

# 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

June, 1913.

## The Month.

Divinity  
Degrees.

FOR the time being, at least, Oxford and Cambridge have settled the question, but they have settled it in different ways. At Cambridge, in a House of 600, a ten per cent. majority was in favour of the change. At Oxford, in a House of upwards of 1,200, two votes to one were cast against it. But it must not be imagined for a moment that the question is settled. We believe that in the interests of Christian charity and of Christian scholarship—nay, more, in the interests of Christian justice—the Degrees and Examinerships in Divinity must be thrown open to those Christian students and teachers who stand outside the Established Church. Moreover, we have reason for believing that the vote at Oxford was not really brought about by any disinclination to grant Degrees and Examinerships to Nonconformists. Of course, there are many who, in the interests of a narrow but mistaken ecclesiasticism, would confine the Degrees to the Church of England, many who believe with the *Church Times* that “undenominationalizing” means, logically, secularizing. Frankly we do not take that view, and we believe that many who voted *non-placet* last month do not take it either. It seems to us that the Oxford scheme suffered a good deal from its details and its wording, and a good deal more from the language used in its defence by its friends. In his speech against the Decrees, the Dean of Canterbury, probably the most influential of all their opponents, contended that a Christian thesis can be broadly determined to be such, and we venture to agree that with a

little more care and thought a new set of Decrees can be evolved, which will bring many of the 800, and amongst them the Dean, to the *placet* side.

It ought to be clearly understood that the vote was not, as some of the Nonconformist papers have suggested, a mere piece of narrow-mindedness. Just now official Nonconformity has little right to lecture the Church of England on the subject of sectarian bitterness. At the same time, two blacks do not make a white, and the 800 who voted against the Decrees were few, if any, of them influenced by the Welsh Disestablishment Bill. Orthodox Nonconformity has contributed too much to Christian scholarship and Christian theology for Churchmen to forget the debt. We look forward to the day when a fresh set of Decrees shall be submitted to Convocation, framed in such a way as will win the support of all moderate and really Catholic Churchmen.

**Church  
Finance.** Canon Bullock-Webster, the Secretary of the Archbishop's Committee on Church Finance, has issued a pamphlet on the place of Missions in the reform scheme. We hope the pamphlet will be repudiated in due course by the Central Board of Missions; until that is done it is bound to do serious mischief to the progress of the scheme. There are obvious dangers and difficulties in that scheme, but we have felt that as loyal Churchmen, Evangelicals should do their best not only to acquiesce in its general principles, but loyally to share in the work of carrying it into effect, using their best endeavours at the same time to overcome the difficulties and to avoid the dangers. Canon Bullock-Webster in the four pages of his pamphlet makes a startling and most unwelcome suggestion. Put in plain words, it is the abolition of the Church Missionary and other Missionary Societies. The C.M.S. for more than a century has stood at the centre of Evangelicalism, and has represented all that is truest and best amongst us. It has done, moreover—and we say it in no invidious way—more service in the cause of Missions than any other society of the Church of England. If in the real furtherance of the Kingdom

of God the time has arrived to cast the C.M.S. upon the scrap-heap, no Evangelical will complain. But the time has not arrived, nor will it, so long as Evangelicalism is true to its Master and to itself. The pamphlet in question is an incitement to murder living organisms, and it is essential that its purpose be frustrated. We hope that in every diocese that Evangelicals will do their best to facilitate the working of the Diocesan Board of Finance and the general organization of the new scheme, but we do most strongly protest against this effort to undermine the labours of our Missionary Societies. Canon Bullock-Webster has thrown out a feeler; let our answer be a clear and pointed refusal to be parties to his plan.

We were very glad indeed to notice some sentences which fell from the lips of the Bishop of St. Albans at the annual meeting of the Church Missionary Society. Dr. Jacob is a warm-hearted and wise-headed veteran in the cause of Missions, and a reassurance from him gains additional force. He told his audience that he was anxious to dissipate the understanding upon this matter, and he added: "It has never entered into the minds of the Board of Missions to do anything other than help the Societies, and we mean to help them. It has never been in the minds of the Archbishop's Committee on Finance to do anything whatever to supplant a Society." This reassurance, coming from one who has been intimately connected both with the Board of Missions and the Committee on Finance, goes far to dispel our anxiety. As, however, silence on the subject might be taken to mean indifference, we feel bound to make our protest against the bare suggestion of Canon Bullock-Webster's pamphlet.

**China.** The Government of China has officially asked for the prayers of the Christian Church. If that sentence had been printed in this magazine fifty or even twenty years ago, we should have been accused not only of falsehood, but of folly. It is easy to exaggerate its importance. It does not mean that China is won for God. It does not mean that

Christianity is to become the official religion of China, either now or in the near future. But it does mean that all the years of Christian work and witness, all the patience and self-sacrifice, all the suffering and martyrdom, are at last beginning to gain their rightful influence upon the slow-moving mind of China. It does mean the opening of the door of opportunity in a way in which it has never been opened yet. Christianity and Christian missions are beginning to count in China. What of the homeland? We still have to deplore the absence of a sense of proportion in the matter of missions. Funds have increased, but never in proportion to the need, and the present position gives cause for real anxiety in many directions. This news from China comes to us just when we most need to hear the clarion call of opportunity.

