

# 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 Advertiser.

OCTOBER, 1903.

---

---

# MUDIE'S LIBRARY

(LIMITED).

---

## TOWN SUBSCRIPTIONS:

From ONE GUINEA per annum.

LONDON BOOK SOCIETY (for weekly exchange of books at the Houses of Subscribers) from TWO GUINEAS per annum.

## COUNTRY SUBSCRIPTIONS:

From TWO GUINEAS per annum.

N.B.—Two or three friends may UNITE IN ONE SUBSCRIPTION, and thus lessen the cost of carriage.

---

## SALE DEPARTMENT.

A New Edition of MUDIE'S CLEARANCE CATALOGUE is Now Ready, comprising the Surplus Copies of many Leading Books of the Past and Present Seasons, at Greatly Reduced Prices.

---

*The Oxford Teacher's and Reference Bibles, Nelson's Teachers' Bibles, also OXFORD PRAYER and HYMN BOOKS are now kept in Stock in various sizes and bindings.*

---

30, NEW OXFORD STREET, LONDON;

241, BROMPTON ROAD, S.W.; and

48, QUEEN VICTORIA STREET, E.C.; and at

BARTON ARCADE, MANCHESTER.

“The late Prof. Henry Drummond has found a successor in this volume.”  
*Glasgow Herald.*

## **The Religious Sense in its Scientific Aspect.**

**By GREVILLE MACDONALD, M.D.**

Crown 8vo., Illustrated. Price 3s. 6d.

“A very interesting and instructive book.”—*Methodist Times*.

“This is theology. This is God and the doctrine of God, and that it is revealed through Nature makes it not the less true and not the less a revelation. This is the theology to which the modern mind will listen. That it is expressed in terms of science rather than philosophy makes it more acceptable, and does not make it less true.”—*Expository Times*.

“It is very refreshing to find a man who thinks for himself, expresses himself in a novel and unconventional style, and whose treatment compels his readers to follow him closely and weigh him carefully. The book is illustrated by several admirable plates, and the lectures are full of thought-provoking matter.”—*Record*.

“A most interesting book. . . . Thoughtful readers will much enjoy the various definitions scattered throughout the book.”—*Church Family Newspaper*.

“It is refreshing to read so delightful a book, written by one who is evidently an accomplished student of science.”—*Examiner*.

“The most important volume dealing with the relations of Religion and Science since the late Professor Henry Drummond’s ‘Natural Law in the Spiritual World,’ and ‘The Ascent of Man.’ . . . The lines of thought are firmly drawn, and the scientific illustrations are admirable. . . . All readers will unite in appreciation of the author’s clear and vigorous style—sometimes rising to real, though restrained, excellence—and of the plates and diagrams illustrating the argument, which are excellently produced.”—*Presbyterian*.

HODDER & STOUGHTON, 27, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

THIRD EDITION.

In square crown 8vo., handsomely bound in cloth, and fully illustrated.  
 Price 6s. net.

## **IN A MINSTER GARDEN.**

*A CAUSERIE OF THE OLD TIME AND THE NEW.*

By the DEAN OF ELY.

*A Charming Succession of Gossiping Chapters.*

*With many quaint and picturesque Illustrations of the Clooks and Corners of Ely Cathedral and its Surroundings.*

“A delightful book; contains numerous pleasing illustrations of Ely Minster and garden, and the cover is tastefully designed.”—*Church Bells*.

“It is a book to possess and dip into very often, betraying the personality of the writer, and teaching much that is well worth learning of the past, especially that past connected with the old minster.”—*Bookman*.

“In this volume Dean Stubbs reveals himself as a verse writer of no mean ability.”—*Globe*.

“Succeeds in bringing before us the wealth of historical, legendary, literary, and scenic material connected with Ely.”—*Daily Graphic*.

“A book which has infused into it the charm and the calm restfulness of the cathedral close. The Dean gives us an olla-podrida of history, poetry, anecdote and dialogue. There is a mingled flavour of scholarship, music, antiquarianism, and love of nature. Charmingly illustrated with features of beauty-spots of the cathedral and its surroundings.”—*Christian World*.

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

THIRD EDITION NOW READY.

*In crown 8vo., cloth, gilt lettered, price 2s. 6d. net.*

# VITAL RELIGION;

OR,

## The Personal Knowledge of Christ.

BY

Rev. G. H. S. WALPOLE, D.D.,

*Principal of Bede College, Durham.*

“The keynote of this interesting and beautiful book is the thought that religion is essentially the life of friendship and intimacy with God revealed in Jesus Christ. . . . We have no hesitation in saying that Dr. Walpole has given us a work of real spiritual value, and we heartily commend it to all thoughtful readers, especially to those who lament the ‘decay of experimental religion.’ The present volume is a solid contribution to the solution of the problem how ‘to find a basis for faith in actual experience.’”—*Guardian*.

“Dr. Walpole writes with a true moral passion. He pleads for a deeper, more intimate more vital knowledge of God. Nothing could be more appropriate in a series calling itself ‘The Church’s Outlook for the Twentieth Century’ than a volume like this, that sends us back to the fountain and source of all spiritual life.”—*New York Churchman*.

“The perusal of that high-toned book has been to us a source of refined pleasure.”—*Weekly Leader*.

“We must congratulate Dr. Walpole on having produced a very valuable work. It is of supreme importance that the personal element in religion should not be neglected, and that due attention be paid to the development of inner spiritual life. Dr. Walpole calls attention to real needs, and he gives excellent advice as to the means of satisfying them.”—*Pilot*.

“No one who wishes to follow his argument will regret the half-crown it costs, so exceedingly helpful and uncommon is his treatment of the profoundest of all subjects—Living union with our Living Lord.”—*Church Bells*.

“This is a fresh and interesting presentation of a perennially important subject. . . . The book is characterized by a spirit of true devotion to our Lord, and is marked throughout by earnestness of thought and appeal.”—*Life of Faith*.

“Contains many new and helpful thoughts.”—*Mission Field*.

“It has the tone of sincere and earnest piety and the ring of honest conviction. In other words, we like the book and we like the personality which seems to lie in peace and confidence behind it.”—*Saint Andrew*.

“There is a deal of force in the author’s words about marriage, the shams of so-called worship, prayer, attitude, and daily duty.”—*Family Churchman*.

“Many and weighty thoughts are expressed on the subject, which deserve careful consideration.”—*Liverpool Mercury*.

IN THREE VOLUMES.

# The Story of England's Church.

By the Rev. CHARLES BULLOCK, B.D., formerly Rector of St. Nicholas', Worcester.

## VOLUME I.

Second Edition. Now Ready, Cloth Gilt. Price 1s. 6d. With 20 Illustrations.

## SUNRISE IN BRITAIN: HOW THE LIGHT DAWNED.

## CONTENTS.

- |   |                                    |                                   |
|---|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| I. How Christianity Came.                       | V. The Story of Alban.             | IX. The Story of Columba.         |
| II. Britain under the Romans.                   | VI. The Irish School of Iona.      | X. Augustine's Mission.           |
| III. The Glastonbury Tradition and King Lucius. | VII. The Life and Work of Patrick. | XI. Augustine's Usurpation.       |
| IV. Perranzabuloe.                              | VIII. The Faith of Patrick.        | XII. The Roman Mission a Failure. |

The BISHOP OF LIVERPOOL says: "I am heartily glad 'Sunrise in Britain' has been published."

The Right Rev. W. PAKENHAM WALSH, D.D., late Bishop of Ossory, says: "I have read, with great interest, 'Sunrise in Britain.' I could wish to see the subject very widely studied and made known. A clear and reliable book like this is invaluable."

Also now Ready.

## VOLUME II.

Cloth Gilt. In 17 chapters, with 20 Illustrations. Price 1s. 6d.

## THE ECLIPSE OF TRUTH: HOW THE LIGHT WAS OBSCURED.

"The only safeguard from error in religious matters is to be found in faithful allegiance to the written Word of God."—Page 88.

VOLUME III. Cloth, 1s. 6d. With 13 Illustrations.

## DARK DAYS IN ENGLAND and The Dawn of Reformation Light.

A Book for the Times.

ENLARGED CHEAP EDITION. Tenth Thousand. 6d.

Can be also had in Cloth, 1s. 6d.

By the Rev. CHARLES BULLOCK, B.D., formerly Rector of St. Nicholas', Worcester.

# WHAT CHURCH?

With New Tracts for New Times.

By printing Ten Thousand at a time, the price of this Cheap Edition of "WHAT CHURCH?" originally published at Half a Crown, has been reduced to SIXPENCE.

An Edition in cloth gilt, price 1/6, can also now be had.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE LATE ARCHBISHOP MANNING, Etc.

The late Right Hon. W. E. GLADSTONE, in a letter to the Author, dated June 7th, 1896, says: "I sincerely concur in the whole substance of your paragraphs concerning the soul of the Church."

"Beware of deceit when thou hearest the name of the Church."—BISHOP HOOPER.

"The hinge upon which the whole question between Catholics [Roman] and all who dissent from them turns."—POPE PIUS IX.

\* \* \* For Circulation amongst Roman Catholics, quantities not less than Fifty are supplied direct from the London Office at HALF-PRICE.

LONDON: "HOME WORDS" OFFICE, 11, LUDGATE SQUARE, LUDGATE HILL, E.C.

# The National Protestant Church Union.

To Maintain the Principles of the Reformation as set forth in the  
Prayer Book and Articles of the Church of England.

President—W. D. CRUDDAS, Esq.  
Chairman—The Rev. Prebendary WEBB-PEPLOE, M.A.  
Treasurer—T. F. VICTOR BUXTON, Esq.  
Secretary—Sir C. ROBERT LIGHTON, Bart.

The National Protestant Church Union witnesses for—

1. The supremacy and sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures as the Word of God.
2. The sole and sufficient efficacy of the sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ upon the Cross.
3. The justification of man by faith only in the Lord Jesus Christ.
4. The right of every believer to direct and unimpeded access to God, through Christ.
5. The freedom and sovereignty of the work of the Holy Spirit in sanctification.

**WILL YOU HELP THIS IMPORTANT WORK ?**

For List of Publications, Terms of Membership, etc., apply to the Secretary, N.P.C.U.

**324, REGENT STREET, LONDON, W.**

## EDUCATIONAL.

### WEYMOUTH COLLEGE.

*A fully equipped Public School*

in which Boys are definitely prepared for the Universities, any of the Professions, or for Business Life. Very healthy situation by the sea. Splendid Fields for Cricket and Football. Reduction made for the sons of Clergy and Officers. The religious teaching of the school is Protestant and Evangelical.

Apply to H. C. BARNES-LAWRENCE, M.A., The College, WEYMOUTH, Dorsetshire.

### ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE,

Near TENBURY, WORCESTERSHIRE.

BOYS thoroughly prepared for Public Schools. Most healthy situation; large playing fields and Fives Courts; separate cubicles. Head master, Rev. W. A. RENWICK, M.A., late Scholar of Hertford College, Oxford.

APPLY: REV. THE WARDEN.

### DAVENTRY GRAMMAR SCHOOL.

Founded A.D. 1600.

PUBLIC SCHOOL EDUCATION at moderate cost. Resident staff of University Graduates in Honours. Entrance scholarships. Special terms for sons of clergy and medical men. Sound Church teaching, Healthy situation, 300 feet above sea-level. Good buildings. Large Playing-fields, Laboratory, Gymnasium. Fives' Court. Experienced Matron.

**Entrance Scholarship for Sons of Clergy materially reducing Fees.**

For Prospectus apply: REV. H. JOHNSON, Head Master.

**ECCLESIASTICAL INSURANCE OFFICE, LTD.**

11, NORFOLK STREET, STRAND, LONDON, W.C.

**FIRE INSURANCE. BURGLARY INSURANCE. GLASS INSURANCE.**

The Surplus Profits are devoted to Institutions, etc., which are for the benefit of the Clergy and of Church objects.

For information and Forms, apply at the Joint Offices of the Ecclesiastical Insurance Office, Ltd., and the Clergy Pensions Institution, 11, Norfolk Street, Strand, London, W.C.

JOHN DUNCAN, F.I.A., Secretary.

"This is a serious attempt made in good faith to help the Clergy to help themselves, and to husband the existing resources of the Church."—*Guardian*.**CLERGY PENSIONS INSTITUTION.**

11, NORFOLK STREET, STRAND, LONDON, W.C.

The distinguishing characteristic of the scheme of the Institution may be concisely stated in the three words, "Self-help aided." Clergymen who wish to secure the benefits of the Institution for themselves or their families exercise self-help by making payments in purchase of Benefits; while Honorary Contributions are applied to augment the Benefits so purchased. The Institution comprises the following:

1. Clergy Pensions Fund; 2. Sickness Fund; 3. Widows and Orphans Fund; 4. Daughters Fund; 5. Other Benefits Fund; 6. Personal Accident Assurance (Clergy); 7. Accidents to Employees (Assurance of Liability of Clergy as Employers).

For information and Forms, apply at the Joint Offices of the Ecclesiastical Insurance Office, Ltd., and the Clergy Pensions Institution, 11, Norfolk Street, Strand, London, W.C.

JOHN DUNCAN, F.I.A., Secretary and Actuary.

**SOCIETY FOR RELIEF OF PERSECUTED JEWS**

(SYRIAN COLONIZATION FUND)

Employs 72 Jews at Abraham's Vineyard, Jerusalem, in various industries. Many more apply but cannot be admitted till funds increase. Aged, sick, and blind are given food, clothing, and drinking-water (to hundreds who have no other supply). 1,500 FAMILIES ARE ON THIS "RELIEF" REGISTER.

**FUNDS GREATLY NEEDED** and THANKFULLY RECEIVED byF. A. BEVAN, Esq., *Hon. Treasurer*, 54, LOMBARD STREET, E.C.

AND BY

E. A. FINN, *Secretary*, 41, PARLIAMENT STREET, S.W.**"LIBERATOR" RELIEF FUND.**

Patron: H.R.H. PRINCE CHRISTIAN.

£10,000 required to Relieve New and Urgent Cases.

**H**UNDREDS of aged and afflicted victims, so cruelly robbed of their life-savings by the great Liberator Fraud, just as they were hoping to enjoy the fruit of their industry and thrift. Many of them are members of the Church of England. Cheques and P.O.'s should be sent to the Secretary, Rev. J. STOCKWELL WATTS, 16, Farringdon Street, E.C.

**THE MISSIONS TO SEAMEN.**

Patron: HIS MAJESTY THE KING.

Vice-Patrons:

H.R.H. THE PRINCE OF WALES, K.G.

THE FOUR ARCHBISHOPS, THE BISHOPS, etc.

The FOUR ARCHBISHOPS, THE BISHOPS, etc. Labourers afloat and ashore, at home and abroad, among seamen of all classes and nations, fishermen, barge-men, and emigrants. Seventy-three harbours



are occupied. Expenditure in 1902, £46,642. Increased Contributions and Offerings, urgently needed, should be forwarded to the Secretary, Commander W. DAWSON, R.N., 11, Buckingham St., Strand, London, W.C.

In crown 8vo. Paper cover. Price 6d.

**THE ETHIC OF CHRISTIANITY.**

A Paper read before the Christosophic Society.

BY THE

Rev. R. W. CORBET, M.A.,  
LATE RECTOR OF STOKE-ON-TERN.

Author of "Redemption," "Letters of a Mystic of the Present Day," and "Addresses on St. Paul."

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

# THE NILE.

**COOK'S** Modern and splendidly equipped STEAMERS leave **CAIRO** for **LUXOR**, **ASSOUAN**, and the **SECOND CATARACT**, regularly during the Egyptian Tourist Season—**November to March**—affording opportunities to visit all the temples, monuments, and places of interest in **UPPER EGYPT**.

**FREQUENT SAILINGS. MODERATE FARES.**

**COMBINED BOOKINGS** by Egyptian and Soudan Railways and Cook's Steamers at special Rates to **all points in UPPER EGYPT** and to **KHARTOUM** and **GONDOKORO**.

**NEW** and luxuriously furnished STEAMERS and Steel **DAHABEAHS**, of various sizes, **ON HIRE** for private parties.

*For detailed information see special Programme, with Maps and Plans, on application to*

**THOS. COOK & SON, Ludgate Circus, London, or any Branch Office or AGENCY.**

## PROTESTANT REFORMATION SOCIETY.

The **OLDEST** Church Society for the Maintenance of the Religious Principles of the Reformation.  
The **ONLY** Mission to Roman Catholics in England.  
(Established 1827.)

**MISSIONARY. EDUCATIONAL. EVANGELISTIC.**

Resident Missionaries to Roman and Ritualistic Centres.

Sermons and Lectures by the Rev. C. H. H. WRIGHT, D.D., M.A., Ph.D., Clerical and General Superintendent  
Educational Lantern Lectures on Church History by the Secretary.

Cheap effective literature dealing with subjects of present importance.

Donations, Subscriptions, or requests for Lectures or Sermons should be addressed to the Secretary.

**Funds are Urgently Needed.**

WALTER A. LIMBRICK, Secretary, 62, Berners Street, London, W.

## THE RISE and GROWTH of the Protestant Alliance Magazine.

Being an abridged reprint of the Jubilee Issue (with a Series of Illustrations) explaining the Basis, Principles, and Work of the Protestant Alliance. *PRICE ONE PENNY.*

PROTESTANT ALLIANCE,

Offices: 430, STRAND, LONDON.      Opposite Charing Cross Hospital.

# HOLLOWAY'S PILLS

**CURE INDIGESTION, LOSS OF APPETITE,  
DIZZINESS, BILIOUS and SICK HEADACHE, &c.**

They Purify the Blood, Strengthen the System, and are the Safest and most Reliable Medicine for Female Ailments.

Manufactured only at 78, NEW OXFORD STREET, LONDON; sold by all Chemists and Medicine Vendors.

