. Pearson, H. Webb-Peploe, A. J. Robinson, Neville Sherbrooke, E. A. Stuart, F. E. Wigram, etc.