The Report of the Royal Commission upon the  
 University of London has just been issued, and, as  
 we should expect from the calibre of the Commis-  
 sioners, it is a document of the weightiest importance. For us in the Church of England who are concerned with the education of our future clergy—and no loyal Churchman can be unconcerned—it has special significance, in view of the Resolutions of the two Upper Houses of Convocation requiring a University degree from candidates for Holy Orders after 1917. It is important to remember that you can gain a University degree without a University education, and that you can receive a University education without necessarily gaining a University degree. The Report of the Royal Commission makes this fact quite clear, and the leader-writer of the *Times* sums up the position in a paragraph of particular sagacity :

“When we say that a man has received a University education, do we mean that he has set the seal upon his studies by taking a degree conferred by a recognized University on the results of an examination, or do we mean something more indefinite, but much wider in its scope—that he has acquired by association with fellow-students and teachers that spirit and love of learning which is an end in itself, and enables the student to apply his knowledge throughout his life in an ever-widening circle? If we mean the first, then the ‘external’ side of London University, which has admittedly

done such good work in the past, is still of paramount importance ; then it is sufficient for undergraduates to pass examinations upon set syllabuses and to work either alone, aided by needful coaching, or in a variety of unrelated and independent institutions, vaguely grouped under the general ægis of a University. But if we mean the second—and no one can doubt that this should be our meaning, even if it is not—‘external’ examinations diminish in importance ; it is the ‘internal’ life which becomes essential.”

We are wholly at one with the writer of these lines. Education is always more important than examination ; University education infinitely more valuable than graduation. The whole problem of education in England is as complex as any problem that man has had to face. The problem of elementary education has not yet been settled. We have changed many things in connection with it during the last forty years, but we have very much yet to do. The problem of clerical education is almost as difficult, and hurried changes are not necessarily reforms. The weighty Report of the Royal Commission has added one more factor which must be taken into account.

We make no apology for once more returning to this subject. Some Evangelicals had grave misgivings, which we scarcely shared, about the enabling Bill. That Bill has been withdrawn, and a special Bill for Sheffield and East Anglia substituted. It is perfectly clear to all who know anything of the work of a modern Bishop that the three new dioceses involved are urgently needed in the interests of the progressive work of the Church. The new Bill is not open to the possible objections of the old, and yet its progress has been blocked. Its opponents are some of them Nonconformists, and we deny the right of Nonconformity to prevent the expansion of our work ; there is little of Christian charity in such opposition. Some of the opponents, however, are Churchmen, and they oppose the Bill, to put it shortly, because the present bench of Bishops has not done its work, because abuses unchecked by Episcopal authority have been allowed to creep into the Church of England. We profoundly regret this opposition. Reformation churchmanship will never

gain anything by a policy of stupid obstruction. To overwork the Bishops that we have because some of them have not done as much as they might to exercise their proper oversight of the Church can only in the long run discredit those who are parties to such action, and can never make the smallest contribution to the real welfare of the Church. We yield to none in our loyalty to the Reformation settlement, but we repudiate as firmly as we can the misguided policy which would find vengeance for one injustice in the perpetration of another.

**The End of  
the Opium  
Traffic,** Those who have taken interest, whether theoretical or practical, in the anti-opium crusade may well be happy at the announcement made in the House of Commons on May 7 by Mr. Montagu that the Government has decided to send no more Indian opium to China. There are, it is true, some 20,000 chests of opium now at the Treaty ports which have in some way to be absorbed by China, but this is the last of the traffic so far as the introduction of supplies under British auspices is concerned. It is hardly putting the matter too strongly to say that an end has been put to a state of things which was a blot on our national record. The *Times*, which handles the matter with characteristic balance and detachment, admits frankly that the Indian opium traffic with China is an unpleasant page in British history, and expresses its pleasure that Great Britain has done with it. It now remains for patriots and reformers in China to continue their crusade with unabated energy against the consumption of the drug by their fellow-countrymen. We earnestly trust that the Divine blessing will rest on their efforts. It is something, at any rate, that their hands will not be fettered by shackles placed there with the approval and sanction of the British Government.

**Wealth and  
Religion.** There are clear indications to the thoughtful observer that many features of our national and religious life are just now presenting matter for grave concern. To realize this it is only necessary to put

various newspaper announcements side by side. We are told, on the one hand, that the great missionary societies, Anglican and Nonconformist, are faced by serious falling off in income ; we read, on the other hand, a letter from Dr. Clifford, which the *Times* prints under the significant heading, "The Growing Wealth of Nonconformity." The newspapers speak in general terms of the greatly augmented holiday traffic, especially to the Continent. That facilities should be increased for leisure and recreation to those who do the serious work of the world is no matter for regret ; but we cannot resist the impression, to which many are giving utterance, that there is abroad, throughout all grades of English society, a more mundane spirit, a preoccupation with pleasure and a demand for excitement, which, in the end, is bound to cause real deterioration in our national character. When material prosperity is on the whole increasing, as it appears to be doing, and the various Christian organizations have to struggle with increasing deficiencies, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that these things are causally connected—that the voice of the world is drowning the call of the Kingdom.

A recent letter in the *Daily Mail* ought to bring comfort to those who have reached middle life, and who are inclined to be depressed at the thought that their best period of activity and service has passed by. The writer of the letter warmly repudiated the suggestion that a man's best days are over at sixty. He has collected statistics about the great works of some four hundred of the world's leading men, with reference to the time of life at which the works were done. He finds that some 35 per cent. of their great achievements fall between the ages of sixty and seventy, and 23 per cent. between seventy and eighty, and after eighty 6 per cent. ; so that 64 per cent. of their great performances fall after the age of sixty. On the other hand, only the proportion of 1 per cent. falls below the age of forty. There are, of course, exceptions. Deeds requiring the power of youthful energy, such as the conquests of Alexander, belong rather to youth, and the

A Man's  
Best Years.

lyric inspiration of a Shelley or a Keats. To the clergyman, in his capacity as pastor and teacher, the statements of this letter may bring some cheer and encouragement. In these departments of life a man is not "too old at forty." It may well be that in ripeness of experience and maturity of thought he has a service to render, impossible at an earlier age. It would be well, too, if this consideration were to have due weight with the laity in their estimate of ministerial life and worth.



## The Predictive Element in the Old Testament.

BY THE REV. A. TAIT, D.D.,  
*Principal of Ridley Hall, Cambridge.*

TO some minds the mere idea of revelation presents such difficulties that their attitude towards the Christian belief is practically determined without regard for the particular evidence on which that belief is based.