**EDE, SON & RAVENSCROFT**TELEPHONE :  
602, Holborn.

Established 1889.

**ROBE MAKERS**

Royal Warrant Holders.

**ROBE MAKERS TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.****SURPLICES FOR CLERGY AND CHOIR. CLERICAL TAILORING.**  
Hoods, Cassocks, Scarves, Stoles, College Caps, Clergy Collars, etc.

PEERS', LEGAL AND CORPORATION ROBES.

**93 & 94, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.**

In crown 8vo., cloth, price 2s. 6d.

**KING DAVID: A Tragedy.** By R. C. FILLINGHAM, Vicar of Hexton, Author of "The Gospel in the Fields," "Christ in London."

In crown 8vo., cloth, gilt lettered, price 2s. 6d.

**BIBLE TREASURES IN ENGLISH MEASURES.**

A small volume of verses designed to promote other attempts of the same kind to bring the Bible into more general use and favour.

"We recommend these hymns with the utmost confidence. They have literary merit, and combine sweetness with strength."—*Weekly Leader*.

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

**BYGONE DAYS: a Story of Village Life.**

By Jno. T. PROCTOR. In crown 8vo., cloth, price 3s. 6d. net.

The story is written to illustrate the manners and customs, religion and superstition, of Lincolnshire village life in the early part of the nineteenth century, the redeeming and elevating influence of love in the lower circles of human society giving the picture a bright and cheery tone. Although the characters and places are disguised, neither they nor the incidents narrated are fictitious, but real, and drawn from the writer's personal experience. Many of them will, no doubt, be recognised by older people still living in the district.

LONDON: ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

In crown 8vo., cloth, price 2s. 6d. net.

**THE COLLIERS OF WINDY HILL:**

Crucial Moments in a Welsh Village.

By WILFRID SPARROY,

Author of "*Persian Children of the Royal Family*."

When the curtain rises Myfanwy Phoenix is dead, but her memory lives on, influencing the lives of her friends at crucial moments. Thus the story is episodal; it is also dramatic, impersonal, a bit of life in a field that is fresh to modern literature. The scene, which is laid in a Welsh colliery village, is suggestive of the Celtic spirit, with its earnestness of outlook and its unswerving faith in the realization of its dreams.

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

**HOME MISSIONS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.****Additional Curates Society.**

39, VICTORIA STREET, WESTMINSTER.

More than 1,200 ADDITIONAL CLERGYMEN are now at work in poor and densely-populated Parishes through the help of grants (about £55,000 a year) from this Society.

No Party considerations affect the appropriation of the Funds.

THE  
CHURCHMAN

---

OCTOBER, 1903.

---

ART. I.—CHALDEAN PRINCES ON THE THRONE OF  
BABYLON (ISAIAH XIII. 19).

I.

A CLOUD of mystery hangs over the Chaldeans. Their name, their nationality, the region from whence they sprang, and even their first appearance on the page of history—all is more or less involved in doubt and uncertainty. We may, however, take for granted that which scarcely admits of a reasonable doubt—viz., that the Kasdim of the Hebrew Bible, who figure in our Authorized Version as the Chaldees or Chaldeans, are to be identified with the Kaldi of the Assyrian cuneiform inscriptions and the *Χαλδαῖοι* of the Greek writers. Before the decipherment of the cuneiforms it was usual to regard the Babylonians and Chaldeans as one, and the same people, but the records of Assyria have now revealed to us the fact that they were really distinct peoples. Thus, to take a notable example, Sennacherib, in the annals of his reign recorded on the Taylor Cylinder, carefully distinguishes between Shuzub of Babylon and Shuzub the Chaldean. And now that we are thus enlightened from contemporary records, we can trace for ourselves the same distinction in the extracts from the Chaldean "History of Berosus" as preserved in the pages of Josephus. Thus, when Berosus makes out Nebuchadnezzar a Chaldean and Nabonidus a Babylonian,<sup>1</sup> we no longer look on these ethnic designations as equivalents. In spite, however, of this clear distinction between the two peoples, there is nevertheless sufficient evidence to show that the sovereign power at Babylon was for long periods in the

---

<sup>1</sup> Josephus c. Apion, I., 19, 20.

hands of the Chaldeans, thus abundantly justifying the description of the prophet Isaiah :

"Babylon, the glory of kingdoms,  
The beauty of the Chaldeans' pride."<sup>1</sup>

It is the design of this article, while collecting what little is known of this remarkable people, to trace out more especially their connection with the throne of Babylon.

The name *Kaldu*, according to Hommel, was originally *Kashdu* ; then, as early as the second millennium B.C., *Kardu*—whence the Kassite Kings of Babylon got the name *Kardunias* to designate Babylonia—and, finally, certainly from the ninth century B.C. and onwards, *Kaldu*, whence the Greek *Χαλδαῖοι*.<sup>2</sup> Delitzsch, on the other hand, considers the change from *Kashdu* to *Kaldu* as an instance of a rule very common in the Assyrian language, according to which a sibilant before a dental is frequently changed into "l."<sup>3</sup> Schrader is of the same opinion.<sup>4</sup> It will be observed, then, that, according to these three eminent authorities, the Hebrew *Kasdim* represents the older form of the name. However, this, too, is a point on which all are not agreed, for, according to Muss-Arnolt, in his valuable Assyrian dictionary, *Kaldu* is the original form of the name, whilst *Kashdu* is to be regarded as an analogical change after the word *kashādu*, "to conquer." A view put forward by Sayce<sup>5</sup> that the Biblical *Kasdim* is in some way connected with the term *Kashi*, by which the people of Babylonia are designated in the Tel-el-Amarna Tablets of the fifteenth century B.C., has been proved untenable by Schrader, who points out that both the *Kaldi* and the *Kashi* are mentioned by Assur-natsir-pal,<sup>6</sup> and that they must therefore be regarded as distinct peoples.

With regard to the nationality of the *Kaldi*, Professor Rogers assures us that they were undoubtedly Semites. He observes that "not only are their names purely Semitic, but their religion, manner of life, and adaptation to Semitic usages, all bear the same stamp, those of the Semitic Babylonians."<sup>7</sup> On the other hand, Jensen has suggested that they were Semitized Sumerians, which Rogers justly characterizes as a guess, having no direct support in the inscriptions.

<sup>1</sup> Isa. xiii. 19.                   <sup>2</sup> See "Ancient Hebrew Tradition," p. 212.

<sup>3</sup> See Delitzsch's "Assyrian Grammar," p. 120.

<sup>4</sup> See "The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament," vol. i., p. 118.

<sup>5</sup> See "The Higher Criticism," p. 158, footnote.

<sup>6</sup> See R.P., N.S. (= "Records of the Past," New Series), vol. ii., p. 164, lines 17, 24.

<sup>7</sup> See "A History of Babylonia and Assyria," by R. W. Rogers, 2nd ed., vol. i., p. 310; London, 1901.

Another view, otherwise not improbable, that they were Semitized Kassites, is forbidden by the inscription of Assurnatsir-pal noticed above.

Whence, then, did this mysterious people make their way into Babylonia? To this question three answers have been given: (1) From the mountains of Kurdistan,<sup>1</sup> (2) from North Africa, (3) from Arabia. Of these the last is the one now very generally accepted by Semitic scholars. According to Winckler: "Perhaps from the eleventh century B.C., possibly earlier, they pressed forward from the east of Arabia into Babylonia, where they pushed on from the south to the north, and by degrees overran the whole country. From this time forward Babylonia had a Chaldean population in the open country, which was under Princes of their own, whilst to the old inhabitants, the Babylonians, only the towns remained with the territory belonging to them."<sup>2</sup> For those who, with the writer of this article, believe in the authenticity of the Books of Moses, the earliest notice of the Kaldi is to be found in the pages of Scripture. As early as the days of Moses, or possibly of Abraham, the very ancient city of Ur, near the mouth of the Euphrates, was connected with this people. "Ur of the Chaldees" was the patriarch's early home; and the position of this old-world city, in the extreme south of Babylonia, almost on the shores of the Persian Gulf, and also near the western deserts, marks it as the spot at which the Kaldi would obtain their earliest footing, on the supposition that they came from the heart of Arabia. It is, then, possible that the patriarch himself belonged to this people, and a fair argument for this supposition may be made out as follows: In Gen. x. 22 we meet with a list of the sons of Shem, "Elam and Asshur and Arpachshad and Lud and Aram." In this passage, as Hommel points out, Elam takes the place of Babylon, Babylon being then under Elamite rule; Asshur stands for Assyria, then in the infancy of her existence; whilst Arpachshad—*i.e.*, *Ar-pa-keshad*—represents the Kaldi, being, indeed, an exact equivalent of "Ur of the Chaldees," since *pa* is nothing less than the Egyptian preposition "of."<sup>3</sup> Inasmuch, then, as Arpachshad figures in the genealogy of Abraham, it is not so far fetched to regard the patriarch as a Chaldee, of which, perhaps, we have a reminiscence in the

<sup>1</sup> It was thought that the Hebrew כְּשִׁדִּי was derived from a more ancient form, כְּרִדִּי, still preserved in the name *Kurds*. See Gesen, *Heb. Lex.*

<sup>2</sup> See "Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament," by Eberhard Schrader. I. Hälfte, S. 22; Berlin, 1902.

<sup>3</sup> See "Ancient Hebrew Tradition," by Prof. Hommel, pp. 294, 295.

name "Chesed," given to one of the children of his brother Nahor.<sup>1</sup>

In the cuneiform records the first possible, but by no means certain, reference to the Kaldi is to be found in the Babylonian dynastic tablets.<sup>2</sup> According to these tablets the first Babylonian dynasty, consisting of eleven Kings, reigned for 294 years. Under this dynasty, which Hommel has shown to be of Arabian origin,<sup>3</sup> Babylon first comes into the light of history, and appears as the capital of a kingdom as distinguished from a small city-state. Under its sixth monarch Khammurabi, the Amraphel of Gen., chap. xiv., she casts off the Elamite yoke, and achieves a position of proud independence. The second Babylonian dynasty, which also consisted of eleven Kings, and lasted 368 years, is called the dynasty of Uru-azagga or Uru-ku, and is believed by some scholars to have been contemporary with the first dynasty, and to have reigned in Uruk, the Erech of Gen. x. 10. The third dynasty presents us with a long list of Kassite Kings, who reigned over Babylon for 576 years. The Kassites, or Kashi, were mountaineers, who occupied the high valleys from the frontiers of Elam northward. As stated above, this is the name by which the Babylonian power is designated on the tablets from Tel-el-Amarna. The Kassite dynasty came to an end about the middle of the twelfth century B.C. It was followed by the fourth dynasty, a dynasty of Semitic rulers, which lasted for 132 years. Nebuchadnezzar I., the most distinguished of these rulers, and possibly the founder of the dynasty, has left us a long inscription of some interest, in which he records his victory over the Elamites, and claims conquests both over the Kassites and in the West.<sup>4</sup> The fifth dynasty, however, is the one that most concerns us at present in our endeavour to search out the history of the Kaldi. This short dynasty, consisting of only three Kings, and covering the brief space of twenty-one years, is entitled on the Second Dynastic Tablet "the Dynasty of the Country of the Sea," and from this name it has been inferred that we have here to do with a race of Chaldean rulers, seeing that the "Country of the Sea," *mat tamtim*—*i.e.*, the marshy district round the head of the Persian Gulf—appears about a century and a half later as one of the principalities of the Kaldi.<sup>5</sup> When, however, we come to study the names of the three Kings of the dynasty, the

<sup>1</sup> See "Ancient Hebrew Tradition," p. 212.

<sup>2</sup> R.P., N.S., vol. i., pp. 1-41.

<sup>3</sup> See "Ancient Hebrew Tradition," chap. iii.

<sup>4</sup> See Budge's "Babylonian Life and History," p. 50. Published by R.T.S.

<sup>5</sup> See R.P., N.S., vol. i., pp. 17, 21, and compare vol. iv., p. 79, line 7.

inference as to its Chaldean origin is seen to be most uncertain. Thus the first King bears the Kassite name of Simmas-sipak or Simbar-sikhu, whilst the name of his father, Erba-Sin, is Semitic. With the second King it is the other way about; his name, Ea-mukin-zira, is Semitic, but his father's name, Kha'smar, according to Professor Sayce, is the Kassite for "a hawk." The name of the third King, Kashu-nadin-akhi, offers a fresh puzzle, for, though Semitic in form, it points mysteriously to the nation of the Kassites. Perhaps the most natural solution of this series of riddles is that, instead of having here a dynasty of Chaldean rulers, we have rather a second dynasty of Kassites, whose names have been partially Semiticized by their Babylonian subjects, and who at this period were in possession of a district which became later the very centre and stronghold of the nation of the Kaldi.

So far, then, we have groped in vain. The Kaldi doubtless are in Southern Babylonia—witness the statement of Gen. xi. 28—but nothing is heard of them from cuneiform sources till they come into contact with the might of Assyria. Passing over, therefore, the short sixth dynasty, the dynasty of Bit-Bazi, which lasted only twenty years, and the still shorter seventh dynasty, consisting of a single Elamite monarch, who reigned only six years, we come, about the year 1,000 B.C., to the eighth dynasty, a dynasty, as I shall presently show, of Chaldean rulers. When this dynasty was more than a century old, the powerful Assyrian King, Assur-natsir-pal, in the year 879 B.C., conducted a campaign on the Euphrates.<sup>1</sup> Leaving the city of Anat, the modern Anah, he descended the river, and encountered at the fortress of Suru Shadudu the chieftain of the Shuhites<sup>2</sup> and his allies "the far-spread soldiers of the country of the Kassites." These allies of Shadudu were Babylonians, and Shadudu himself must be regarded in the light of a Babylonian vassal. Hence at the fall of Suru Assur-natsir-pal captured, so he tells us, "fifty cavalry horses, together with the soldiers of Nabû-apal-iddin, the King of Karduniash (Babylonia), and Zabdanu his brother, and Bel-apal-iddina the prophet, who went in front of their army." Further, the downfall of this fortress is represented by the Assyrian King as a great blow to the Babylonian power and to the Kaldi. "The fear of my sovereignty," he writes, "prevailed as far as the country of Karduniash; the might of my weapons overwhelmed the country of *Kaldu*. On the countries beside the Euphrates I poured out terror." Such is the first clear mention of the Kaldi. We gather from it

<sup>1</sup> See R.P., N.S., vol. ii., p. 164, lines 16-25.

<sup>2</sup> Job ii. 11.

(1) that they were settled at this time along the course of the Euphrates below the district of Karduniash—*i.e.*, Babylonia proper—and (2) that they were under the rule of Nabû-apal-iddina, King of Babylon, who was probably a Chaldean himself. But for some such close connection with Babylon the fall of Suru could hardly have inspired them with terror. Suru was at some distance from their country, and Babylon lay between. At Suru, as the next line of the inscription informs us, the Assyrian King erected a trophy of his victories, with the record of which he closes the narrative of this year's campaign, thus clearly showing that he advanced no further down the river. What, then, had the Kaldi to fear, unless their fortunes had been in some way closely linked with those of Babylon?

The second mention of the Kaldi occurs a little later, in 852 B.C., when Marduk-nadin-shumu had succeeded his father, Nabû-apal-iddina, on the throne of Babylon. Owing to a dangerous rebellion, headed by his lame brother, Maduk-bel-usate, this monarch was led to call in the aid of the Assyrian King, Shalmaneser II., the son of Assur-natsir-pal. After successfully putting down the rebellion, and offering sacrifices at the shrines of Merodach and Nebo in Babylon and Borsippa, "I went down," writes Shalmaneser, "to the country of *Kaldu*. I captured their cities, I received the tribute of the Kings of the country of *Kaldu*. The torrent of my arms overwhelmed as far as the *nar Marrati*—" *i.e.*, "the bitter river" or salt marshes at the head of the Persian Gulf, identical with the Merathaim of Jer. l. 21.<sup>1</sup> In the fuller account of this campaign, given on the gates of Balawat, Shalmaneser names three of the Kings of the Kaldi—*viz.*, "Adini, the son of Dakuri," "Yakin, King of the Country of the Sea," and "Mushallim-Marduk, the son of Amukkan."<sup>2</sup> These names are deserving of notice, for about a century later the Assyrian inscriptions make mention of the Chaldean States of *Bit-Dakuri*, *Bit-Adini*, *Bit-Amukkan*, and *Bit-Yakin*. Comparing these names with those just given, it is seen that these small kingdoms were called after the names of distinguished chieftains, just in the same way as the kingdom of Northern Israel was known as *Bit-Khumri*, "the House of Omri." A further inference is that they were capable of subdivision. Thus Adini, the son of Dakuri, seems to have divided Bit-Dakuri into two portions, one retaining the original name, and the other called after himself, Bit-Adini.

To the four Chaldean States just mentioned must be added

<sup>1</sup> See the Obelisk Inscription, lines 73-84, R.P., N.S., vol. iv., pp. 42, 43.