When this hesitation in accepting the idea of revelation accompanies doubt as to the existence of God, it is in itself quite reasonable; but the man who, while acknowledging the existence of a Personal First Cause, refuses to accept the idea that there is a revelation, has taken up a position which is contrary alike to reason and experience. It is contrary to experience, because the acknowledgment of a Personal First Cause is the acknowledgment of the source of all true fatherhood, and wherever true fatherhood is found there is always intercourse with the offspring.

A man, it is true, may be in the position of a father without possessing any of the instincts of a father; but such a case cannot be considered here, because it offers no true parallel, either in intention or desire, to that of the First Personal Cause of the Universe. If the intention of the First Personal Cause was not that of a true father, it becomes a thing which is inconceivable; and wherever true fatherhood exists there is always found self-revelation. Experience demands that revelation shall be an essential constituent in our conception of God.

And reason makes the same demand. The conception of God setting things in motion, initiating a series of processes which lead up to the production of moral beings, and then leaving those moral products of His own laws in utter ignorance of their author, withholding from them any revelation of Himself, His will, purpose, and intention, and of their origin, duty, destiny—such a conception as that is entirely unreasonable.

The denial of revelation by the Atheist and Agnostic is a simple necessity of their position, but the denial by a Deist is contrary alike to reason and experience. Furthermore, just as revelation is an essential element in our conception of God, so prediction is a necessary element in our conception of revelation.

True education always stretches out towards the future. The earthly father prepares his child, within the limits of his own knowledge and foresight, for what is to come. The intercourse between father and son, so far as experience and judgment permit, will always contain the predictive element. Can we then conceive of the Divine education of the human race stopping short at interpretation of the past and instruction as to present duty?

Experience and reason unite once again in demanding that prediction shall be an essential element in the content of Divine revelation. The thought was expressed by a writer in the *Hibbert Journal* of July last, when he said: "Prophecy is not limited to prediction, but prediction is an essential element of prophecy." Whatever opinion may be held as to the alleged predictive element in the Old Testament, there can be no question as to its presence in the New Testament.

To take but one example. In such a short and practical letter as that of St. Paul to the Philippians there are at least eight predictive passages. Five times in that letter does the Apostle refer to *the day of Jesus Christ* or to His expected appearing; he foretells the manifested sovereignty of Christ when at His Name *every knee should bow*; he twice anticipates the resurrection of the dead, and the transformation of *the body of our humiliation*, when the believer shall attain to the goal of the high calling of God in Christ. In other words, the revelation which has been vouchsafed for this dispensation has, as part of its function, the preparation of men for the future, not merely through instruction in righteousness, but also through prediction.

We may expect, therefore, to find that the revelation made

under the old dispensation was similarly designed to prepare men for the dispensation which was to follow, and that this was accomplished through prediction as well as through instruction in righteousness. The same Lord was revealing Himself. He who *hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son* was the same Divine Person who *spoke in time past by the prophets*,<sup>1</sup> and He who *sent His angel to show unto His servants the things which must shortly come to pass, was the Lord God of the holy prophets*.<sup>2</sup> And in the writings of the Old Testament prophets we find two particular claims made in respect of the matter of prediction.

The first is represented by the words of Amos: *The Lord God will do nothing, but He revealeth His secret unto His servants the prophets*.<sup>3</sup>

It is one of the clearest assertions contained in the Bible of the principle that Divine revelation must include prediction.

The tendency of the present day seems to be so to emphasize the truth that the prophet is the forthteller rather than the foreteller, that the function of predicting is almost left out of sight. It is doubtless due to reaction from the equally one-sided conception of the prophet as one whose distinctive function it was to foretell.

We must certainly begin with the more comprehensive conception of the forthteller, but we must at the same time be careful to see that forthtelling is not set over in contrast with foretelling.

The other claim is found in the closing chapters of the Book of Isaiah, where the writer frequently appeals to the fact of prediction as evidence for the belief in Jehovah as the true God.

*Produce your cause: bring forth your strong reasons* is the prophet's confident challenge to the idolater. *Let them bring them forth, and declare unto us what shall happen: declare ye the former things, what they be, that we may consider them, and know the latter end of them; or show us things for to come. Show the things that are to come hereafter, that we may know*

<sup>1</sup> Heb. i. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Rev. xxii. 6.

<sup>3</sup> Amos iii. 7.

*that ye are gods.* The prophet himself answers the challenge : *Who hath declared it from the beginning, that we may know ? and beforetime, that we may say, He is righteous ? yea, there is none that declareth ; yea, there is none that sheweth ; yea, there is none that heareth your words.*<sup>1</sup>

But of the Lord he says : *I am the Lord : that is My Name : and My glory will I not give to another, neither My praise to graven images. Behold, the former things are come to pass, and new things do I declare : before they spring forth I tell you of them.*<sup>2</sup>

In similar strain the prophet writes : *Who, as I, shall call and shall declare it, and set it in order for Me, since I appointed the ancient people ? and the things that are coming, and that shall come to pass, let them declare. Fear ye not, neither be afraid : have I not declared unto thee of old, and showed it ? and ye are My witnesses. Is there a God beside Me ? yea, there is no Rock : I know not any.*<sup>3</sup> Again : *Assemble yourselves and come ; draw near together, ye that are escaped of the nations : they have no knowledge that carry the wood of their graven image, and pray unto a god that cannot save. Declare ye and bring it forth : yea, let them take counsel together : who hath showed this from ancient time ? who hath declared it of old ? Have not I, the Lord ? and there is no God else beside Me : a great God and a Saviour ; there is none beside Me.*<sup>4</sup>

Yet again : *I am God, and there is none like Me ; declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times things that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all My pleasure.*<sup>5</sup>

In the light of such passages as these it can hardly be denied that prediction was a recognized element of Old Testament prophecy, and that there had been actual experience in Israel of prediction being fulfilled. The modern tendency to regard all early predictive passages as prophetic reflections upon the past, cast into the form of prediction, appears, therefore, to be pre-

<sup>1</sup> Isa. xli. 21-26.<sup>2</sup> Isa. xlii. 8, 9.<sup>3</sup> Isa. xlii. 7, 8.<sup>4</sup> Isa. xlv. 20, 21.<sup>5</sup> Isa. xlv. 9, 10.

carious, if only as removing that which is required to explain the language to which we have referred. If there had been no early predictions, and no recognized fulfilment of them, it is difficult to understand the apologetic of this writer in his controversy with the idolaters.

The acknowledgment, however, of the predictive element in the Old Testament is independent of the exegesis of any of these earlier passages. Whatever explanations may be forthcoming of the oracle of Noah, for example, or of the promise given to the Patriarchs, there can be no question at all as to the presence of prediction in the Old Testament viewed as a whole.

And when we consider prediction and its fulfilment as a branch of Christian apologetics, we are on the strongest ground if we confine ourselves to those broad principles which are interwoven in the fabric of the Old Testament, and which do not depend on the interpretation of any particular passage.

It is here that the modern apologist is generally compelled to part company with the earlier attitude. He looks for the fulfilment of principles rather than of details, and recognizes that the language of a prophet belongs to the prophet's own time. For him the consecration of all things to God's service, foretold by Zechariah, will not take the particular form of writing "Holiness unto the Lord" on the bells of the horses. Nor is the Eucharist a sacrificial ordinance because Malachi speaks of a pure offering amongst the Gentiles.

The time was when attention was concentrated on a detail here and one there, and any alleged correspondence between prophecy and event was pressed into the service for the truth of Christianity.

The tendency now is to fly to the opposite extreme, and to leave the argument from fulfilled prediction out of count altogether. Many of the interpretations were so fanciful and the alleged fulfilments were so foreign to the spirit of scientific inquiry that, in spite of the emphasis on detail which is frequently found in the Apostolic writings, the argument from fulfilled prediction fell into disrepute. But, in this case, neglect

is worse than exaggeration. The earlier attitude had at least the merit of recognizing the Divine both in the Word and in history; it sought for that co-operation of the Divine Spirit in revelation and of Divine Providence in the ordering of events, which is essential to a belief in the Divine at all. And what was needed was a restatement of the argument which would be strictly faithful to the scientific spirit, without losing any of the enthusiastic belief in the supernatural, which characterized the earlier thinkers.

But the unscientific treatment of prophecy seems to have brought the subject into such ill-favour amongst scholars that there does not appear to have been much enthusiasm about the restatement of the argument.

Far be it from me to pose as one who is competent to fulfil the conditions. I can only tentatively suggest the line of restatement as it presents itself to my own mind.

The predictive element in the Old Testament Scriptures exhibits three principal features, relating to the worship of Jahweh, the people of Jahweh, and the revelation of Jahweh.

1. *The Worship of Jahweh.*—Under the Old Covenant, with its emphasis on law and ceremony, the popular religion became almost entirely a matter of outward observance. Israel came to regard the bond between Jahweh and herself as indissoluble; established by fleshly descent, sealed and certified by outward rite, expressed and exhibited in service and ceremony, nothing further was wanting to secure the continuance of this sacred tie between Israel and her God.

It was against this popular conception of religion, upheld and nourished by the priesthood, that prophet after prophet, like solitary voices in the wilderness, made their protest, proclaiming that the bond between Jahweh and Israel was a moral one; that obedience was a greater thing than the fat of rams; that fasts and feasts, burnt-offerings and meat-offerings were an abomination unto the Lord unless they were the expression of a true and contrite heart; that Jerusalem's safety depended upon the moral condition of its inhabitants; that the Day of the Lord,

so far from being an object of joyful anticipation, would be found to be a day of judgment and disaster for the impenitent people. And side by side with these pronouncements, bearing upon the actual circumstances which confronted the prophets, there are found predictions that in the latter days their ideal of religion will characterize the people of the Lord.

*Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah. . . . This shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after these days, saith the Lord. I will put My law in their inward parts, and in their heart will I write it.*<sup>1</sup> In other words, the religion of those latter days was to centre itself upon a state of heart and will; holiness and uncleanness were to be determined by moral condition and not by ceremonial distinction (on the bells of the horses would be written, *Holiness unto the Lord*<sup>2</sup>); and the service of the Lord would be independent of Jerusalem and its temple (*Men shall worship Him, everyone from his place*<sup>3</sup>).

2. An even more radical change (if that were possible) from the prevailing conception is held forth in the prophetic prediction of the people of the Lord. Exclusiveness was to give place to catholicity. The whole world was the Lord's, and all nations were to do Him service. The Gentiles were to receive the light, the Law was to go forth out of Zion, and the salvation of the Lord was to reach unto the ends of the earth.

On one of the occasions when the Lord Jesus set before His Apostles the task of evangelizing the world, He based His charge on these Old Testament predictions: *Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer and rise again from the dead the third day, and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His Name unto all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem.*<sup>4</sup>

The prophetic picture of the dispensation in which we live presents to our view the people of the Lord constituted, not

<sup>1</sup> Jer. xxxi. 31 *et seq.*

<sup>2</sup> Zech. xiv. 20.

<sup>3</sup> Zeph. ii. 11.

<sup>4</sup> Luke xxiv. 46 *et seq.*

merely by the recovery of the outcast of Israel, but also and still more by the ingathering of the nations of the world.

And the Apocalyptic vision of the redeemed, which embraced not merely the 12,000 of each of the tribes of Israel, but also a great multitude which no man could number out of every nation, and of all tribes, peoples, and tongues, was in strict accord with that Old Testament portrayal.<sup>1</sup>

3. These two features of the prophetic anticipation are not to be treated as independent and separate pictures, but as features of one picture. They stand or fall together. The picture must be taken as a whole or left altogether. If the argument from fulfilled prediction is to have its proper weight, it must be through taking the picture as a whole; the evidence is cumulative.