<sup>2</sup> See R.P., N.S., vol. iv., pp. 76-79.

three others—*Bit-Shilani*, *Bit-Shahalli*, and *Bit-Sala*. To fix the exact whereabouts of these seven small principalities is beyond our power. According to Winckler, *Bit-Dakuri* was the most northerly and nearest to Babylon. *Bit-Adini* and *Bit-Amukkan* bordered on *Bit-Dakuri*, *Bit-Amukkan* lying on both sides of the Euphrates, and adjacent to the territory of the *Pugudu*, the *Pekod* of Ezek. xxiii. 23 and Jer. I. 21. South of these lay *Bit-Shilani*, *Bit-Shahalli*, and *Bit-Sala*.<sup>1</sup> Further south still, at the head of the Gulf, and stretching down its western shore, was *Bit-Yakin*, "the Country of the Sea," the most famous of the seven. Thus, while Sargon includes among the kingdoms of the Kaldi, *Bit-Dakuri*, *Bit-Amukkan*, *Bit-Shilani*, and *Bit-Shahalli*, he excludes *Bit-Yakin*, apparently because in his day this last had attained to such prominence under its famous monarch Merodach-baladan that it seemed to hold a position of its own.<sup>2</sup> To Merodach-baladan, therefore, he accords the title, "King of Kaldu," as being over-lord of all the Chaldean States.<sup>3</sup> Assur-bani-pal also distinguishes between the Land of Kaldu and "the Country of the Sea."<sup>4</sup> The rulers of the States of the Kaldi are generally styled *Sharrani* "Kings"; in one place, by Sennacherib, *Nasikkani* "Princes."<sup>5</sup>

Continuing to gather up the scraps of Chaldean history, which meet us in the Assyrian annals, we notice that Shamshi-Rammanu, King of Assyria 825-812 B.C., in his fourth campaign marched into Babylonia, and at Dur-Papsukal, a city which stood on an island in the Tigris, attacked and defeated Bau-akhi-iddina, a vassal King under Marduk-balatsu-iqbi, King of Babylon, who shortly after arrived on the spot with a large army drawn from the lands of *Kaldu*, Elam, Namri, and Arumu. The fact that Kaldu stands first on this list is suggestive that Marduk-balatsu-iqbi was a Chaldean Prince.<sup>6</sup> In 813 B.C., near the close of his reign, Shamshi-Rammanu undertook a second expedition into Babylonia. Bau-akhi-iddina, who by this time was seated on the throne of Babylon, was defeated by the Assyrian King and led captive to Assyria.

<sup>1</sup> See H. Winckler, "Untersuchungen," SS. 51, 52. And for the position of *Bit-Amukkan* as bordering on *Pekod*, see *Proceedings of Society of Biblical Archaeology*, vol. ix., pp. 247, 248.

<sup>2</sup> See the Triumphant Inscription, lines 21, 22.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, line 122. In the time of Tiglathpileser III., Merodach-baladan was only "King of the Country of the Sea." In Sennacherib's first campaign he is called "King of Karduniash," for he was then seated on the throne of Babylon, in virtue of which position he was also "King of Kaldu."

<sup>4</sup> See the Annals, Col. III., 97, 91.

<sup>5</sup> Taylor, Cylinder, Col. VI., 15, 16.

<sup>6</sup> See the Monolith Inscription of Shamshi-Rammanu, Col. IV.

We are also informed that, after offering sacrifices in the sacred Babylonian cities, Shamshi-Rammanu went down to the land of *Kaldu* and received tribute of their Kings.<sup>1</sup> This was repeated by his son Rammanu-nirari in the year 803 B.C.<sup>2</sup> After this we hear no more of this remarkable people till the time of Tiglathpileser III., 745-729 B.C. The Babylonian wars of this monarch bear witness to the indomitable courage of the Princes of the Kaldi. Thus in 745 B.C., to quote the words of the ruthless conqueror, "Bit-Shilani throughout its extent I broke like a potter's vessel. Sarrabanu, their royal city, like a mountain wave I devastated, and carried away the spoil thereof. Nabû-ushabshi, their King, I impaled before the great gate of his city. His land, his wife, his sons, his daughters, his goods, the treasures of his palace, I took for a spoil. Bit-Amukkan, like a threshing instrument, I threshed the whole of its people and the substance thereof."<sup>3</sup> Yet despite these severities the spirit of the Kaldi was still unsubdued. In 731 B.C. Zaqiru, Prince of Bit-Shahalli, who had "sinned against the ordinances of the great gods," was thrown into chains and carried off to Assyria, but his people, rendered desperate by fear, fought it out to the bitter end.<sup>4</sup> In this year Bit-Amukkan, for a second time, encountered the might of Assyria. Its Prince, Ukin-zer, had but lately made himself master of the throne of Babylon. Having larger resources at his disposal, even as he had a greater issue at stake, he was able to hold out successfully in his fortress of Sapia. Meanwhile his palm-groves were cut down, his enclosures laid waste, and his cities burned with fire.<sup>5</sup> In a second campaign, two years later, this valiant foe fell into the hand of the conqueror.<sup>6</sup> However, it is no wonder that to some of the Princes of the Kaldi at this time prudence seemed the better part of valour. Accordingly, while Tiglathpileser was besieging Sapia, Balasu of Bit-Dakuri, and Nadinu of Larak, brought their tribute. At the same time came "Merodach-baladan, the son of Yakin, King of the sea, who in the time of the Kings my fathers had come before none of them and kissed their feet," but who now, "cast down by the fear of the majesty of Assur, my lord, came to Sapia into my presence

<sup>1</sup> See the Synchronous History of Assyria and Babylonia, Col. IV., R.P., N.S., vol. iv., pp. 33, 34.

<sup>2</sup> See the Slab Inscription of Rammanu-nirari, line 22, and compare the Assyrian Canon for 803 B.C.

<sup>3</sup> See the Slab Inscription, lines 8-11.

<sup>4</sup> See the Nimrud Inscription, lines 19-22, R.P., N.S., vol. v., p. 122.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, lines 23-25.

<sup>6</sup> Babylonian Chronicle, Col. I., 19-21, R.P., N.S., vol. i., p. 23.

and kissed my feet.”<sup>1</sup> But the wily Chaldean was not overwhelmed by the glory of Assur, as Tiglathpileser boasts; he was only biding his time to rise up, seize the throne of Babylon, and for twelve long years defy the arms of the great Sargon, a Prince whose military activity was such that the prophet Isaiah has aptly compared him to “a fiery flying serpent.”<sup>2</sup> But as this portion of the history of the Kaldi is very closely connected with the remarkable prophecy of Isa. xxi. 1-10—“The Burden of the Wilderness of the Sea”—I reserve it for a future paper.

Our study of the history of the Kaldi so far has brought us down to the era of Tiglathpileser, towards the close of whose reign Isaiah spoke of Babylon as

“The glory of kingdoms,  
The beauty of the Chaldeans’ pride.”

At this point, then, we may suitably pause, and, turning aside to examine the Babylonian dynasties, endeavour to gain from them a yet clearer idea of the extent of the connection of this people with the throne of Babylon.

CHARLES BOUTFLOWER.

*(To be continued.)*

---

## ART. II.—THE BOATS OF THE GOSPEL STORY.

IN the August number of the *CHURCHMAN* the Rev. J. E. Green endeavours to throw a new light on the nature of the fishing craft used by the Apostles by claiming a technical distinction between *πλοῖον*, “boat,” and *πλοιάριον*, “little boat.” The ordinary view of the vessels in which Peter and the sons of Zebedee pursued their calling receives a drastic correction, and we are presented with a picture of the Apostles plying “fishing-smacks” large enough to be served by (and therefore also to carry) “dinghies.” The former are supposed to be called in the Gospels *πλοῖα*, the latter *πλοιάρια*. As Mr. Green cites a remark of mine in a former number of the *CHURCHMAN*, to the effect that “John vi. 22-24 shows that there is no distinction in his use of *πλοῖον* and *πλοιάριον*,” and as I am convinced that the specific identity of these craft is recognisable all through the Gospel story, I propose to occupy a few pages with a consideration of this somewhat revolutionary theory.

---

<sup>1</sup> Nimrud Inscription, lines 26, 27, R.P., N.S., vol. v., p. 123.

<sup>2</sup> Isa. xiv. 29.

I shall confine my discussion to the passages selected by the writer. In each of them the question is complicated somewhat by the fact that *πλοῖον* repeatedly in the Gospels alternates as a *varia lectio* with *πλοιάριον*, and *vice versâ*. Without discussing this phenomenon, which itself, perhaps, is an argument for identification, I shall try to pursue my argument on the basis of the readings accepted by Mr. Green himself. We will follow him in reading the diminutive form in Luke v. 2 (where it is rather doubtful), as well as in John vi. 22, 24, xxi. 8 (where it is well accredited), and see whether it be indeed the malign "atmosphere of grammars, lexicons, and commentaries" that has blinded us to this larger view of the Apostles' fishing operations. It will be found that the "smack and dinghy" theory introduces into two of these scenes elements of obscurity and confused narration which with the present view of the Apostles' craft are happily absent. It will be found that in all the passages the identity of the *πλοῖα* and *πλοιάρια* is really unassailable, and in one passage (with the reading Mr. Green prefers) is almost as clear as words can make it. It will be found, too, that as neither were the *πλοῖα* vessels of large burden that kept away from shore, nor the *πλοιάρια* vessels with the small capacity of a "dinghy," these relations of smack and dinghy become a thing impossible. In his search for technical nautical terminology, Mr. Green has merely unearthed a verbal distinction without specific difference.

I cannot pretend to explain how these two terms came to be used indifferently. Possibly by a seaman all the fishing-boats in question would have been technically called *πλοιάρια*, just as the piece of water on which they floated would certainly have been called by him a "lake." It is not very hard to conceive of local usage occasionally raising the *πλοιάρια* to the dignity of *πλοῖα* in common speech, just as it certainly dignified that inland water with the title "sea." And with this choice of two practically synonymous terms before them, the Evangelists may have used now one and now the other, just as indifferently as we vary such terms as "ship" and "vessel," and without in the least staking their "technical accuracy" by such use. But this I merely hazard as a conjecture. What I am sure of is that the explanation of the evangelists' diction does not lie in the broad distinction suggested by Mr. Green.

Small boats of the "dinghy" order, I may say here, nowhere happen to appear in the Gospel story. But Josephus seemingly mentions them as plying on the lake under the designation *σκάφος*. The feminine form *σκάφη* is the term which Luke actually uses, when in the narrative of St. Paul's ship-

wreck he tells us of a dinghy launched from the deck of the imperilled vessel. This term would probably appear, at all events in Luke's story, if the Apostles' fishing operations were on the scale of magnificence postulated by Mr. Green, and if we were to think of fishing-smacks served by dinghies for the purpose of embarking or disembarking. But let us now test the merits of the case by the passages Mr. Green has cited.

I. The first scene is the story of the great draught of fishes in Luke i. 1-8. I claim that (with the reading *πλοιάρια*) it is decisive for the identity of the two terms in question as far as Luke's diction is concerned. If this be so, we shall be cautious how we introduce those distinctions "smack" and "dinghy" in the Gospel of St. John. I claim, too, that, even without that reading, this passage tells us how impossible it is to enlarge the Apostles' *πλοιά* to the proportions desiderated by Mr. Green. St. Luke says that our Lord saw "two little boats" (*πλοιάρια*) standing by the lake, whose occupants had left them and were washing their nets. Next he says that Jesus entered into "one of the boats" (*πλοίων*), which was Simon's, and asking him to put out a little from the land, taught the people therefrom. Simon is afterwards told to put out into deep water and cast his nets, and he is rewarded with an extraordinary haul. The crew beckon to the partners, the sons of Zebedee, "in the other boat" (*πλοίω*) for help.

On the commonly accepted view, there is here a plain, unbroken story, which few probably have failed to understand throughout. I say this because Mr. Green apparently boggles at Luke's implying (instead of saying distinctly) that when Jesus entered the boat which was Simon's, He asked Simon, who was washing his nets hard by, to enter it too.

Nor could words much more plainly express the identity of the *πλοίων* and the *πλοιάριον*. It is as clear that *one* and the *other* (in vers. 3, 7) must take us back to the *two* in ver. 2 as it is in Luke xxi. (where, again, we have *δύο, εἰς, ὁ ἕτερος*) that "one" and "the other" take us back to the "two" robbers previously mentioned as crucified with Jesus. Nor, apart from arbitrary theories of "technical" terminology, is there any difficulty in the slight variation from *πλοιαρίων* to *πλοίων*. Just in the same way in his account of the healing of a palsied man in chap. v. 18, 19, Luke calls the man's couch in one verse *κλίνη*, "bed," and in the next *κλινίδιον*, "little bed." But if we are to stumble at the variation of term, let us consider this story from Mr. Green's premises, that *πλοιάριον* means an attendant "dinghy," and *πλοίων* a "smack," its proprietor.

Luke will, then, intend to express *two* couples of vessels *scil.*, two dinghies and two smacks. Our first difficulty will

be that his mention of the dinghies in ver. 2 is utterly irrelevant. They had not helped the Apostles to disembark, nor do they help them to re-embark, Peter's *πλοῖον* being itself upon the lake shore (ver. 3). Why, then, does Luke fix our attention on "two dinghies" at all, when our interest in the story is really focussed on the two smacks? "He next observed some smacks," says Mr. Green, to bridge over this chasm. But Luke supplies nothing of the kind, and he would have to say "two," not "some," smacks, to give any sense to the phrase "the other smack" in ver. 7. Finally, Simon's partners are somehow transferred from the vicinity of their dinghy to their smack (which presumably Mr. Green puts out at sea), when all we know of them is that they were near the "dinghy" washing their nets. I need scarcely remark that all this is to make that usually perspicuous writer Luke express himself confusedly — so confusedly, indeed, that he has been utterly unintelligible till now, if Mr. Green be right.

Few of my readers will doubt that only one couple of vessels is mentioned by St. Luke when the passage is allowed to tell its own story, and that if *πλοιάρια* be the reading, its identity with *πλοῖα* is a certainty. In fact, Mr. Green's cause would have been better served by adopting in ver. 2 the reading *πλοῖα* (attested by BND, and received into their text by Westcott and Hort), and altogether putting aside this damaging passage in getting evidence for his "dinghies." But I note besides that, even after this change, the passage is subversive of his theory of "fishing-smacks" of sufficient burden to make the service of such dinghies requisite. The *raison d'être* of the supposed "dinghies" is that they are "able to approach nearer to the shore" than the supposed "smacks." But this passage tells us (twice over, if *πλοῖα* be read in ver. 2) that Peter's *πλοῖον* was itself by the shore. Nor was it in deep water. Even after Peter had gone out a little he is still in a comparatively shallow sea, and has to put out yet further before his nets can be cast "into the deep." The passage is itself, then, an indication that these vessels were of no great draught, and were something quite different from "smacks" needing to be served by dinghies.

Lastly, there is a statement in ver. 7 which Mr. Green has probably overlooked, but which is itself fatal to his theory: "They came and filled both the boats, so that they began to sink." It is simply inconceivable how a single haul of the nets full of fish could have thus filled two smacks large enough to carry dinghies. It could hardly have filled one. Substitute the usual idea of fair-sized fishing-boats for these supposititious "smacks," and this difficulty of course vanishes.

From this scene, then, we may safely infer that the craft

used by Peter and the sons of Zebedee were not smacks, but fishing-boats, and that this sort of boat was called by Luke indifferently *πλοῖον* and *πλοιάριον*.

II. The next passage is John vi. 15 *et seq.* After the feeding of the five thousand on the plain near Bethsaida Julias, we are told that Jesus was harassed by the obtrusive admiration of the crowd. He sends His disciples away by sea, and secures privacy by retirement to the hillside. The disciples "entered" their *πλοῖον* (according to Mr. Green, by the aid of a dinghy, though John's readers would not suspect it), and as they crossed towards Capernaum were distressed by a contrary gale. Jesus appeared to them walking on the sea, and joined them; and, the wind ceasing (Matt. xiv., Mark vi.), the vessel was "straightway *at the land* whither they were going." (The words italicized show that, at all events, they did not need a dinghy to disembark.)

Matthew and Mark also give accounts of this memorable voyage. From neither of them should we have guessed that the disciples were put on board their so-called "smack" by the aid of a "dinghy." How, then, is its existence here discoverable? From the passage John vi. 22-25, says Mr. Green, which we will now consider. These verses tell us how the multitude, having noticed that there was but one *little boat* on the shore the day before, and that Jesus did not enter the *boat* with His disciples, were at a loss to know where He had gone. We have hitherto recognised here merely another proof that the words *πλοιάριον* and *πλοῖον* are used indifferently for one vessel, *scil.* that in which the Apostles crossed the lake. But Mr. Green's interpretation of the matter is this: The people had noticed that there was but one smack's "dinghy" on the shore, and also that Jesus did not go away by its means in the "smack" itself with His disciples. This seems at first sight to account well for the change of expression, although, as I shall show presently, such variations are eminently characteristic of the diction of St. John. But, in view of all that has been said under I., we shall probably want strong proof that *πλοιάριον* means "a dinghy," or that the *πλοῖον* used on this occasion was anything specifically different from that indicated by St. Luke. Now, this very passage happens to give a striking testimony in an opposite direction. For it goes on to tell us how certain vessels had run over to that north-east coast all the way from Tiberias. It tells, too, how these numerous seekers after Jesus solve their perplexity by using these vessels to follow on the Apostles' track, and how they at last find Jesus at Capernaum. And the vessels in which all this was done are themselves called *πλοιάρια*.

I can scarcely believe that Mr. Green has realized what this implies. These so-called dinghies were capable of crossing on that stormy morning all the way from Tiberias, a distance of some fifteen miles. They were able to transport the crowd six miles to Capernaum. Surely such voyages could not have been made by "dinghies" of the small kind attached to fishing-smacks. The *πλοιάριον*, one feels at once, must be a boat of more pretentious dimensions. In fact, this incident leaves on one a strong impression that boats must be meant of the same class as that in which the Apostles made their own passage to Capernaum, and that for John, as for Luke, the terms *πλοῖα* and *πλοιάρια* are interchangeable. If we follow the text of Westcott and Hort this conjecture becomes a matter of certainty. For their text in ver. 23 actually gives us the word *πλοῖα* for these vessels, which in ver. 24 are called *πλοιάρια*. If John can thus interchange the terms in the case of the transit of these "seekers after Jesus," it is plain that in his allusion to the transit of the Apostles *πλοιάριον* and *πλοῖον* cannot be differentiated as respectively "a dinghy" and "a smack."