But we have still to mention the third, the principal and central feature of the picture. I mean the advent of the Messiah. The two radical changes which we have noticed are predictive of the time of the Messiah; they were to be ushered in by the arrival upon the scene of Him who was to be at once Servant and Lord, Sufferer and King, Victim and Priest.

The preaching of repentance and remission of sins unto all the nations was linked up by the Lord Jesus to the death and resurrection of the Christ, as two inseparable features of the one picture. The evangelization was to be the consequence of the Messiah's work; both were essential elements in the prophetic portrayal.

Such, then, in general outline, seems to be the content of Old Testament prediction: the coming of the Messiah, whose advent would bring in a revolution of men's conceptions as to the nature of religion and the membership of the Kingdom.

When we turn to the world around us, what do we find?

The God of Israel recognized, believed in, served by all nations, kindreds, and peoples, worshipped in every country and in all tongues. I speak generally, using the word "all" in the sense of "the many," as opposed to "the one."

<sup>1</sup> Rev. viii: 9.

The people of Jahweh know no limits of race save those imposed by the failure of the Church to discharge the commission which was entrusted to her by her Lord and Master.

The descendants of Israel remain as a drop in the bucket, witnesses to their past, a survival which bears evidence to the rock out of which they were hewn, but, in comparison with the multitudes of the Gentile worshippers of Jahweh, a mere handful.

From the religious point of view, their influence is so minute that, if the religion of Jahweh were confined to them, it would justly be regarded as one of the effete systems of the world.<sup>1</sup> But, instead of that, the desirable things of all nations are being used for the adornment of the Temple of the Lord, all nations have received the Law from Mount Zion, and are walking in its light, the servant of the Lord has been sent to the Gentiles, and has become His salvation unto the ends of the world.

Moreover, the religion of Jahweh has changed ; in its essence it is dependent no longer upon places or ceremonies. *Neither in this mountain nor yet in Jerusalem* do men worship Him now, but each from his own place. *God is Spirit* is their creed : *they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth* is their principle,

It might be said that the Jews of to-day act on the same principle. Yes, but there is this great difference : for the Jew it is an inevitable (and they hope) temporary accommodation to circumstances ; for the Christian it is a permanent principle of life. The essence of religion for the Christian is the spiritual union of God and His children, and the spiritual communion which flows from it.

And these two transformations of the Judaistic conceptions of religion are the direct consequences of the teaching of Jesus of Nazareth, who claimed to be the Jewish Messiah. He it was who proclaimed the abolition of racial privilege, and it is in obedience

<sup>1</sup> I am not unmindful of the glorious results of a restored and converted Israel anticipated by St. Paul in Rom. xi. 11 *et seq.* This is the statement of the obvious present fact of the fall of Israel being the *riches of the world*, and the *diminishing of them* being the *riches of the Gentiles*.

to His teaching that the world is being evangelized. He it was who asserted the spiritual character of acceptable worship, and announced the coming of the Comforter, through whose indwelling in the heart God and His children should become one spirit, and it is the acceptance of His teaching which has made the religion of Jahweh essentially spiritual and experimental.

In weighing up the evidence of this comparison between Old Testament prediction and the circumstances of our own time, we shall do well to remember that the changes were effected in spite of the appointed guardians of the prophecies. The Church to which the oracles had been committed, rejected and put to death Jesus, who was called Christ ; it refused His interpretation of their Scriptures, and regarded Him as the enemy of the true religion.

The correspondence which we have noticed has been effected not only without the assistance, but in spite of the strenuous opposition of the authorities of the Jewish Church.

The predictions have received a fulfilment which was repudiated by the official teaching of these authorized custodians, and the correspondence in fact cannot be explained as the natural consequence of the predictions.

It is along some such line as this that the argument for the truth of Christianity, which is based on the fulfilment of Old Testament prediction, must (I believe) retain its place in the equipment of the Christian Apologist.

We, with St. Paul, must be ready to declare *the glad tidings of the promise made unto the fathers, how that God hath fulfilled the same unto our children.*<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Acts xiii. 32 *et seq.*



## The Church and the Poor.

### A SERIES OF HISTORICAL SKETCHES.

By W. EDWARD CHADWICK, D.D., B.Sc.

#### VI.

##### THE END OF THE MIDDLE AGES.

FROM the coming of the Friars to England about A.D. 1224 to the Reformation is almost exactly three hundred years. This period is one of great interest; but its adequate study, and still more an adequate presentation of its leading features within the space of a few pages, involves very considerable difficulties. It witnessed certain social movements of great importance, and writers upon the period are not entirely agreed as to the chief causes of some of these. Of course, the sources of our information for this epoch are far more full than are those for any previous epoch which we have considered. Because my space is limited, and because I wish to deal as clearly as I can with the main features of this period, I shall confine myself almost altogether to what took place in England, and to showing how the Church in our own country attempted—and unfortunately to a great extent failed—to meet the rapidly changing conditions in the social life of the people. To form a just estimate of the Church's work it is most important to have as clear as possible an idea of those conditions.

The period is divided into two almost equal parts by the "Black Death," which ravaged this country as it did others about 1348-49, and by which it is estimated that between a third and a half of the people of England perished.<sup>1</sup> The economic results of this terrible scourge were immense. One of these was naturally an immediate scarcity of labour,<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Green, "Short History of English People," p. 241, says "more than half"; Cunningham, "Western Civilization," p. 144, says, "about a half."

<sup>2</sup> Preamble to "Statute of Labourers," 23 Edward III., A.D. 1349.

another was a very rapid rise in the price of food.<sup>1</sup> These changes were not entirely due to the Black Death, because for some time previous to this very considerable alterations had been taking place in the manorial system—for instance, many of the serfs had already begun to pay a money commutation in lieu of work ; in other words, they had commenced to pay rent instead of rendering personal service.<sup>2</sup> After the Black Death the peasants still desired to pay the same rent they had previously paid, but the landlords found that as prices had doubled they could only hire labourers by paying them double wages. This was probably the root cause of such movements as the Peasants' Revolt ; the Poll Tax was only the match which set fire to a seething mass of industrial discontent. Parliament, which at this time represented simply the interests of the landlords, tried to interfere. It attempted to regulate wages *before* it regulated prices.<sup>3</sup> Consequently the peasants found they could not procure even food for the amount of wages which Parliament tried to force them to accept. Another method attempted by the landlords was to refuse commutation payment—*i.e.*, rent in lieu of service ; but men who had once tasted freedom would not be driven back into slavery.

Thus, as labour could not be obtained at the old rates, and as service could not be re-exacted without violence and murder, another plan must be tried : either new arrangements must be made with labour, or less labour must be employed. Some landowners granted land on lease to tenants for a rent, and then the tenant had to find the labour. Here we have the origin of the modern tenant-farmer, as a kind of middleman between the landowner and the labourer. Other landowners found that, as wool was growing in demand, sheep-farming paid better than

<sup>1</sup> By an Act of 1363 an attempt was made to regulate the price of provisions.

<sup>2</sup> Meredith, "Economic History of England," pp. 43 *et seq.* ; Nicholls, "History of the Poor Law," vol. i., pp. 30 *et seq.* See also Trevelyan, "England in the Age of Wycliffe," p. 185.

<sup>3</sup> The Statute of Labourers was passed in A.D. 1349, and amended in 1350-51, while prices seem to have been first regulated in 1363.

arable farming, because much less labour was needed.<sup>1</sup> But this meant that a large number of people were thrown out of employment. The landowners also, for the purpose of increasing pasturage for sheep, began to enclose common or waste land on which the serfs had pastured their cattle; this, again, pressed heavily upon the poor.<sup>2</sup>

Side by side with these movements among the peasantry, there proceeded throughout this period many changes in town life. The genesis and growth of the English town—to which we find no exact parallel in other countries—is a most interesting subject.<sup>3</sup> While the struggle of the townsmen for freedom and self-government was on the whole peacefully effected in England, on the Continent, especially on the Rhineland, it was frequently marked by considerable bloodshed. Among the many causes which contributed to the growth of the towns, two stand pre-eminent: one being the development of trade, the other being the desire for freedom. If a serf or villein could prove a residence in a town of a year and a day, he therewith became free of his owner.<sup>4</sup> Consequently the towns became a refuge for very different kinds of characters, some of these being very undesirable. The struggles between the original inhabitants who owned land in the town and the people who for various reasons flocked into the town, were frequently severe. And it will easily be understood that in those days, when scientific sanitation and the conditions of public health were unknown, the poorer quarters of the towns became hotbeds of sickness and misery.<sup>5</sup> In their earliest days the Franciscan Friars did a noble work among the sick and the

<sup>1</sup> The history of the English wool trade from the thirteenth century is full of interest. See Thorold Rogers, "Economic Interpretation of History," pp. 9 *et seq.*

<sup>2</sup> Meredith, "Economic Interpretation of History," pp. 42 *et seq.*, 115 *et seq.* This was the subject of legislation as early as the Statute of Merton in A.D. 1235.

<sup>3</sup> Meredith, *op. cit.*, pp. 47 *et seq.*

<sup>4</sup> Nicholls, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 64.

<sup>5</sup> The death-rate from the Black Death was much greater in the towns than in the country.

wretched ; and they generally fixed their houses among the worst of the slums. Those who would understand the social life and especially the social difficulties and evils of the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries must pay particular attention to the conditions existing in the towns, and to the changes which took place in these. I use the term "changes" rather than "development" because there appears to have been a diminution in the relative importance and influence of the towns towards the end of the fifteenth century.<sup>1</sup> There seems to have then arisen a tendency for manufacturing industries to desert the towns for the country ; also it appears to have become more difficult to induce substantial men to undertake the burdens of municipal government.<sup>2</sup>

One means whereby we may gain much insight into the conditions of any period is by studying the various laws—for the correction of evils, the regulation of life, and the protection of property—enacted within it. A study of certain Acts of Parliament passed during the period we are considering is extremely instructive. I would now draw attention to a few of these connected with our present subject, say from the middle of the fourteenth century. By Acts passed in 1335 and 1350 for the freedom of buying and selling,<sup>3</sup> we have an assertion of the great principle that privileges were not to be enjoyed by one class to the injury of another. In 1349 we have the celebrated "Statute of Labourers," by which, among other things, it was enacted "that because many valiant beggars, as long as they may live of begging, do refuse to labour, giving themselves to idleness and vice . . . none, upon pain of imprisonment, shall, under the colour of pity or alms, give anything to such which may labour, or presume to favour them in their sloth, so that thereby they may be compelled to labour for

<sup>1</sup> Meredith, *op. cit.*, pp. 122, 123. The national consciousness grew, and the nation rather than the town became the centre of interest.

<sup>2</sup> Meredith, *op. cit.*, pp. 123, 124.

<sup>3</sup> By the Act of 1335 (9 Edward III.) it was enacted "that all merchants, strangers, and denizens . . . may freely, without interruption, sell to what persons it shall please them."

their necessary living." Two points in reference to this statute should be noticed : first, it is not prohibited to help those who are not able to work ; secondly, no statutory provision is made for these.<sup>1</sup> By the same law it was enacted that " no man pay, or promise to pay, any servant any more wages, liveries, meed, or salary than was wont"—*i.e.*, before the Great Plague ; also it was further enacted that " butchers, fishmongers, hostellers, brewers, bakers, pulthers, and all other sellers of all manner of victual shall be bound to sell the same for a reasonable price."<sup>2</sup> A copy of this statute was sent to each of the Bishops to be published in the churches, with the request that he would " direct the parsons, vicars, ministers of such churches and others under him, to exhort and invite their parishioners, by salutary admonitions, to labour and observe the ordinances aforesaid, as the present necessity requireth."<sup>3</sup>

It is one thing to pass a law, it is another thing to get it obeyed ; and apparently very great difficulty was found in getting the people to obey this particular law, for in less than two years<sup>4</sup> another Act was passed amending and continuing it. In the preamble to this Act it is stated that " servants having no regard to the said ordinance, but to their ease and general covetize, do withdraw themselves . . . unless they have livery and wages to the double or treble of what they were wont to take before." The Act then proceeds to define with great particularity the various scales of wages which shall be paid to various classes of workers.<sup>5</sup> In the same Act we have what may perhaps be regarded as the first trace of the " law of settlement," which has continued in force down to the present time ; for it directs that " none [of the workers] go out of the town

<sup>1</sup> It is apparently still assumed that the resources of charity will suffice.