As Mr. Green makes some mention of supposed topographical difficulties in connection with this section of St. John, and seems to be unaware of the identification of Bethsaida Julias, I here go outside the purpose of my paper to make two remarks: (1) The language in John vi. 23 certainly means that the vessels had come *to* not *from* the vicinity of the spot where our Saviour had worked the miracle of feeding. They had crossed from Tiberias on the south-west side to the coast at the north-east corner of the lake. (2) For the site of the "city" Bethsaida Julias, near which that miracle was worked, we have no need to resort to "conjecture" or the authority of "Grimm's Lexicon." Its ruins have been in recent times identified by Reland at "Telui," itself a corruption of "Tel Julias." "Close by" this Telui, says Dean Farrar, "is the green, narrow, secluded plain of El Batihah, which exactly answers to the description of the Evangelists." The importance of this discovery in relation to supposed difficulties in the Gospel story is noticed in Farrar's "Commentary on St. Luke."

III. The third passage is John xxi. 1 *et seq.* Here we have the story of the Risen Saviour's appearance to seven Apostles fishing and of the second draught of fishes. We are told that the seven embarked in a boat (*πλοῖον*), which was presumably one of the two of which we heard on the occasion of the first draught, and probably that belonging to Peter. When the form of the Risen Jesus is detected on the bank by John, Peter leaps into the sea. The remaining six follow "in

the little boat" (ἐν τῷ πλοιαρίῳ), still hauling at their net, which has been cast at the word of Jesus and is filled with fish. To an English reader a transition from πλοῖον to πλοιάριον seems more startling than from πλοιάριον to πλοῖον, and many an incautious student has doubtless surmized that some other vessel is intended here than that from which the cast has just been made. But in the Greek the harshness of the variation is no greater from πλοῖον to πλοιάριον than *vice versa*. The transition of Luke v. from κλίνη, "bed," to κλινίδιον, "little bed," in the cure of the palsied man, presents an exact parallel. But Mr. Green, of course, claims here a substantial evidence for the existence of a "dinghy" running between the Apostles' "smack" and the shore. What we have learnt from Luke v. 1 *et seq.* of the nature of the craft from which the Apostles fished confutes the hypothesis, even if we do not read (with Mr. Green) πλοιάριον in Luke v. 2. But I think, quite apart from the two passages I have already discussed, a little consideration of this story of John xxi. is sufficient to exclude Mr. Green's theory. For (1) this story suggests the same conclusion as the last anent the size of a πλοιάριον. A vessel that could not only contain six men, but allow of all this work of hauling and rowing going on in it simultaneously, could hardly be a dinghy trailing at the smack's stern, and of necessity small enough to be shipped<sup>1</sup> in stormy weather on the smack itself. (2) *Per contra*, the story does not raise the πλοῖον to the dignity of Mr. Green's smacks. Even 153 big fish would not be a very heavy haul for the long net of a smack equipped with a dinghy, and the words, "for all they were so many, yet was not the net broken," seem to lose their point. (3) On the other hand, the transfer of the operation of handling a net so laden from a smack's deck to the bottom of a dinghy, whether floating or suddenly launched, would be so difficult that it is hard to conceive of its successful accomplishment at all. (4) Nothing is said about the Apostles casting anchor. And certainly no other men but the seven Apostles can be conceived of as occupying the "smack" on the occasion of this revelation of the Risen Lord. On Mr. Green's theory, then, what becomes of the "smack" itself? Are we to suppose her to be left adrift? (5) Peter would scarcely put on his "fisherman's coat" to get it drenched in the sea, and we usually conceive of him on this occasion as wading in comparatively shallow water. But in that case the πλοῖον must have been of but small draught,

---

<sup>1</sup> How the "smack" itself fared in a storm may be gathered from Mark iv. 37; Luke viii. 23. Such a storm would necessarily wreck a dinghy towed astern.

and, again, a fishing-smack of the pretensions postulated by Mr. Green seems to be excluded from consideration.

John xxi. 1 *et seq.*, then, in no way modifies the conclusions we reach from the other passages in respect to the variations *πλοῖα* and *πλοιάρια*. The latter term is practically synonymous with the former, and the "technical accuracy" of the Gospels is not concerned. There is no occasion to alter the received view of the boats used on the Lake of Galilee. Expositors and artists have done rightly in conceiving of them as large fishing-boats. We cannot imagine them capable of containing many more than the thirteen persons who, on certain well-known occasions, were conveyed in a *πλοῖον* or *πλοιάριον* across the lake. Still less can we conceive of their being vessels carrying their own dinghies. The Lilliputian craft familiar to us in Raphael's cartoon doubtless does not do justice to the proportions of Peter's vessel. But even this is not so specifically faulty as Mr. Green's conception of a dinghy-served smack. Our Revisers have certainly done well in altering the "ship" of the Authorized Version to "boat" in the case of *πλοῖον*. And they would have done better if they had rendered *πλοιάριον* always by this word "boat," as is actually done in John vi. 17, 23, and not confused us by occasional retentions of "little boat," as in Mark iii. 9; John xxi. 8. For, from a general consideration of all the passages, it is plain the terms are used indifferently. Nowhere can we say with confidence that an Evangelist uses *πλοιάριον* rather than *πλοῖον* because he has in mind a fishing-boat of comparatively small size.

A comparison of our best critical texts shows how impossible it is to speak always decisively as to the true reading amid these repeated variations of *πλοῖα* and *πλοιάρια*. In this matter even our best uncials appear to have suffered from the attempts of transcribers to present a harmonious account. The difficulty of deciding here may be realized when I state that in every single case where *πλοιάριον* is used in the Gospels there is *some* manuscript evidence for *πλοῖον*. It is perhaps, *prima facie*, improbable that John in all these passages really varied *πλοῖον* with *πλοιάριον* to the extent that our best textual critics postulate. Still—and this must be my answer to Mr. Green's dictum: "It is hard to imagine why St. John should have used these two words in describing one boat"—such insignificant verbal variations are undeniably a characteristic of this Apostle's writings. Others besides myself have doubtless noticed how repeatedly St. John's own diction<sup>1</sup> varies, a phrase recently used without any appreciable

<sup>1</sup> This feature occurs in S. John's own narrative. On the other hand, in his report of speeches, any subsequent citation repeats the first expres-

alteration of meaning. But as this feature well illustrates his interchanges of *πλοῖον* and *πλοιάριον*, I cite here a few instances, using the text of Westcott and Hort. In 1 John i. 3, 5, we find *ἀπαγγέλλομεν* altering into *ἀναγγέλλομεν*; in vers. 5, 6, *σκοτός* altering into *σκότια*; in *ibid.*, ii. 12, 14, *τεκνία* into *παῖδια*; in *ibid.*, v. 16, *αἰτήσῃ* followed not by *αἰτήση*, but by *ἔρωτήση*. Similarly in the Gospel in i. 11, 12, *παρέλαβον* changes to *ἔλαβον*; in vers. 30, 34, *τεθέαμαι* to *ἑώρακα*; in vers. 42, 43, *ἔστι μεθερμηνευόμενον* to *ἐρμηνεύεται*; in ver. 48, *λέγει* to *εἶπεν*; in vers. 48, 50, *ὑπο τὴν σукήν* to *ὑποκάτω τῆς σукῆς*; in iv. 32, 34, *βρώσις* to *βρῶμα*; in iv. 50, 51, *υἴος* to *παῖς*. Similarly in the very passage (chap. xxi.) considered above, if the boat is now a *πλοῖον*, now a *πλοιάριον*, the subject of the miracle is now *ὄψάρια* (ver. 10; cf. ver. 9), now *ἰχθύες* (vers. 8, 11). It is probable that these slight variations are due mainly to a desire to secure euphony and avoid tautology. In translating it is hardly necessary and may be quite misleading to try to reproduce them. This mention of translations suggests an illustration intelligible to readers unacquainted with Greek. Such readers will realize how these subtle "euphonic" influences affect even a faithful version, if they will notice the words italicized in the following passages from our Authorized Version, and bear in mind that in each verse one Greek word has two different translations: "These shall go into *everlasting* punishment, but the righteous into life *eternal*" (Matt. xxv. 46); "He that exalteth himself shall be *abased*, and he that humbleth himself shall be *exalted*" (Luke xiv. 11); "Bear unto the *governor of the feast*. . . . When the *ruler of the feast* had tasted the water . . ." (John ii. 8, 9).

There is no deep design in such variations. Neither is there any in the alternations *πλοῖον* and *πλοιάριον*. Once we admit that they had become for practical purposes as synonymous in Galilæan idiom as the words italicized above are to us in their respective contexts, the change of diction becomes merely a substitution of other coinage without change of value.

It is not worth while to extend this article by illustrations of the question in its philological bearings. But I may add that the most straightforward inferences from diminutive forms are often the most misleading. All our ideas of size are comparative, and the standard of comparison is not to all the same. Diminutives, too, have a strange trick of adapting themselves to new lines of thought in which all ideas of size, and even of etymology, are lost. *Παίδιον* is strictly a "little

---

sions verbatim. I scarcely find any deviation from this rule, except the one in i. 48-50, cited with the other instances above.

child," yet Mark applies this term to Jairus's daughter (whom Luke calls *παῖς*), and nevertheless knows that she is of an age at which Oriental females marry. *Οψάρια*, one of the two words for "fish" in that miracle of John xxi., is itself a diminutive, yet immediately afterwards John tells us that the haul consisted of 153 "great" fish. The *γυναικάρια*, or "silly women," whom St. Paul describes in 2 Tim. iii. 6, as so ready to run after pernicious teachers, may doubtless have lacked mental development, but are not generally conceived to have been females of defective stature. And possibly even Mr. Green, whom I know to be alike an experienced sailor and an exemplary ecclesiastic, forgets occasionally that in English his "vessel" must always suggest a "little vase," and his "chasuble" a "little cottage."

ARTHUR C. JENNINGS.



### ART. III.—THE MIRACLES OF JOSHUA IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN DISCOVERIES.<sup>1</sup>

IT is scarcely worth while considering the miracles of Joshua unless we believe them to be recorded in an authentic history; and it is clear from internal evidences that the book is such a history.

It is called the Book of Joshua because it contains an account of his doings. But it is distinctly stated that he himself wrote some portions of it. Thus, in xxiv. 26 we read: "And Joshua wrote these words in the book of the law of God." And the rest cannot have been written long after his death, for Rahab the harlot was still living at the time (vi. 25). And the same expression, "unto this day," occurs in many other cases.

Like the writings of Xenophon and Cæsar the narrative is often in the third person, but in many cases the date is suggested by the use of the first person. Thus, Rahab "hid the messengers which *we* sent" (vi. 17). "Wherefore hast thou at all brought this people over Jordan to deliver *us* into the hand of the Amorites to cause *us* to perish? Would that *we* had been content and dwelt beyond Jordan! Oh, Lord, what shall *I* say," etc. (vii. 7, 8).

Then, the little incident of the erection of the altar of witness by the trans-Jordanic tribes would never have been inserted by any other than a contemporary writer, even if

<sup>1</sup> A paper read to the Winchester Clerical Association by the Rev. Canon Huntingford, D.C.L.

some later author can be supposed, as some critics assert, to have invented the story of the erection of the tabernacle itself.

And, then, whatever moral difficulties may be suggested by the narrative of the extermination of some of the first opponents of Joshua, the story of the conquest of the land is very natural. The book gives us a mere summary of it. The author describes two great campaigns—one in the south, and another in the north. But a long seven years' war is implied which issued in a state of perfect rest.

Some of the cities in the north he utterly destroyed; but others he left standing, and slew the men only who fought against him. "So Joshua took the whole land . . . and the land had rest from war" (xi. 23).

But few readers of this history realize how small a proportion of the population of Canaan the Israelites formed at this time, and for many subsequent generations, even up to and after the time of David and Solomon.

Israel in the time of Joshua held Canaan much as we hold India or Egypt, being a very small fraction of a vast population, but the ruling race. They held the country in subjection, as we do, by the force of character and military renown. The Canaanites knew that Joshua would suppress any rising or conspiracy, just as we suppressed, with a few thousand soldiers, the Indian Mutiny in a country inhabited by millions.

These are a few, but only a few, of the indications of date which the book contains, and whatever doubts and difficulties may be suggested by our modern critics, a fair-minded reader can scarcely read the narrative with close attention without feeling that he has in the Book of Joshua an authentic history.

And if the book had contained no record of miracles, its authenticity would rarely have been questioned.

Let us, then, examine the recorded miracles of Joshua in the light of modern discoveries.

"The whole subject of miracles," writes Edersheim, "requires fuller and clearer treatment than it has yet received." "The objection to miracles, as such," he says, "proceeds on that false supernaturalism which traces a miracle to the immediate fiat of the Almighty without any intervening links" ("Life and Times of Jesus," vol. ii., p. 626).

The discoveries of the Palestine Exploration Fund, and a careful consideration of the language in which the miracles of Joshua are described, enable us to understand what were the intervening links of the two great miracles of the drying up of the waters of the Jordan and the answer to Joshua's prayer at the battle of Beth-horon.

A miracle does not cease to be miraculous when we can see by what application of natural forces it was wrought. And our not being able to see by what intervening links a miracle was effected does not even suggest the absence of such intervening links; it only proves that we cannot see them.

By the application of a natural force, and as the result of countless experiments as to its behaviour under certain conditions, Marconi has succeeded in sending a message across the Atlantic without a wire or cable. This and many other modern human miracles are the result of man's knowledge and power and will.

The miracles of the Bible are the result of the use of His own created natural forces by Him whose knowledge and power are infinite, and whose will is irresistible.

But sometimes, as in the case of the miracles of Joshua, He enables us to see by what intervening links they were wrought.

The drying up of the river Jordan was unlike that of the waters of the Red Sea, and the miracles are attributed by the sacred writers to very different natural causes. The one is attributed to "a strong east wind" which "the Lord caused to blow all night" (Exod. xiv. 21).

But the stream of Jordan is described as being cut off by some obstacle which caused the upper waters to stand up in a great heap far above the ford. If this was caused by one of those landslips which often occur at the time of flood in that most remarkable river, the circumstance of its occurrence exactly at that time would make it as miraculous as if it were the result of any other cause.

The following is written by Harper in his book entitled "The Bible and Modern Discoveries":

"Not like the Nile in its overflow, which fertilizes the land, the Jordan merely hurries on so rapidly that its fall is sixty feet to the mile; difficult to approach in many places, impossible in others, because of the jungle and banks, it has yet many fords. In some places there are cliffs, old deposits of marl, which crumble and fall into the river in time of flood. It was, therefore, at flood-time (April) that Joshua led the Israelites through the river. The spies had crossed the ford, but no 'ford' would be broad enough for the host to pass; and as the Israelites left Egypt and crossed the 'sea of reeds' by a miracle, so their children cross this torrent stream by another miracle. The water stood still near 'the city of Adam, that is beside Zaretan.' The Revised Version translates this passage thus: 'The waters which came down from above stood and rose up in one heap—a great way off at Adam, the city that is beside Zaretan.' The meaning of

'Adam' is 'red earth.' Near Beisan is an unusually large mound called Tell es Sarem. A good deal of clay is found here, and a mile to the south is a stream, the Arabic of which means 'red river.' The soil is red, and a ford near is also called by an Arabic name which means 'red earth.'

"It has been suggested that the waters of the Jordan were suddenly dammed up by a landslip or similar convulsion. The appearance of the banks, and the curious bends of the river near this place, would seem to support the idea" (p. 184).

If this were so, it only makes the record of the event more intelligible, but does not at all lessen its miraculous character.

It is very probable that the same may have happened often in such a river as the Jordan; but it is a historical fact that it did happen in A.D. 1266, as described in the writings of an Arab historian. "The Sultan Beybars caused a bridge to be built across Jordan to facilitate the strategic movements of his army. . . . When it was completed and the people were dispersed, part of the piers gave way. The Sultan was greatly vexed, and blamed the builders, and sent them back to repair the damage. They found the task very difficult, owing to the rise in the waters and the strength of the current. But in the night the water of the river ceased to flow, so that none remained in its bed. They remedied the defects of the piers and strengthened them, and effected repairs which would otherwise have been impossible. They then despatched mounted men to ascertain the nature of the event that had occurred. The riders found that a lofty mound which overlooked the river on the west had fallen into it and dammed it up. The water was held up, and had spread itself over the valley above the dam. The water was arrested from midnight until the fourth hour of the day. Then the water prevailed and the dam was broken up" (*Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement*, July, 1895).

The other most startling miracle is that of the supposed standing still of the sun upon the prayer of Joshua at the battle of Beth-horon.

Mr. Palmer, in his excellent little book entitled "A Misunderstood Miracle," has shown how much light the survey of the Holy Land, and our consequently more accurate knowledge of its topography, have thrown upon this event, and have proved that what Joshua must have wanted was not longer daylight, but the continuance for a whole day of that obscuration of the sun and moon which was striking such terror into the hearts of his enemies, the worshippers of those heavenly bodies.

The Gibeonites by treachery had persuaded Israel to make

a covenant of peace with them. To punish them five kings of the Amorites made a combined attack upon their city. They send an urgent message to Joshua begging him to help them. Joshua marches all night, and falls upon the Amorites early in the morning. "And the Lord discomfited them before Israel, and slew them with a great slaughter at Gibeon." West of Gibeon was the descent of Beth-horon, a rugged and most difficult pass, which proved fatal in later times to a retreating Roman army. If anywhere, a defeated enemy would here make a final stand before committing themselves to this dangerous ravine. It was there, therefore, that the Lord sent that terrific hailstorm in their faces which sent them headlong down the fatal gorge. It was there, too, that Joshua, having the sun in the east over Gibeon behind him, and the moon in the west over Ajalon, at this momentous crisis in the battle prayed that the terrifying darkness might continue until his enemies were completely routed.

He cannot have wanted longer daylight, for from the position of the sun behind him over Gibeon in the east, and the moon before him in the west, it must have been about nine in the morning when he uttered his prayer. At no much later time could the sun and moon have been so situated.

The words which Joshua used are consistent with this more rational explanation of the miracle, for he does not command the sun to stand still upon Gibeon, but, as more literally translated in the margin, both of the Authorized and Revised Versions, to "be silent." *Dôm*, the Hebrew word which he uses, means to be dumb or silent, and never has any signification connected with movement or cessation of movement. Mr. Palmer has shown in how many languages the same word is used to express the ideas of darkness and silence. Indeed, in our own language Milton represents the blind Samson as saying :

"The sun to me is dark,  
And silent as the moon,  
When she deserts the night,  
Hid in her vacant interlunar cave."

The same word is used in the Hebrew in verse 13: "And the sun was silent, and the moon stayed"—*i.e.*, stayed from shining, or stayed as it was.

Such were the recorded words of Joshua, from which it seems evident that he did not call upon the sun to stand still in its course, but to continue in obscurity. Of course, nothing is impossible to the Almighty; but it is in the highest degree

improbable that He would work such a miracle as that which He is supposed to have done, especially when under the circumstance, now better understood, it would have been wholly unnecessary.

But what of the words which follow: "And the sun stayed in the midst of heaven, and hastened not to go down about a whole day"?

It is from these words rather than from those spoken by Joshua that a wrong view of what actually happened has so universally prevailed, causing so much perplexity to the believer and putting such a strain upon his faith.

But as Joshua certainly did not command the sun to stand still in its course, which would have been of no use to him, but to be silent or dark, so the verb *Amad*, stood or stayed, must be understood in a sense consistent with the verb used in the principal clause of the prayer. And it is so used of the moon just before: "And the sun was silent, and the moon stayed" (remained so).

It is used, apparently, in this sense in Hab. iii. 11: "The sun and the moon stood in [betook themselves into] their dwelling."

It often means "to remain in any state or condition." Thus, it is said of Leah, after the birth of Judah, that "she stood from bearing"—that is, ceased bearing (Gen. xxix. 35, xxx. 9).

And so this inserted comment on the answer to Joshua's prayer must mean: "And the sun stayed"—*i.e.*, stayed in the condition which Joshua desired. "And there was no day like that before it or after it, that the Lord hearkened to the voice of a man," spreading a thick darkness over the sun and moon, to the terror of the Amorites who worshipped them, "for the Lord fought for Israel."

There is another miracle connected with the sun in which modern science enables us to see by what intervening link of a natural cause it was probably effected. To confirm God's promise to Hezekiah, Isaiah prayed that the shadow of the sun might go back ten degrees on the dial of Ahaz. This must have been the natural result of a sudden and miraculous change in the density of the atmosphere, causing a refraction of the sun's rays. Every evening after the sun itself has sunk below the horizon its image remains visible for some little time, its rays being refracted by the denser atmosphere near the surface of the earth. A few weeks ago an elongated image of the sun suddenly appeared above the horizon, due probably to some unusual condensation of the air. It is absurd, therefore, to suppose that the intervening link in the causation of this miracle had anything to do with the revolution of the earth on its axis, when it might so naturally result

from a sudden refraction of the rays of the sun, causing the shadow to appear ten degrees higher on the dial.

We don't know what sort of dial it was or what were the width of the degrees, but of course the retrogression of the sun's shadow would depend upon the density of the medium through which its rays passed.

Another difficulty in the book is that of the commanded wholesale slaughter of the Canaanites. Such massacres, indeed, are far from uncommon in the history of the world. They have occurred in modern times, and even in so-called Christian countries. In the age of Joshua, and for many centuries before and after his time, the slaughter of men, women and children, and even the ripping up of the pregnant, was far from uncommon. Accustomed to such ruthless treatment of the vanquished by the victors, the Israelites were not shocked, as we should be, by the command of Joshua to exterminate the conquered Canaanites.

There is no difficulty, therefore, in believing the truthfulness of the historian in his account of these massacres. It may be a question whether God gave such a command, and so sternly insisted upon its being carried out to the letter; but the record of the massacre itself does not in any way affect the question of the historical character of the book.

It is important, however, to observe that the Israelites were strictly forbidden to adopt this common practice of heathen nations, in all other battles with their neighbours. The Canaanitish races were to be specially dealt with for very special reasons.

The following was to be their ordinary practice in warfare :

“When thou drawest nigh unto a city to fight against it, then proclaim peace unto it. And it shall be, if it make thee an answer of peace, and open unto thee, then it shall be that all the people that is found therein shall become tributary unto thee, and shall serve thee. And if it will make no peace with thee, but will make war against thee, then thou shalt besiege it: and when the Lord thy God delivereth it into thine hand, thou shalt smite every male thereof with the edge of the sword; but the women and the little ones, and the cattle, and all that is in the city, even all the spoil thereof, shalt thou take for a prey unto thyself, and thou shalt eat the spoil of thine enemies which the Lord thy God hath given thee. Thus shalt thou do unto all the cities which are very far off from thee, which are not of the cities of these nations. But of the cities of these people, which the Lord thy God giveth thee for an inheritance, thou shalt save alive nothing that breatheth; but thou shalt destroy them: the Hittite, and the Amorite, the Canaanite, and the Perizzite,

the Hivite, and the Jebusite; as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee: that they teach you not to do after all their abominations, which they have done unto their gods; so should ye sin against the Lord your God" (Deut. xx. 10-18).

Here, then, we have the meaning of this unique Divine purpose.

This strange command to make no peace with the cities of Canaan, but to slay with their own hands the men, women, and children which were in them, was intended to burn into the hearts of Israel a sense of God's hatred of the cruel and unnatural crimes which they committed in the obscene worship of their gods.

And it had this effect. For, except when they apostatized from their own Jehovah, and worshipped the idols of Canaan, the Israelites were conspicuous among the nations for their abhorrence of infanticide and the unnatural and cruel practices of the heathen.

In His moral government of a race to whom He had given freedom of will, God seems to have educated mankind as we educate our children. From Adam to Christ His system of government has been one of more or less immediate or temporal rewards and punishments.

But having once proved by signal judgments His hatred of impurity, He has left men free to profit by their teaching. For a too frequent use of rewards and punishments obviously interferes with man's freedom of choice and action.

Sexual sins are the only causes mentioned of the universal corruption of the society of the antediluvian world, and the flood was God's expression of His hatred of them.

When this proved insufficient, the fires of Sodom and the annihilation of the cities of the plain were added to emphasize and make clear this teaching to all future generations of men.

But this was not enough to put an end to the "abominations which the Canaanites did unto their gods."

Here, then, we see the meaning of the selection of a chosen people to be the teachers and the witnesses of God's moral law until the coming of Him who should entirely change God's system of government by temporal rewards and punishments, and raise mankind to a higher moral level, as no longer servants under bondage, but the free and loving children of the Father through the Incarnation and Atonement of Jesus Christ.

Few readers of the Bible realize sufficiently the great difference which is apparent between the system of Moses and that of Christ, and between the nation of Israel and the Christian Church.

The nation of Israel was an army sent out to fight with the literal sword and spear against the enemies of mankind, against the enemies of God and His law.

The Church of Christ is an army of martyrs led to victory by a Martyr King, sent forth to overcome evil by good, to conquer the devil and the world, "by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony, and because they loved not their lives even unto death" (Rev. xii. 11).

Christendom, since the age of Constantine, has often sadly forgotten this. Hence the sword has been freely used to propagate the religion of the King of Peace (Rev. vi. 4).

Emperors and kings have compelled their subjects and conquered nations to be baptized; and the rulers of the Church have employed the armies of kings and the tribunals of the temporal magistrates to suppress all opposition to their decrees by fire, and sword, and the horrors of the torture chamber.

And have we yet thoroughly learned the lesson so plainly taught by Jesus to His impetuous disciples, when they asked Him whether they should call down fire from heaven to destroy His enemies? It was quite right that Elijah should do this, because he was living under the system of Moses, but the Son of man came not to destroy men's lives, but to save them (St. Luke ix. 54).

As it was the duty of Elijah, at the command of God, to slay the false prophets of Baal, so it was the duty of Joshua and his warriors to exterminate the sinners of Canaan.

As God destroyed men, women, and children by the waters of the flood and the fires of Sodom to express His abhorrence of their cruel and unnatural crimes, so by the sword of Joshua He exterminated the sinners of Canaan who practised the same abominations in the worship of their gods.

It was a terrible lesson, and this is given as the reason why these sinners were to be utterly destroyed: "That they teach you not to do after all their abominations which they have done unto their gods, so should ye sin against the Lord your God" (Deut. xx. 18).

It is important also to remember that Israel was not given the possession of the Promised Land for their own righteousness, but because of the wickedness of the Canaanites (Deut. ix. 4-6).

Again and again this is impressed upon them.

"Speak not thou in thy heart after that the Lord thy God hath thrust them out from before thee, saying, For my righteousness the Lord hath brought me in to possess this land: whereas for the wickedness of these nations the Lord thy God doth drive them out from before thee . . . know

therefore, that the Lord thy God giveth thee not this good land to possess it for thy righteousness : for thou art a stiff-necked people."

After giving a terrible list of the crimes of these nations, God says by Moses : "Defile not ye yourselves in any of these things : for in all these things the nations are defiled which I cast out from before you ; and the land is defiled, therefore I do visit the iniquity thereof upon it, and the land vomiteth out her inhabitants. . . . Ye therefore shall keep My statutes . . . and shall not do any of these abominations . . . that the land vomit not you out also, when ye defile it, as it vomited out the nation that was before you " (Lev. xviii. 24-29).

It was, therefore, to impress upon Israel first, and then upon all future generations of men, the duty of purity, that these wholesale slaughters of sinners were commanded. And through all their history Israel was appointed to be the sword of the Lord to execute vengeance upon sinners.

Israel was to go forth as the army of the Lord into a sinful and God-forgetting world, "with the praises of God in their mouth, and a two-edged sword in their hands ; to be avenged of the heathen, and to rebuke the people ; to bind their kings in chains, and their nobles with links of iron " (Ps. cxlix. 6).

All this was to be changed when Christ came, as the Captain of an army of martyrs, with His call to suffering here and His eternal rewards and punishments hereafter.

But the Christian Church has too often forgotten this, and lost sight of the secret of Christ's victories, following Moses and Joshua instead of Christ ; using force and the sword to make converts instead of persuasion and kindness, and the example of a holy and self-denying life.

Like the infant Christian Church, united by love into one society of believers, the Israelites little thought what a falling away from God and scattering was soon to follow, so that for many generations any central place of worship should be as impossible as a united Church. For when we wonder at the apostasies of Israel, we must never forget that the Christian Church has imitated, or, rather, far exceeded, the sins of God's ancient people, and has fallen further away from Him who said : "By this shall all men know that ye are My disciples, if ye have love one to another"; whose words of prayer are the condemnation of a divided Christendom : "That they all may be one . . . that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me " (St. John xvii. 21).



#### ART. IV.—THE CHURCH AND THE SOCIAL PROBLEM (continued).

##### III. THE "OPPORTUNITY" AND THE "EQUIPMENT."

UNDER the head of "opportunity" I would bring all which makes it possible to apply "the Truth," as contained in the principles of Christ, to the "needs of men," as manifested in the social conditions of the present time. And under the head of "equipment" I would consider the means of doing this now at the disposal of "the Churches," and more particularly at the disposal of the Church of England.

I. As to the opportunity—1. I believe it is at present great in this respect, that, amid all the terrible indifference of which we see so much evidence, there never was a greater readiness to listen to "the principles of Jesus," nor was there ever at bottom (even if unexpressed) a stronger conviction that, if the evils of society are to be remedied, we shall be wise in seeking their remedy in these principles. The amazing (if very ephemeral) popularity of a book, with not very much besides its title—"What would Jesus do?"—to recommend it, certainly witnessed to the widespread interest in the answers to this question. As Professor Peabody says: "It is one of the most extraordinary signs of the times that, while the great *doctrines* which centre about Christ have to great multitudes almost lost their meaning, His personality has acquired fresh loyalty and homage. . . . Among the conflicting activities of the present time, His power is not one more activity among the rest, but is that of wisdom, personality, idealism. Into the midst of the discordant efforts of men He comes as one having authority; the self-assertion of each instrument of social service is hushed as He gives His sign; and in the surrender of each life to Him it finds its place in the symphony of all" (pp. 127, 128).

2. Another factor in the "opportunity" of the present I believe to be the growth, however slow and feeble it may yet be, of "the power of appreciation of truth," or at least of the detection of unreality. Even a little education frequently gives this. There is a sense in which it is true that the mass of the people are both terribly thoughtless and extremely ignorant. They seem, almost wilfully, to refuse to think, and they often appear to be incapable of that appreciation of truth and moral beauty which it should be the primary object of education to bestow. But I believe these powers of appreciation are much more dormant and unexercised than actually non-existent. As a proof of this, I would cite the fact that we

frequently see this power exercised in a way which is not pleasant for "the Churches"—I mean in the way of criticism. The criticism may be ignorant and unjust, it may be superficial and untrue, but the very fact of criticism witnesses to the existence of interest. It witnesses to some mental activity, and it suggests to us the possibility of increasing this interest, and of guiding its exercise into wiser and more profitable directions.

3. Another element in the present which should not be disregarded is "the sense of responsibility for the poor," which probably has never been felt as it is felt now. This sense of responsibility may often be little more than a vague "feeling," whose exact nature it may be difficult to define. As to how to act upon this feeling there may be little, if any, intelligent knowledge. But its existence adds to the opportunity, and it is certainly a force to be employed by being guided to a wise discharge. As Professor Peabody says: "Never was the sense of responsibility for the poor so profoundly felt by the Christian Church as at the present time. No body of Christians, however humble, can maintain its self-respect without an elaborate organization of compassion and relief" (p. 232).

4. As one more factor of the opportunity, I am inclined to add the growing sense of stewardship. This, of course, is far from being either so deep or so general as it should be; still, I believe it is more conscious and more widespread than it was. It forms a more common topic for sermons, and for speeches at all kinds of philanthropic meetings. And though thousands of rich and leisured people still seem to be utterly regardless of any other thought about their time and money except that these may be used solely for their own self-gratification, yet the number of those is growing who have at least "an uneasy feeling" that, where they do possess time and money, a portion at least of one or both of these should be devoted to some object external to themselves. As a proof of this, the immense increase in the number and variety of charitable and philanthropic agencies seems to imply a corresponding increase in the number of those who are trying "to do something or other for those who need."

Taking into consideration all these various signs of the times or factors of the age—and with more space I could have increased their number—I am led to the conclusion that at present the "opportunity" (I use the word in its widest sense) does seem propitious for a "forward movement" in an attack upon "the social problem."

II. I turn now to the "equipment" of "the Churches" as they stand face to face with the problem, and as they are attempting its solution. This equipment may be regarded

under two heads: (1) That of "organization" or machinery; (2) that of workers.

1. At first sight the Church of England seems here—in her "parochial system"—to have an enormous advantage over all other Christian bodies. Has it not been said in praise of the definiteness and comprehensiveness of this system that there is not a man, woman, or child anywhere in England but who dwells within some definite parochial boundary, for the oversight of which some definite man with cure of souls is responsible? Surely, where the best or most possible is made of it, it would not be easy to exaggerate the value of the parochial system.

Here I would take the opportunity of most strongly recommending, to everyone who is in any way interested in the social problem, "Chalmers on Charity"—an admirable compendium, drawn from many volumes, of Chalmers' work and teaching on that subject. The book has been compiled and arranged by Mr. G. F. Masterman, who is himself an authority upon the subject, and whose own teaching, generally as a commentary upon Chalmers, is a valuable part of the book. It would be difficult to praise this book too highly; and if I were asked to name any *one* book in which could be found the safest and soundest advice as how best to deal with the problems of poverty—no small part of the social problem—I should without hesitation name this book of Chalmers.

I mention it here because Chalmers had the strongest possible belief in "the parochial system." Upon its lines all his work was done. He felt that it gave to himself and his workers a definite position and a definite sphere of responsibility; and I suppose there is not on record a more thoroughly successful experiment than that which Chalmers inaugurated and carried out in his large, poor Glasgow parish, with its ten thousand people, in the lowest and worst part of the city. I have not space here to describe either Chalmers' methods or results, but everyone who wishes—whether on parochial lines or otherwise—to be a true helper of the poor should make a careful study of these methods. They are, I believe, not only right ones—they are the only right ones; and just because he employed them his success was assured.

Mr. Masterman's comment at the end of the description of Chalmers' plan is as follows: "The parochial clergy have an immense advantage over the best agencies which have been formed to guide the administration of relief. They are strong where the societies are weak. They have a territorial system divided into small areas, and occupied by a band of visitors with a moral mission to the poor. They can exert the highest kind of influence. These are the very conditions which

Chalmers established in his model parish. But here the resemblance ceases. Our clergy do not use their instruments for his purpose. The position has been thrown away. The natural relationship between the people and their friends has been destroyed by almsgiving, and that too often of the very worst kind—inadequate almsgiving at the hands of visitors uncontrolled by discipline or knowledge.”

This condemnation is certainly too sweeping, though in the great majority of cases it is probably only too true. Did not, at least, one Metropolitan Relief Committee last winter seek to prove its wise expenditure of the funds committed to it by stating that “those clergymen whose wisdom and knowledge in regard to this work were not assured” had been carefully excluded from its operations?