<sup>2</sup> But the " reasonable price " is not fixed or defined as by the Act of 1363.

<sup>3</sup> Nicholls, " History of the Poor Law," vol. i., p. 39.

<sup>4</sup> In 1350-51 (25 Edward III.).

<sup>5</sup> *E.g.*, " a mower of meadows is to be paid 5d. for an acre, or 5d. a day ; reapers of corn 2d. an acre in the first week in August, 3d. in subsequent weeks ; a master-carpenter is to have 3d. a day, a master-mason 4d., and their servants 1d. The pay of a common soldier at that date was 6d. a day, or about 5s. of our money " (Hume's " History," vol. ii., p. 496).

where he dwelleth in the winter, to serve the summer, if he may serve in the same town."

There can be no doubt that vagabondage and disorder were the chief evils of the time. In an Act of 1 Richard II. we are told that "villeins withdraw their services and customs from their lords by the comfort and procurement of others, their counsellors, maintainers, and abettors which have taken hire and profit of the said villeins and land-tenants."<sup>1</sup> Professor Thorold Rogers feels sure that this "refers to the company of poor priests whom Wicliffe had appointed, and who were the channel by which communications were kept up among the disaffected serfs."<sup>2</sup> There is more than sufficient evidence to show that the lower classes were seething with a spirit of dissatisfaction when the Peasant Revolt under Wat Tyler broke out in A.D. 1381.<sup>3</sup> That the real cause of this revolt was the attempt of the lords, against the growing spirit of freedom (which was active not only in England but in France and Flanders), to enforce the old conditions of serfdom there can be no doubt. The object of the revolt was simply to abolish the conditions and incidents of villeinage.<sup>4</sup> The demands of the peasants, it may be remembered, were four: (1) The total abolition of slavery for themselves and their children for ever; (2) the reduction of the rent of good land to 4d. an acre; (3) the full liberty of buying and selling, like other men, in all fairs and markets; (4) a general pardon for all past offences. I must not dwell upon either the incidents or the results of the revolt, but must pass on to point out how one or two other Acts of Parliament at the end of this fourteenth century throw further light on the condition of the people. In A.D. 1388 an Act was passed which by some is regarded as marking the first step in our present Poor Law; it is also interesting as containing the first

<sup>1</sup> Nicholls, *op. cit.*, vol. i., pp. 48, 49.

<sup>2</sup> "Economic Interpretation of History," p. 29.

<sup>3</sup> See Trevelyan, "England in the Age of Wycliffe," chap. vi.

<sup>4</sup> In the preamble of an Act of 1377 it is stated, "Complaint has been made by the lords of manors, as well men of Holy Church as others, that the villeins on their estates affirm them to be quite and utterly discharged of all manner of serfage, etc." (Trevelyan, p. 193).

recognition of the "impotent poor" as a class.<sup>1</sup> One reason for this Act was probably that people were being drawn from the rural districts into the towns for the sake of higher wages and greater comfort. The Act prohibits servants and labourers from wandering, whether in search of employment or for some other cause. It also states that "beggars impotent to serve shall abide in the cities and towns where they be dwelling; and if the people of these cities and towns will not, or may not, suffice to find them, that then the said beggars shall draw them to other towns within the hundred, rape, or wapentake, or to the towns where they were born." It should be noticed that side by side with this enactment again no provision is made for the sustenance or relief of these people: they are simply left to chance or casual charity. The only object of the Act is apparently to prevent them from wandering.<sup>2</sup> Three years later we have another Act which may have been partly designed to meet the inconveniences occasioned by the last; for in A.D. 1392 it was enacted that in every appropriation of the revenues of any parish church to some cathedral, or monastic, or other religious institution, "the diocesan shall ordain a convenient sum of money to be distributed yearly of the fruits and profits of the same, to the poor parishioners in aid of their living and sustenance for ever."<sup>3</sup>

Even before the arrival of the Black Death, as we have seen, emancipation from villeinage had made very considerable progress; but like every other social change, however excellent in itself, it was at least temporarily attended by various evils. So long as the serf remained a serf he was sure of, at least, bare sustenance from his master;<sup>4</sup> when he became a free labourer he was dependent upon himself, and that in an age in which

<sup>1</sup> Nicholls, *op. cit.*, pp. 55 *et seq.*

<sup>2</sup> Ratzinger apparently holds that during the fourteenth century in England the clergy and monastic institutions looked well after the needs of the poor; but in the fifteenth century he admits things in this respect changed for the worse. It must, however, be remembered that he holds a strong brief for the Church ("Armenpflege," pp. 426 *et seq.*).

<sup>3</sup> Nicholls, *op. cit.*, pp. 54.

<sup>4</sup> Nicholls, *op. cit.*, p. 27. See also Meredith, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

there was no Poor Law to fall back upon. The man who has been practically a slave is by no means always at once ready to occupy and use wisely a position of freedom. He has to learn to use his freedom, which means to depend upon himself. It is facts like these which explain many of the social difficulties of the end of the Middle Ages. An Act passed early in the fifteenth century<sup>1</sup> reveals another difficulty of this period. Its object was to check the exodus from the country to the town, to stem the growing dearth of agricultural labourers. By this Act it was ordained "that no man or woman, of what estate or condition they be, shall put their son or daughter of whatsoever age to serve as apprentice to no craft nor other labour within any city or borough, unless he have land or rent to the value of twenty shillings by the year at least."