The parochial system, if well and wisely worked—that is, by men inspired by the wisdom and equipped with the knowledge of Chalmers—is excellent. But this is a very large proviso. And is it not well known to social workers, as to others, that frequently the best instruments are the most dangerous in the hands of those who do not know how to use them? The parochial clergy have, as Mr. Masterman shows, definite areas in which, as far as our Church organization is concerned, their authority may be said to be supreme. Thus, for the efficiency or inefficiency of any voluntary organization connected with the Church or ecclesiastical parish they must finally be held responsible. Let me say that I do not here refer merely to the organization of charity, to which Mr. Masterman refers, but to all *voluntary* organizations for the moral and spiritual, as well as the material, benefit of the people.

In this lies the weakness of the parochial system—in the frequent *unfitness of the men* who occupy positions from which, simply for inefficiency, they cannot be removed; and, from being in possession, they also prevent others from doing good work in the areas over which they may be said to have control.

2. We must also remember that the inefficiency of the head affects all the workers. One of the very strongest parts of Chalmers' work lay in his judicious choice and in his careful training of his workers, to whom he imparted his principles, and who worked in strict obedience to these. All this I must not stay to describe, but must again be content with a reference to the chapter in Mr. Masterman's book entitled “The Parochial System of St. John's.”

No doubt one of the difficulties which clergymen to-day—especially those working in large and poor parishes—have to encounter is the finding of suitable workers. Most of

Chalmers' twenty-five deacons came from *outside* his parish; but, remembering the attraction which, as Professor Peabody shows, philanthropic work has now for so many, it ought not to be difficult, if they are sought over a sufficiently wide area, to obtain suitable workers. Here is one point in which, surely, the parochial limit may be overstepped, and so leisured persons living in rich parishes may find work among their poorer brethren.

Thus, as far as the "opportunity" and "equipment" are concerned, the present time does seem favourable for the Church to make progress towards the solution of the great pressing social problem. The atmosphere is full of evident interest, and not only of interest, but of an uneasy conscience—indeed, of an ardent desire to do something which may be beneficial. These feelings, surely, can be utilized. Then, as far as equipment is concerned, the Church has her parochial system, her buildings, and her workers. She has her churches and schools and mission-halls. She has her clergy and her great host of lay-workers, her zealous laymen (would they were more numerous!), her sisters and her deaconesses, her district visitors, her day and Sunday school teachers.

Wherefore, then, her alleged paralysis and her apparent failure to exercise a real and manifest influence for good upon the great masses of the people? To attempt to answer these questions shall be the last portion of my subject.

#### IV. THE NEED TO-DAY.

Of this, again, I believe we shall best think under the same two heads of (1) organization and (2) equipment (*i.e.*, properly equipped workers).

If the parochial system, as alleged, is generally a failure, it is so, not because of any inherent weakness in itself, but on account of the men who are working it. We must remember that the number of "large and poor" parishes is now very great; they are found in the towns, and in the country, and even in the suburbs. But who will venture to assert—even if we could insure that the most suitable man for the particular parish was always placed over it—that among the clergy there is an equal number of men who may be described as "well equipped" for the work which the head of each of these separate "spheres of influence" should be capable of doing? Let me speak of only a portion of that equipment.

1. It implies the fullest knowledge available of what may be termed in the widest sense "social science"—*i.e.*, the principles and laws which govern the welfare of society, these laws being in themselves as fixed and irrefragable as the laws

of chemistry or building-construction. To obtain this knowledge will need much hard study of all kinds of the best literature dealing with the various aspects of the social question; and, in the light of this knowledge, it will demand study of these various problems very *patiently* and at first hand. The discrepancies between the opinion of an expert and the rough-and-ready method of dealing with some fragment of the social problem as generally pursued by amateurs (*e.g.*, in regard to almsgiving) may well lead us to think seriously.

2. The equipment of the parochial clergyman should imply the qualification of being able to "address," and so to appeal to, the "masses." With these "manner" is a great matter. They will not listen to "a poor talker." I do not say they demand oratory, but they do demand clear, thoughtful, earnest, and "ready" speech. They want a man who can state his case clearly, and whose method of stating it appeals to them. And not only do the clergy need this power, but they need to cultivate it in their workers. Yet how many lay-speakers in an average parish are capable of "holding" an audience of working men? Here I believe the Nonconformists, and especially the Wesleyans, with their lay-preachers trained by years of practice, are far stronger than the Church. As a proof of the Church's weakness here, I would again ask anyone to look through the various returns of the recent religious census in London, and especially to those columns headed "Church of England Mission Services." No one can examine these without noticing how very few *men* appear to attend these services, either in the morning or the evening. Here we have, at least, one key to the weakness of the Church when brought face to face with the masses of the people—a weakness which is in some measure due to the great weakness of the parochial system—I mean in its tempting us to have, if not actually too many efforts, certainly too many *weak* ones. This thought leads us back to the question of organization.

Churchmen may at times learn something from Nonconformists, and undoubtedly the modern Wesleyan method of strong "Central Missions" in our great towns has much to recommend it. I cannot speak from personal experience of their London missions; but I can do this of their Manchester Mission, whose success, judged by more than one standard and from more than one point of view, may be regarded as phenomenal. I only wish I had space to tell of what I know of the work whose centre is the Central Hall, in Oldham Street. But anyone who wishes to learn about it may for one shilling obtain a history and report of the mission, entitled "After Fifteen Years." This volume—for it consists of more

than 200 closely-printed pages—will, I think, convince any dispassionate reader of what an enthusiastic, yet wise and intelligent, aggressive effort may do among the masses of the people. A few figures may be given. The official paid staff—consisting of superintendent, ministers, lay-preachers, sisters, and nurses—now numbers 36. The *voluntary* workers are more than 1,500. Besides the Central Hall, the mission owns, or rents and works, thirteen other buildings, including a great Men's Home, shelters for women and girls, and a House of Rest. In the Central Hall alone each week upwards of 70 services, meetings, and classes of various kinds, are held. In the various Sunday-schools there are more than 3,500 scholars and more than 300 teachers. On a Sunday evening the Central Hall, which holds 2,000, is packed; the Free Trade Hall, almost the largest building in Manchester, is equally crowded, and a relief service has now to be held in the Grand Theatre. It is computed that by the paid and voluntary workers more than 6,000 visits are paid each week to the homes of the people, while in one way or another week by week some 30,000 people are under the influences of the mission. On the social side the work, as far as one can judge, is equally successful. Take, for instance, the men's shelter and labour yard. In these two it is shown in the last report that in one year 5,802 helpless men were dealt with. The expenditure was £2,160, but the income—received from the letting of cubicles, the sale of food, and the work of the men—amounted to £2,283, showing a profit of £123: 3,198 cubicles were let weekly at 3s. a week, and 12,870 were let nightly. The report of the women's shelter is very similar, and showed a profit on the year of more than £95.

Where lies the secret of success? I believe, very largely in this: that a thoroughly efficient man stands at the head of the mission—a man who is a genius in the work—and that his next lieutenants are almost equally capable. One "weak" chapel after another in the city, with perhaps a feeble organization and a dwindling congregation, has been, not absorbed by the mission, but put into connection with it, and always to be revived into strong, effective, and aggressive vitality.

I now ask, "Is something of the same kind impossible in the Church?" And I answer, "Yes, quite impossible, *so long as* the parochial system is narrowly and selfishly and rigidly worked." I would not *destroy* the parochial system in our great towns, but I would not regard it as supreme. It requires to be worked *under* a higher and larger system. Here the diocesan system is ready to our hand. If the parochial system is to be successful, from the highest religious point of view, in

dealing with the great indifferent masses of the people, it must be worked as part of a diocesan system.

The details of such a scheme would require the most careful consideration, and they would have to be adapted towards the needs of each town and its particular population. But in each great town, for this particular work, there should be as superintendent (this word implies the office and work to be done, rather than the title necessarily to be chosen) one who is an expert in social work, and who has great power of appealing to the people. Under him there should be a small band of experts ready to carry on this work anywhere in the town. The superintendent would know what part each parish was able to take in the whole work or permanent mission; while much of the time of his immediate helpers would be taken up in the careful training of voluntary workers, who would, of course, work within the limits of the different parishes. But the various churches, schools, and mission-halls would at suitable times be at the command of the mission superintendent for services and meetings of a missionary nature. But behind all schemes there will lie the need of men—capable in themselves and capable of training others—if the great “social problem” is to be solved. Till these are found, or, rather, trained and educated, the Church will remain, as to-day, in the majority of parishes conspicuous by her weakness rather than by her strength.

I cannot speak from experience as to how far instruction upon the various problems which comprise the social question enters into the ordinary curriculum of the theological college, nor as to how far knowledge of the subject is required by the Bishops in candidates for Holy Orders. But, surely, for practical usefulness in dealing with and influencing men, few branches of knowledge can be more necessary!

Enthusiasm and self-sacrifice are essential, and among both the clergy and the voluntary workers in our large, poor town parishes we see many and very beautiful examples of both virtues. But without knowledge and skill to direct these forces they must to a large extent prove ineffectual.

That this knowledge and this skill are among the greatest needs of the Church to-day, those who know how religious organizations are struggling, but, alas! too often making little progress, among the toiling multitudes of our great centres of population, can feel no doubt.

W. EDWARD CHADWICK.



## ART. V.—BYWAYS OF CHURCH HISTORY.

THE Rev. Wentworth Webster, for a considerable time the holder of a foreign chaplaincy, has lately given to the world the results of his long-continued studies in the less frequented regions of Church history.<sup>1</sup> His object is to give information concerning the tenets of the Church of Rome "from authentic documents," and he laments, in his preface, that so many English Churchmen resort to less trustworthy sources of information. The contents of his volume are literally what he describes them as being, "Gleanings"; but he so uses the various sources of his information as to enable us to correct various impressions which, unfortunately, are widely spread among Englishmen at the present time. The importance of the book is considerable. Mr. Webster is both well informed and scrupulously fair. We shall therefore allow him, as far as possible, to speak for himself, premising that the conclusions which we shall give in his own words are amply supported by the facts recorded in his work. The papers are on a great variety of subjects, and are most of them reprints from the *Foreign Church Chronicle* and the *Anglican Church Magazine*. It is well that they should be made accessible to the public in a more permanent form.

The first paper is on the alleged relics of St. James in Santiago de Compostella. After a careful review of the evidence, Mr. Webster sums up as follows: "Can it be rightful for the heads of any Church so authoritatively to declare the literal truth of facts which the more learned members of their Church have ceased to believe in, which they have thoroughly disproved, and to impress and impose on the unlearned the belief in facts thus disproved, as is done in these decrees and encyclical letters of Pope Leo XIII.?"

In his essay on "Minor Christian Latin Poets" we note that he describes them as taking a uniformly cheerful view of the visible universe, with but one, and that a most significant exception. *Woman* is the one black spot on God's beautiful universe! "Prima mali labes heu femina! . . . erepti tu causa boni, tu janua morbis." Here we see the cause of the lax morality of East and West alike, an evil which arose early, and is never to be overcome until we are permeated by the deep moral teaching of the first chapter of Genesis. Matter, said the Gnostic and the Manichæan, is essentially evil. All things, said the author of Gen. i., are of God, and all He

<sup>1</sup> "Gleanings in Church History, chiefly in Spain and France." By Rev. Wentworth Webster, M.A. Oxon., Corresponding Member of the Royal Academy of History, Madrid. London, 1903. S.P.C.K. 356 pp.

created "very good." From the paper on "The Spanish Church up to the year 1000," based on the work of the Jesuit Masdeu, we extract the following reflection: "It might, I have thought, be of interest, and perhaps even of service, to English Churchmen, showing as it does that even a Jesuit theologian can look back with envy on a National Church, under royal protection, and with Bishops appointed directly by the Crown." Masdeu, moreover, tells us how "there were no cloistered monks in Spain for the first five centuries, only lay hermits and consecrated virgins living in private houses." "The consecrated virgins *were not allowed to make a vow of chastity*, nor were they permitted to take the veil *under forty years of age*." "All monks and nuns," we further learn, "were subject to their Bishop both in temporal and spiritual things." But after the year A.D. 1000, as Masdeu's pages inform us, the royal power was first humiliated, then the clergy were exempted from the royal authority, then the nomination of Bishops and the power of convoking national councils was taken from the Kings, while "concubinage among the clergy, with other disorders unknown before, followed on the introduction of monasticism." Perhaps those who are so busy in reintroducing medieval doctrine and practice among us at present may listen to a Jesuit when they are deaf to the voice of "Protestant intolerance." But at least the reasonable Englishman will find here abundant cause for doubt whether modern reactionaries are likely to be of real service to his Church.

Another paper is on "Loyola and the Counter-Reformation." We regret that we can only extract from it the following passage: "One fact we may mention which seems to have escaped his pen [*i.e.*, of the author Mr. Webster is quoting]. Portugal was the favourite country of the Jesuits in Europe. Paraguay was their chief success in mission-work. Portugal was the first to expel them; hardly a trace remains of their work in Paraguay. Facts such as these should be remembered when we read of the extraordinary cleverness of the Jesuits, and of the superexcellence of their system, even while they need not make us stint our admiration of the ability, the heroism, and the saintliness of many of the members of the Order."

We must pass over two interesting papers on "St. Teresa" and on "The Mysticism of Valdés and Molinos." From "Hispanism and Regalism" we may extract a remark on the information given us by a Canon of the fourth Council of Toledo, A.D. 633, that the *province* was the unit of ritual uniformity. The idea of "Catholic custom" in the matter of ritual thus derives as scant support from Spain in the seventh as from the Church at large depicted by the historian Socrates of the fifth century. We have next a sketch of hysteria dis-

guised as saintliness in the life of St. Philomena, and "a likeness and a contrast" discovered in the respective careers of Lamennais and F. D. Maurice. The "Life of Père d'Alzon" is full of instruction, but we cannot quote from it. From that on ecclesiastical appointments in Spain we gather that "in the Basque Provinces and Navarre, the only fervently religious provinces of Spain," no Bishop, up to the beginning of the last century, "had the appointment to a single benefice"; the livings were all in the gift of the Crown, or the clergy were elected by the parishioners themselves; and Father Larra-mendi, S.J., assures us that "these last made by *no means the worst appointments.*"

Perhaps the most valuable of all Mr. Webster's papers are those on the recent congresses of the Roman Church. The special congresses to which he refers are those of Jerusalem in 1893, of Rheims in 1894, of Brussels in 1898, of Lourdes in 1899, and the Latin-American Council at Rome in the same year. We have not space to give the lengthened quotations we could wish to give; but we shall be much pleased if the brief allusions to the subject should whet our readers' appetite for more, and induce them to study the book itself. The first remark which Mr. Webster makes is that, whereas in the early part of the nineteenth century it was predicted that pilgrimages and other superstitious practices would speedily disappear, at the beginning of the twentieth they have become more common than ever. So says the late Professor Reusch in his "Die Deutschen Bischöfe und der Aberglaube," in which he appeals to the German Bishops to put a stop to the rapid and alarming growth of superstition. "Pilgrimages, in particular," says Mr. Webster, "are now so common that that it would be difficult in France to find any very professedly devout family one of whose members at least had not made" one or more. "Yet, with all this centralization," he says again (he is speaking of the greater authority vested in the Pope since the Infallibility decrees), "never was there a greater multiplication of new saints, new cults, of indulgences attached to material objects, of forms of popular devotion, of so-called pious beliefs and practices, at variance with what is truly Catholic" (p. 337). In other words, the Roman Church has placed herself on an inclined plane, and cannot arrest her downward progress. The smoother the way is made for her, the faster she travels on it.

Mr. Webster further points out the admissions made at these congresses concerning the gradual growth in times past of the customs which the medievalist school is making such strenuous endeavours to naturalize as "Catholic" among ourselves. As the Roman Church no longer appeals to history,

but to authority, these admissions are made without hesitation. As *our* appeal is to history, we ought to take careful note of them. Thus, the famous letter of Pliny (A.D. 120) is accepted as fixing the date when the Agape was definitely separated from the Communion, and when, therefore, the practice of Evening Communion ceased to be universal. The idea that St. Paul abolished it after he wrote his first Epistle to the Corinthians is not hinted at for a moment. "The practice of Evening Communion on fast days is recorded in the Maronite Liturgy down to 1736." In the Syrian Liturgies the celebrant is directed to consume the elements "after the Mass and the departure of the people." In the "Life of St. Gregory III." it is further admitted that in early times "there was consecrated only what was necessary for the Communion of the people." So much for the antiquity and "catholicity" of Reservation! Then we hear of the greedy acceptance of wild tales about devil-worship among the Freemasons, culminating in the famous "Leo Taxil" and "Diana Vaughan" scandal, which created so vast a sensation on the Continent a few years back (though we in England, as usual, knew nothing about it), and over which Leo XIII. made himself so supremely ridiculous.<sup>1</sup> Then we learn how the longevity of the late Pope is seriously attributed by "pious" folk to the offer of themselves by sundry young persons as "expiatory victims," offering the years which they might have lived to protract the life of the Pope—dying, in fact, that he might live! Next we find the members of Congress complaining of the "frightful increase" of civil funerals in France, from 600 in 1873 to 16,000 in 1888. "Deaths without sacraments," we are further told, "are increasing; at the same time first communions, and even baptisms, are diminishing."<sup>2</sup> And yet we are gravely advised by many English theologians of repute to look to Rome for the best methods of bringing religion to bear on the English working classes! Among those methods we find "perpetual" and "nocturnal" adorations of the Eucharist. In it, the workman and others are taught, is "a blood which vibrates (*qui tremit*)." "Ecce Deus Vedster," cries the Abbé Lemire, of Paris—"The Holy Eucharist, *it is your God*." The nineteenth century, we further learn, was the "Age of Mary"; The twentieth will be the "Age of the Sacred Heart."<sup>3</sup> At Brussels we learn from Dom Laurent Janssens that, "quite

<sup>1</sup> The reader may also consult Mr. Webster's final paper on "Legend and Folk-lore, Credulity and Incredulity, in the Nineteenth Century."

<sup>2</sup> P. 546 of the Report of the Rheims Congress.

<sup>3</sup> Report, pp. 609, 610.

recently, the Sovereign Pontiff has shown how the cult of St. Antony of Padua is a powerful help to devotion towards the Holy Sacrament," and a resolution was accordingly passed at the Brussels Congress that "all devotions to the saints, and especially the cult of St. Antony of Padua and the blessed Gerard,<sup>1</sup> lead to devotion to the Very Holy Sacrament of the Altar and to our Lord Jesus Christ."<sup>2</sup> At Lourdes we find ourselves confronted with a new development—the "Eucharistic Heart of Jesus." This has been "legalized in *fifteen briefs*" of His Holiness the Pope. We further learn that, "since Jesus is born of Mary, it is *her* flesh which is sacrificed and suffers," and is present in the Eucharist. Whether the flesh of David, of Abraham, or of Adam, is similarly present we are not told. Lastly, at the Latin-American Congress at Rome it was decreed that the Council "should be consecrated to the Heart of Jesus and to the Immaculate Conception of the B.V.M." The formula was repeated by the whole Council "with such fervour of heart and voice that it called forth tears of sweetest devotion and most tender trust from the eyes of many."<sup>3</sup> The rage for novelty is responsible for the introduction of so many sensational innovations in the Roman Church, as in our own.

"We omit much," says Mr. Webster. And so do we—a great deal which we should like to include in this paper. But we trust enough has been said to make the reader ask, Why have we not been told all this before? Our insular indifference to the religious state of the Continent of Europe has much to answer for. We are, as a nation, utterly ignorant of the disastrous condition into which the imbecilities and puerilities of Roman ecclesiastics have plunged the religion of Christ among millions of people in foreign lands. On the one hand we are gravely assured by sundry unbalanced enthusiasts among ourselves that religion among us is at the lowest ebb, and that it can only be quickened into life by our adoption, as far as possible, of the Roman system, while another party among us, with a holy horror, refuses even to look at Rome as she is, and does not care to be informed of her latest extravagances and ineptitudes. The one party shuts its eyes and, as far as it can, the ears of everybody else to all the mistakes of the Roman Church; the other will not allow Englishmen to learn anything from such

---

<sup>1</sup> What "blessed Gerard" is this? Surely not the assassin of William the Silent.

<sup>2</sup> Report of Brussels Congress, pp. 112, 113. The Bishops, however, have since found it inconvenient to print, as formerly, the details of this cult. They have become too unpleasantly well known in England.

<sup>3</sup> *Acta*, p. lxii.

mistakes. But the strongest evidence against Rome is the evidence of facts. We therefore recommend both parties to study Mr. Webster's most temperate and unimpassioned account of the extraordinary absurdities in which modern Romanism is wallowing. It will be found the most effective way of weaning sundry very ill-informed persons in this country from the foolish idealization of the Roman Church in which they have so long been indulging.

There is only one point on which we are not in full accord with Mr. Webster. In his interesting paper on the "Petite Église"—the body, we must explain, of seceders brought into existence in France by Napoleon's unfortunate Concordat of 1801—he descants on the evil of schism, and speaks of "the fatal incline along which it insensibly slides into error and all kinds of mischief." Now, we are not disposed to deny that schism is an evil, and even a very serious evil. We find this out in our own miserable disputes about the Education Act. But there are worse evils than schism. Has not the Reformation schism done far more good than evil to the world at large? Has not the Old Catholic schism brought into existence on the Continent a perpetual witness for Catholic truth, and against Roman perversions of that truth? The schism of the Concordat in France was but a half-hearted protest, and it was to this fact, not to the fact that it was schism, that all the mischief it did is owing. The Bishops allowed themselves to die out without perpetuating their order. The consequence is a *diaspora* of a few thousands, scattered over France, without ministers, without churches, without forms of worship, gradually narrowing in its sympathies, and dying of inanition for want of the nourishment by which the Christian life has ever been sustained. Is Mr. Webster sure that the present serious decay of Christianity in France, to some of the signs of which we have already alluded—the 800 secessions from the French priesthood, the alarming spread of superstition and credulity in the French Church—that this might not have been prevented had there been a body of believers in existence pledged to maintain the older standards of faith and ecclesiastical life? Old Catholicism, unfortunately, has made no progress in France. The Protestant Church, still more unfortunately, is rent from top to bottom by fundamental differences of opinion. The "one thing lacking" is an effective standing protest in favour of those elementary truths of which there "was never any doubt in the Church." Yes, there is one thing worse than schism, and that is a slavish submission to authority when authority deliberately teaches the thing that is not true.

## ART. VI.—THE REAL DIFFICULTY OF THE HIGHER CRITICISM.

A HISTORY of the Hebrews,<sup>1</sup> written from the point of view of the Higher Criticism, cannot have failed to raise once more in many minds the whole question of the interpretation of the Old Testament. The author has prefaced his book with an introductory chapter in which he sets himself to write a summary "in a simple form" (p. i) of the main conclusions of the modern school. He is to be congratulated on having made a statement which is not only simple, but is eminently lucid. It commends itself still more by its reverent tone and by the evident signs which it bears that the writer possesses sympathy with those who find it hard to adjust their ideas about inspiration to the modern view. This is manifest, for example, in such words as the following: "Sneers at theories of verbal and mechanical inspiration are often due to a complete failure to apprehend the seriousness of the question at issue, and are of no assistance to those who approach the criticism of the Scriptures with any appreciation of its gravity" (Introduction, p. xii).

It is further to be discerned in the passage in which the question of the Book of Deuteronomy is discussed, in which, after giving the modern view, the writer continues: "On the other hand, there is a most natural repugnance to attribute one of the most earnest and spiritual books in Holy Scripture to one who used the venerable name of Moses to advance his own opinions" (Introduction, p. xxiv).

We are encouraged, therefore, to consider the passages in which Mr. Foakes-Jackson describes the attitude of the objector whom he is so evidently anxious to help. The *first* occurs on pages i and ii,<sup>2</sup> and is introduced by the following paragraph: "The decision of modern criticism is that almost every book of the Old Testament shows signs of being composite in character, the work of several authors combined by one or more redactors. In a sense, this is so in the case of every historical work. No historian can be independent of the works of others. His function is to make inquiry, to sift statements made by others, before presenting his own conclusions. A modern author generally puts his own work into the text, and gives his authorities in notes or appendices, sometimes quoting a passage at length from a work he has con-

<sup>1</sup> "The Biblical History of the Hebrews." By F. J. Foakes-Jackson, B.D. 1903.

<sup>2</sup> This and subsequent references are to the introductory chapter referred to above as "Introduction."

sulted. But in early days, when books were scarce, authors composed their works for the information of readers who cared little how the facts were collected; no scruples were felt in copying authorities wholesale, or in combining the narratives of other writers without any acknowledgment. It is supposed that this was the method employed by the Biblical writers, nor can they reasonably be blamed for appropriating the labours of others, since they wrote, as a rule, anonymously, with the sole object of edifying and informing their readers. It is the duty of the modern critic to attempt to discover the process by which the work before him has been reduced to its present shape, to discern what is really ancient, what is more recent, and what parts have been supplied by its latest editor."

This is followed at once by a paragraph headed "Objection to the Modern Method." It reads as follows: "A possible objection to this method is that, since all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, the sacred writers had no need to set to work like profane historians, to consult traditions, monuments, writings, and the like, but had only to set down that which they were moved by God's Spirit to write."

And a little lower down: "But the answer to the foregoing objection is supplied by the sacred writers themselves. In the later books they do not scruple to acknowledge their obligations to earlier works. From the first, indeed, there is evidence of what may be styled a pre-Biblical literature, consisting of books like those of the 'Wars of Jehovah' and of 'Jashar.' The task, therefore, of attempting to resolve the Scriptures into their original component elements can be approached without either presumption or irreverence."

The *second* passage occurs after the modern view has been illustrated by a consideration of the opening chapters of the Book of Genesis, the conclusion of which is stated in the words: "Enough, however, has been said to show that the theory that Genesis has been compiled from many sources is tenable" (p. xiv), while a little further on it is contended that "the fact that the writer used many authorities should add (to) rather than lessen our admiration for his work" (p. xvi).

Reference is then made to an objection as follows: "Still, the question arises, how far the researches of a student are compatible with the notions current concerning the nature of inspiration. What claim, it may be asked, can men, who, like historians, have gathered together their materials and put them into literary form, have to be considered as peculiarly inspired by God's Spirit?" (p. xvi).

The answer is then given: "In answer to this, it may be urged that the greatest productions of the human mind have,

as a rule, been the result of strenuous effort and careful preparation. Yet the production of the *improvisatore* sometimes excites more vulgar admiration than one who has 'a capacity for taking infinite pains.' Creative genius may be so far identified with our conception of 'inspiration' that in both something indefinable from without seems to make a man accomplish more than his unaided nature is capable of. But just as genius, when combined with strength of character and determination, produces infinitely better work than when it manifests itself in a transitory form, so the highest form of inspiration may well accompany earnest effort and firm purpose to tell the truth. The compiler of such a book as Genesis may have been more truly inspired in his labours than one 'falling into a trance, yet having his eyes open.' Why need the presence of God's Spirit be denied in assisting such a writer to select, classify, and arrange the best information he possessed, if the result justifies such a claim? The value of the work is not lessened because the critical spirit of the present day has succeeded in discovering its present sources. The sun shines none the less brightly because the spectroscope has discovered the elements of which it is composed. The history of the growth of the historical and prophetic literature is, moreover, not merely an account of individuals, but of a Church. The Bible grew with the ever-developing religious consciousness of Israel. By modern methods we are able to discern, not only how inspired books were composed, but how the spiritual life in God's people developed from its earliest stages. It need not be added that the question of the date of the compilation of a Biblical work does not affect its intrinsic worth. Genesis is equally beautiful whether it issued from the hands of Moses in its present form, or whether it was not fully completed till after the Captivity" (pp. xvi, xvii).

No one can read these paragraphs without feeling that the author has made a serious attempt to meet the difficulties of those who stand aloof from the views of the modern school. But, strangely enough, the objection, as he states it, is not the chief objection which is felt towards the Higher Criticism. There are many persons who find no difficulty in believing that the "researches of a student" (p. xvi) are not incompatible with inspiration. To illustrate from the New Testament, there are few who would not be ready to allow that, when St. Luke undertook to write the Acts, he used the ordinary methods of the historian. They would at once agree that there is no reason for "denying the presence of God's Spirit in assisting such a writer to select, classify, and arrange the best information he possessed" (p. xvi). So with regard to the Old Testament: it is conceded by many that in the case

of the historical books earlier "sources" have been used, to which the writers not seldom refer. (In addition to the references to pre-Biblical writings, as instanced by Mr. Foakes-Jackson, there are the frequent references to "the Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel" in 1 and 2 Kings, etc.)

For those who think that a true theory of inspiration leaves no room for human means, the remarks above quoted should prove of value; but let it be understood, once for all, that they do not touch that which constitutes the real difficulty which is felt by many to belong to the position taken up by Modern Criticism. It may be well that it should be stated again.

As it presents itself to a considerable number of persons, it is as follows: They feel that the modern theory practically denies to the writers of Old Testament history the historian's instinct. They point out that the Old Testament writers are regarded by the representatives of this school as, not merely collecting a number of documents, but using them for purposes of instruction, and that not always in a reliable way, but so as to be capable of "deliberately improving" (p. xviii) on an earlier narrative, of "intruding" (p. xxvi) their views into a book, of possessing the "tendency to make events as far as possible square with their ideas of how the worship of Jehovah ought to have been conducted in early days" (p. xxv), and in one case—that of Deuteronomy—of "advancing their own opinions by literary artifice" (p. xxiv). They note that the result of this view is to make "a good deal of conjecture" (p. xxviii), not merely allowable, but actually necessary, and that, consequently, "the task of reconstructing the story of Israel from the Old Testament is a hard one" (p. xxvii).

It is such an estimate of the methods which, according to the theory, were adopted by the writers of the Old Testament books which constitutes the real difficulty. It is not a question of repugnance to the idea of a "composite book" in the ordinary sense of the term, but to a *peculiar theory* of "composite authorship," according to which each succeeding "editor" becomes himself a "source," so that what he adds has to be allowed for. It is merely confusing to justify the modern view of "editors" (or "redactors") by an appeal to the methods of ordinary historians. The whole point of the view is that, in the case of the "editor," the instinct of the historian was overshadowed by the desire to commend some religious ideal to the men of his own time. We may grant that the books are composite, and yet deny composite "authorship" in the special sense in which the expression is used.

Let us look a little more closely into the meaning of "composite authorship." It means that the history of the pro-

duction of an Old Testament book might have been as follows : An author (B) took as the main basis of his own book an earlier book by another author (A), and proceeded to rewrite it in such a manner as to make it appear that a certain desirable course—affecting belief or practice, or both—was pursued in the earlier time of which A had written, though A (for this is part of the theory) had said nothing about it. The motive of B is supposed to have been both pious and practical. He is supposed to have acted in the interests of a reform of which he felt that there was pressing need. He is supposed to have acted on the principle that the end justifies the means, and to have argued that, because certain things ought to happen in his own time, they must be commended by being as far as possible represented to have taken place in an earlier time. Some years later the book, as modified by B, was rewritten by C with a similar motive, though this time in the interests of a different reform. It follows that, according to the theory, an Old Testament book may consist of different “strata.” Thus, in our example the first stratum is the original book (*i.e.*, the work of A). The second stratum is made up of the “modifications” which B has introduced into A’s composition, while those introduced by C into the book as it has been left by B constitute the third stratum. A parallel case would be to suppose that a writer of the sixth century A.D. took the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius and rewrote it in the interests of the See of Rome, omitting a few of the facts which he found recorded, and interpolating a sentence or two where the purpose of the writer made it expedient to do so.

Now we affirm that such a theory of composite authorship involves an important question of ethics. If books were constructed on this principle, it is impossible to regard them with the respect with which they have hitherto been regarded, for we lose confidence in the characters of the authors. They cease to be for us honest historians. Indeed, they cease to be in any intelligible sense of the word *historians* at all. To be consistent, we must not merely defend their conduct, we must also defend that of the imaginary later author (or “editor” or “redactor”) of Eusebius. Nay, we must be prepared to go further, and say that the principle which regulated the production of the forged decretals (in which the decisions of early Councils were *actually* treated in precisely the same way as the history of Eusebius in our supposed case) may under certain circumstances be defended.

In regard to the Book of Deuteronomy, Mr. Foakes-Jackson does indeed speak of “a most natural repugnance to attribute one of the most earnest and spiritual books in Holy Scripture

to one who used the venerable name of Moses to advance his own opinions" (p. xxiv). But the conduct which on this hypothesis was the conduct of the author or latest author or editor of Deuteronomy differs only in degree, and not at all in kind, from that which is attributed to other authors of other books. The same *principle* is involved in all the cases. In all we have the employment of a method which is as repugnant to the moral sense of the ordinary man as it is opposed to the historic sense of the historian. Whether it is a single sentence or a whole book that is so constructed, the principle is the same. Deuteronomy is an extreme case, that is all.

With regard to Deuteronomy itself, when we read that "perhaps the only way is candidly to admit that such a literary artifice is not as abhorrent to Orientals as it would be to us" (p. xxiv), it is obvious that candid admission leaves the difficulty untouched. Some grounds ought surely to be given for an estimate of the particular "Orientals" in question, according to which the literary artifice would not be so repugnant to them as it is to us. Some reason ought to be given for believing that the literary artifice was so universally fashionable as to render untenable the suggestion that the Spirit of God might have selected one who refrained from its use. And, again, we should expect to know whether there are any grounds for believing that the custom of employing literary artifice of this type had changed by the beginning of the first century A.D.

But we are not at present concerned with any particular instance. What we wish to lay stress upon is that the case of Deuteronomy is not different—as regards the principle involved—from the cases of other books which are held to have resulted from composite authorship.

It may be convenient to sum up what appears to us to be the logical outcome of the Higher Criticism (in so far as it is identified with this theory of composite authorship). It involves for us three paradoxes :

1. That the historians of almost any age and of almost any nationality are more worthy of credit than the historians of the Hebrew nation in the centuries which preceded the Christian era.

2. That the method by which Old Testament books were made to assume their present form was one the adoption of which by certain writers of the early Middle Ages has always been regarded with scorn and abhorrence.

3. That the work of men for whom inspiration is claimed requires to undergo a process of sifting, for which inspiration is not claimed, before the true story of Israel (which includes the story of God's dealings with Israel) can be known.

It is the fact that the theory of composite authorship leads to conclusions of this fundamental character which constitutes its "real difficulty." And as the theory is only a theory after all, it may not be amiss that the Higher Criticism should reconsider its position, and see whether the data upon which its theory is based may not be as adequately explained by considerations of another order. At least, let the difficulty be fully realized.

H. J. GIBBINS.



#### ART. VII.—REMARKS UPON CANON GELL'S

##### "NOTES ON THE INTERMEDIATE STATE AS AFFECTING THE RESURRECTION."

(THE CHURCHMAN, *September*, 1903.)

IT is impossible to deny that Canon Gell has presented a formidable array of Scriptural arguments against consciousness in the intermediate state, and it must be acknowledged that his reasoning is fatal to such developments as the Romish doctrine of purgatory, or the possibility of repentance and conversion in that condition. But we think that he goes too far in ignoring the interval between death and judgment altogether.

On p. 652 he assumes that all who do not accept what is really the popular idea of "sudden death, sudden glory" hold an "activity" of the soul in the intermediate state. But surely there may be a ripening of the sheaves already cut but not garnered, even though there can be no change of tares into wheat. The earliest Christians certainly prayed for the departed, though in a limited sense. This shows that, in spite of New Testament authority, according to Canon Gell, they did not regard the transition from death to judgment as instantaneous. I think Canon Gell does not attach sufficient weight to the fact that the Apostles anticipated a speedy second coming of our Lord, and therefore the intermediate period was not to them a "long period," as he infers on p. 657. He adduces the term "sleep," which is used so much for "death" in the Bible; but, at the same time, this image, it must be remembered, was also very common in heathen writers. In the mouth of the latter it did not always imply an awakening, if ever. In the mouth of Christians it appears to do so, and is surely used to signify a continued life. Sleep is not the same thing as unconsciousness. It has its dreams, more or less. As Hamlet says:

"To sleep, perchance to dream—ay, there's the rub,  
For in that sleep of death what dreams may come!"

We suffer in our dreams, and we enjoy ourselves in our dreams. Our dreams are reminiscent of our waking life, and also reflect our apprehension of what is to come.

Canon Gell speaks as if we who believe in intermediate consciousness considered each person judged at death (p. 638). This is just what we do not do, and his question asked on the same page, "What can be understood by this Judgment Day?" is to be answered thus: "The settlement of man's final destiny—the perfection of the blessed and the second death for the utterly lost."

His quotations from the Old Testament on p. 658 are beside the mark. It is through the Gospel that light is thrown upon life and immortality. Many consider that but few, if any, Old Testament saints had a sure hope of eternal life. Their despairing thoughts of death and Sheol are not for us to adopt; nor is the philosophy of Ecclesiastes to be our model. A progressive revelation is acknowledged by all intelligent students of Holy Writ, and implied in Heb. i. 1.

He refers to the Transfiguration. If this was a real appearance of Moses and Elijah, and not a mere vision, it surely teaches an intermediate state—at any rate, in their case—which was capable of activity, though not apparent to mankind save by the resumption of their bodies.

He uses our Lord's words to the dying robber for his purpose; but does he mean that "to-day" our Lord was to be in glory? The Apostles' Creed implies that he was in "Hades," and, *pace* Canon Gell, we adhere to this view. The robber was no doubt thinking of a future Messianic kingdom, such as those of which Jewish apocalyptic literature is full, and one, perhaps, not far distant. Our Lord does not grant his actual request, but, instead, the promise of immediate rest, where He too was going. Canon Gell appears to regard "paradise" in this passage as having nothing to do with the intermediate state, but, rather, as referring to the permanent future condition, contrasted with Hades. He quotes Ps. xvi. 11 so as to support this contrast, though it is quite unnecessary to make it do so. It is in the hope of speedy resurrection that the body falls asleep (ver. 10), taking the Psalm in its Messianic sense. There is no aversion expressed for Hades, unless as a permanent abode. In our Lord's mouth "paradise" is not synonymous with the "gloomy shade of Sheol," as Canon Gell thinks we suppose. It represents "Abraham's bosom," which in the parable of Luke xvi. is the portion of Hades enjoyed by the blessed. The writer in Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible" alludes to the Rabbinic school, which regarded it as "a region of rest in the heart of the earth—the intermediate home of the blessed." The writer of the article himself is inclined to con-

nect the New Testament idea, rather, with the popular belief of the Essenes. As to its use by our Lord on the cross, he considers it as promising the robber what he needed—repose, shelter, and joy. But that it could be synonymous with Christ's glorious kingdom in the Christian sense, who ever imagined? That kingdom is usually described in Holy Writ as having its locality on earth—a new earth—not below or above.

The parable of Dives and Lazarus Canon Gell evades. In his note on p. 660 there is an error, making the word "paradise" occur in this connection, which it does not. The scenery of the parable may indeed be only by the way, but the use of the expressions "tongue" and "flame" would be merely figurative, and would not necessarily imply an embodied spirit. The whole story is inexplicable if, as Canon Gell says, the Bible does not sanction intermediate consciousness; in fact, if Canon Gell's methods are allowable, may not the Bible be made to prove anything?

I do not think Canon Gell will be disappointed when he says that "warm-hearted Christians will not readily yield to the cold arguments of the understanding"—*i.e.*, to his arguments. At any rate, only those who have built up a non-Scriptural and uncatholic fabric upon the basis of intermediate life and consciousness have anything to fear from his exposition. In the case of such persons it may do good, but it has not converted the present writer, for one, to the view of Archbishop Whateley and the creed of those who view death, resurrection, and judgment as simultaneous processes.

CARLETON GREENE.



## THE MONTH.

THE Church Congress will be held this month in circumstances by no means conducive to its securing due public attention. The beginning of October is to be marked by the formal initiation of a political movement, which is probably the most important, and is certainly the most exciting, that has occurred in our time. The whole Free Trade controversy has been reopened, and the Fiscal Policy which has prevailed in this country for the last sixty years is challenged by the leaders of the party in power. Mr. Balfour has published a pamphlet, entitled "Economic Notes on Insular Free Trade," previously circulated among his colleagues in the Cabinet, in which he formally declares himself in favour of "regaining our liberty" to protect ourselves against hostile tariffs in other countries by imposing retaliatory duties on imports from such countries into British ports, and he is to expound

this new policy in an address to the National Union of Conservative Associations at Sheffield on October 1. This decision has involved the resignation of several members of his Government, and among them of Mr. Chamberlain. But the resignations of Mr. Chamberlain and of the other retiring Ministers are prompted by precisely opposite reasons. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Lord George Hamilton, and Lord Balfour of Burleigh, have resigned because they refuse to follow Mr. Balfour in departing from our existing policy of free imports. But Mr. Chamberlain has resigned because he desires to go further than Mr. Balfour, and recognises that it is impracticable at present to expect the Ministry to go with him. His aim is to establish such fiscal relations with the Colonies as will create, as far as may be practicable, an Imperial Zollverein, binding the Colonies to us by tariffs which will establish a mutual preference in trade within the Empire, and will protect both them and ourselves against hostile tariffs in foreign countries. Such a scheme, however, involves preferential taxation on some articles of food, and is consequently open to the damaging accusation of taxing the food of the people, and giving them a "small loaf" in place of a large one. Mr. Chamberlain believes that his proposals would not have this effect of increasing the cost of the necessaries of life, but he recognises that the prejudice which has been raised by this cry against his proposals is too great to be disregarded at present by the Government, and he therefore resigns with a double object—first, to avoid embarrassing the Government by allowing them to be associated prematurely with his larger schemes; and, secondly, that he may have a free hand to urge his whole policy upon the country. He agrees with Mr. Balfour so far as he goes, and will give him cordial support; and meanwhile he will endeavour, by an active campaign on his own account, to remove the existing prejudice against a larger policy, and thus to render it possible for the Government, in due time, to go further than they can at present. Mr. Balfour has plainly declared that Mr. Chamberlain has his goodwill in this effort, and the two statesmen are thus practically working towards the same ends.

It is outside the province of this journal to enter into the controversy, which involves political and financial considerations of the greatest gravity and complexity. It may, however, be observed, for the purpose of elucidating the question at issue, that it will probably be found that the cry of the dear loaf, so hastily raised, will prove to be irrelevant. If Mr. Chamberlain desires to tax some food, or food imported from some markets, it is only in order to render other food, and especially food imported from colonial markets, more

plentiful and more secure. If, for example, by the operation of a preferential tariff, the wheat-growing industry of Canada could be fully developed, it seems not improbable that the corn required by the people of these islands could be mainly, if not entirely, derived from that colony, and that we should thus not only secure as cheap a supply as at present, but should be relieved from the danger, to which we are at present exposed, of having the source of our food at the mercy of a hostile country. We content ourselves, however, with stating the issue. The contest over it will be conducted by statesmen of the highest ability and energy, and must absorb the thoughts of the constituencies for a long time to come.

In such circumstances we must expect that the education controversy and the disputes among Churchmen themselves will sink for a while into the background in the interest of the public. If the result is to ensure time for the Education Acts to be brought into practical operation, the advantage may be great. They have, at all events, set a great machinery in action which must have the effect of giving a fresh impetus to the actual work of education, and which will probably prove to provoke much less friction in practice than has been anticipated by partizanship. Passions may be expected to cool, and if any modifications are found to be desirable, they may be introduced in the light of experience, and after quiet reflection. The election at Rochester, which followed immediately after the announcement of the political crisis, does not indicate any failure in the strength of the Government, and gives no indication that the Nonconformist agitation is dangerous to the Unionist party. It may be not less advantageous if attention is for a while diverted from the Church controversies of the hour. Under our new Archbishop we are entering upon a new period of Church life, with fresh opportunities, and it may be hoped that means will be found, under calm reflection, to moderate the dangerous divisions which at present distract us. The Congress will deal with some of the more important of these subjects of division—with the limits of doctrine and ritual, for instance, admissible in a National Church; and with the vital interests at stake in the present position of the criticism of the Scriptures, and particularly of the Old Testament. We can only hope that the discussions may tend to reassure the minds of Churchmen, to check the alarming tendency in some quarters to the adoption of views inconsistent with the settled teaching of the Church, and thus to set the energies of Churchmen more free for the cultivation of that spiritual and moral life to which all doctrine and all ritual should be subservient.

# INDEX TO VOL. XVII.

## INDEX OF SUBJECTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
ABRAHAM, Moses, and Christ . . . . .	589	General Character of Old Testament Prophecy, The, by the Editor . . . . .	363
After the Church Congress: a Meditation on Service and Devotion, by the Editor . . . . .	99	Henry VIII., by the Rev. Arthur Galton . . . . .	81
Anglican Communion and Church Reform in Spanish Lands, by the Rev. T. J. Pulvertaft . . . . .	88, 143	Idea of the Church Catechism, The, by the Rev. J. Llewelyn Davies, D.D., Rector of Kirkby Lonsdale . . . . .	505
Assyriology and the Early Records of the Book of Genesis, by the Rev. W. T. Piltner . . . . .	436	Leo XIII., by the Rev. Arthur Galton . . . . .	625
Authority of the Old Testament, The, by the Rev. Chancellor Lias . . . . .	399, 466	"Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott, D.D.," by the Rev. W. E. Chadwick, Vicar of St. Paul's, Sale, near Manchester . . . . .	492, 513
Baptism: its Place in the Christian System, its Part in the Christian Life, by the Rev. Canon T. D. Bernard . . . . .	393, 449	Light from the Almanack on two of our Lord's Miracles, by the Rev. J. Foxley . . . . .	120
Butler's "Analogy," by the Rev. Canon Meyrick, Rector of Blickling . . . . .	317	Limits of the Oxford Movement, The, by the Rev. Arthur Carr . . . . .	570
Challenge, Dr. Horton's, by the Rev. J. Foxley, Rector of Carlton, Worksop . . . . .	520	Month, The . . . . .	50, 164, 218, 278, 107, 329, 386, 445, 502, 554, 614, 667
Church and the Nation, The, by the Rev. F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock . . . . .	214	Notes . . . . .	336
Church and the Social Problem, The, by the Rev. W. E. Chadwick, Vicar of St. Paul's, Manchester . . . . .	641	Notes on the Intermediate State as affecting the Doctrine of the Resurrection, by the Rev. Canon Gell, Rector of Ripple . . . . .	652
Church Work in India, by the Rev. Walter Wace, Rector of West Hanningfield, late Chaplain on the Madras Establishment . . . . .	596	Notices of Books . . . . .	222, 332, 390, 558
Constitutional Government: a Friendly Criticism, by the Rev. F. G. Spencer, Vicar of All Saints, Haggerston . . . . .	427	Our Lord's Teaching concerning Himself—III., by Principal Sheraton, of Wycliffe College, Toronto . . . . .	16
Definite Religious Teaching for the Young: The Church Catechism and the Free Church Catechism compared, by the Rev. J. Llewelyn Davies, D.D., Vicar of Kirkby Lonsdale . . . . .	281	Our Lord's Virgin Birth and the Criticism of To-day, by the Rev. R. J. Knowing, D.D., Professor of New Testament Exegesis in King's College, London . . . . .	232, 290, 345, 412
Discovery of Jewish "Molten Images" at Dan, The, by Miss M. Brodric, Ph.D. . . . .	47	"Our Unhappy Divisions"—VI., by the Rev. N. Dimock . . . . .	23
Disputed Punctuation of the Church Catechism, by the Rev. N. Dimock . . . . .	337, 404	Plea for an Effective Diaconate, A, by the Rev. P. Petit . . . . .	325
English Church in the Sixteenth Century, The, by the Rev. Arthur Galton . . . . .	158	Point of Technical Accuracy in the Gospels, A: <i>πλοῖον</i> and <i>πλοῦριον</i> , by the Rev. J. E. Green, M.A., Mus.Doc., Vicar of Farmcot and Lower Guiting . . . . .	579
Episcopal Charge in the Seventeenth Century, An, by the Rev. W. E. Chadwick . . . . .	192	Present Dearth of Clergy and Scarcity of Candidates for Holy Orders, by the Rev. Carleton Greene . . . . .	176
Ezekiel on the Early History of Religion in Israel—chap. xx., by the Rev. T. D. Bernard, Canon of Wells . . . . .	225	President Roosevelt on "The Strenuous Life," by the Rev. W. Edward Chadwick . . . . .	134
		Principles of the Interpretation of the Apocalypse, by the Rev. F. E. Spencer . . . . .	186

	PAGE		PAGE
Prophecy in our Lord's Ministry, by the Editor	241	turer on the Septuagint in the University of Oxford	534
Prophetic Character of the Jewish and Christian Revelations, The, by the Editor	113	"The Integrity of Scripture," by Rev. F. Ernest Spencer	32
Recent German Criticism of the Old Testament, by the Rev. J. J. Lias, Chancellor of Llandaff	635	"The Strength of the People," by the Rev. W. E. Chadwick	299, 380
Recent Literature in Relation to the Witness and Work of St. Paul, by the Rev. Professor Knowling, D.D.	1, 57	Thoughts on some Social Questions, Past and Present, by Louisa Twining	73, 149, 203
Reunion and Establishment: an Appeal to English Christians, by the Rev. J. Foxley, Rector of Carlton	372	Tiglath Pileser, King of Babylon—the Key to Isaiah xiii. 1 to xiv. 27, by the Rev. C. Boutflower	39, 67, 123
Reviews	52, 109, 167	True Theory of the Supernatural in Relation to Modern Doubt, The, by the Rev. Canon W. Hay M. H. Aitken	561
Secession of French Priests, The, by the Rev. W. Burnet, Vicar of Childerditch	270	Unity of the Spirit, The: a Congress Meditation, by the Editor	9
St. Luke's Gospel and Modern Criticism, by the Rev. Arthur C. Jennings, Rector of King's Stanley	250, 307, 353, 422, 458	Universities and the Masses, The, by John Garrett Leigh, Esq.	527
St. Stephen's Speech, by the Rev. T. D. Bernard, Chancellor of Wells	617	Use and Application of Holy Scripture in the Prayer-Book, The, by the Rev. Carleton Greene, Vicar of Great Barford, St. Neots	539
Star of Bethlehem, The—Matt. ii. 1-17, by J. Harvey, Esq., late Inspector of Schools, North India	258	Use of Old Testament Prophecy in the New Testament, by the Editor	169
"The Age of the Fathers"; being Chapters in the History of the Church during the Fourth and Fifth Centuries, by E. H. Blakeney, Esq.	601	Value of Prophecy as an Evidence of Revelation, The, by the Editor	476
"The Conflict of Duties," by the Rev. W. Edward Chadwick	606	Virgin Birth, The, by the Rev. J. Foxley, Rector of Carlton, Work-sop	473
"The First Bible," by the Rev. H. A. Redpath, Grinfield Lecturer on the Septuagint in the University of Oxford	534	Visit to Jericho, A, by Hannah Moore Henderson	210
		What England may Learn from Italy, by the Rev. Canon Meyrick, Vicar of Blickling	486
		William Blake: Seer and Mystic, by Miss Whiting	547

## INDEX OF AUTHORS.

	PAGE		PAGE
Aitken, Canon W. Hay M. H.	561	Harvey, J.	258
Bernard, Rev. T. D.	225, 393, 449, 617	Henderson, Hannah Moore	210
Blakeney, E. H.	601	Hitchcock, Rev. F. R.	214
Boutflower, Rev. C.	39, 67	Jennings, Rev. Arthur C.	250, 307, 353, 422, 458
Brodrick, Ph.D., Miss M.	47	Knowling, D.D., Rev. Professor	1, 57, 232, 290, 345, 412
Burnet, Rev. W.	270	Leigh, John Garrett	527
Carr, Rev. Arthur	570	Lias, Rev. Chancellor	399, 466, 635
Chadwick, Rev. W. Edward	134, 193, 299, 380, 492, 513, 606, 641	Meyrick, Rev. Canon	317, 486
Davies, D.D., Rev. J. Llewelyn	281, 505	Petit, Rev. P.	325
Dimock, Rev. N.	23, 337, 404	Pilfer, Rev. W. T.	436
Editor, The	9, 99, 113, 169, 241, 363, 476	Pulvertaft, Rev. T. J.	88, 143
Foxley, Rev. J.	120, 372, 473, 520	Redpath, Rev. H. A.	534
Galton, Rev. Arthur	81, 158, 625	Sheraton, Principal	16
Gell, Rev. Canon	652	Spencer, Rev. F. Ernest	32, 186, 427
Green, M.A., Mus. Doc., Rev. J. E.	579	Twining, Louisa	73, 149, 203
Greene, Rev. Carleton	176, 539	Wace, Rev. Walter	596
		Whiting, Miss	547

THE  
CHURCHMAN

*A Monthly Magazine*

*CONDUCTED BY CLERGYMEN AND LAYMEN  
OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.*

EDITED BY  
HENRY WACE, D.D.  
DEAN OF CANTERBURY

VOL. XVII.  
*NEW SERIES*

LONDON  
ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW  
1903