In the reign of Henry VI. we have another attempt<sup>2</sup> to regulate wages by enacting a new scale, which shows a very considerable rise upon the wages prescribed some sixty years previously. Under Edward IV. we meet with a revision of the sumptuary laws of Edward III., which again indicates an increase in the national wealth.<sup>3</sup> By the Wars of the Roses almost the last traces of feudalism passed away, and upon the close of these wars we see a rapid and practically continuously progressive development both of trade and of national wealth, though some of the old difficulties still exist, two of these being—first, the further conversion of arable land into pasture;<sup>4</sup> and secondly, the increase of "vagabonds and beggars." The two evils, we can easily see, were probably not wholly independent of each other.

It must be conceded that during this period the influence of the Church upon the social welfare of the people was relatively less than during the various epochs we have previously con-

<sup>1</sup> 7 Henry IV., cap. 17 (Nicholls, p. 66).

<sup>2</sup> 23 Henry IV., cap. 12. From this Act a carpenter's wage had risen from 3d. to 5d. a day, a labourer's from 1d. to 3d., the wages of a woman from 1d. to 4d.

<sup>3</sup> Nicholls, *op. cit.*, pp. 84 *et seq.*

<sup>4</sup> By the time of Edward IV. the woollen trade had risen into great importance (Nicholls, *op. cit.*, pp. 88 *et seq.*).

sidered. This was especially the case in the towns. Other influences, besides those we may term ecclesiastical (which are not always synonymous with religious), were growing in importance. The towns were more and more asserting their freedom against the overlordship of the great Barons or against the rights of the great monasteries, under whose protection they had frequently grown. Towards the end of the Middle Ages we certainly witness what may be termed a growing "secularization" of both life and authority.<sup>1</sup> We see this in many directions, and it was due to various causes. The Church in every country could not fail to be to some extent represented in the eyes of the people by the Papacy, as well as to be influenced by the vicissitudes and conduct of the Papal Court. While in outward magnificence the Papacy during this period may have actually grown, its *moral* hold upon the people was rapidly becoming weaker. The spread of such doctrines as those of Wicliffe—*e.g.*, that "dominion was founded upon grace," had far more than a theological influence; their social and economic results were very considerable.<sup>2</sup> Then many of the chief offices of State, which had formerly been held exclusively by ecclesiastics, were now frequently filled by laymen. Such offices had been held by Bishops and priests, not merely because of their superior education, but because it was considered that these were particularly bound to discharge their duties with the fear of God before their eyes.<sup>3</sup> To understand the life, and especially the economic life, of the Middle Ages, we must remember that while ideals and principles were very lofty, actual practice, especially as time went on, fell immeasurably below these. Too often a claim to authority and respect founded upon a spiritual position became a mere pretext to clothe an absorbing interest in worldly dignities and earthly gain. Then, to some extent,

<sup>1</sup> See Cunningham, "Western Civilization," pp. 138 *et seq.*

<sup>2</sup> There is a brief but clear account of Wicliffe's teaching and its social effects in Dr. Workman's essay upon "The Influence of the Christian Church on the Social Development of the Middle Ages," in "Christ and Civilization," p. 326 *et seq.*

<sup>3</sup> Cunningham, *op. cit.*, pp. 140, 141.

the influence of the mendicant orders had a far-reaching effect towards a separation—frequently false in theory and detrimental in practice—of the sacred from the secular.<sup>1</sup> Also during the fourteenth, and especially during the fifteenth century, the conduct of the religious houses seems to have deteriorated; there was a falling off, not only in the management of their property, but in the discharge of their responsibilities both towards their serfs and towards the poor generally.<sup>2</sup> At one time the monks had been the best agriculturists; they had also assisted in the development of commerce. But now “the Church had ceased to be a leader in the arts of practical life, while her inability to utilize privileges and possessions to the best advantage under changed conditions was fatal to her position as the dominating influence over secular life in all its aspects.”<sup>3</sup>

As an interesting example, not exactly of the dereliction of a positive duty, but of an increasing carelessness with regard to the social and economic welfare of the people on the part of the monasteries, I may cite the fact that these gradually ceased to pay the same attention to the repair of bridges and roads, of which in earlier times they had been extremely careful.<sup>4</sup> The welfare of the people depends to a great extent upon trading facilities, which in turn depend upon means of communication. At one time the building of bridges and the making of roads, and the keeping of both in repair, were widely regarded as acts of piety. But in the fourteenth century we meet with various complaints, especially in reference to the monasteries, that both bridges and roads had been allowed to fall into disrepair.<sup>5</sup> It was not, however, until A.D. 1555 that an Act was passed appointing road surveyors, and which “embodies the modern view of the nature of the obligations.”<sup>6</sup>

Yet another example of the growing secularization of relief is furnished by the way in which hospitals and other institutions in towns for the relief of the sick and poor passed more and

<sup>1</sup> Cunningham, *op. cit.*, p. 141.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 145 *et seq.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 145.

<sup>4</sup> See Jusserand, “English Wayfaring Life in the Fourteenth Century.”

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 64 *et seq.*

<sup>6</sup> Cunningham, *op. cit.*, pp. 147.

more under either lay or civic jurisdiction.<sup>1</sup> The various trade guilds made provision not only for their own indigent members, but in certain instances for other poor and afflicted persons. It may have been through their association for these purposes in the guilds that municipal rulers began as such—that is, as representing the citizens and no longer merely the guild—to take an active part in the administration of poor relief.<sup>2</sup> There are instances during the fifteenth century of charitable institutions being not only controlled by the municipalities, but of such institutions owning (at least in part) their foundation to these bodies. An interesting early example of municipal relief is furnished by Southampton where, in the middle of the fifteenth century, “the townys almshouses were settled on a plan,” and lists were kept of weekly payments, which seem to have furnished sufficient relief for about a hundred and fifty people.<sup>3</sup>

Upon the *fact* that, at any rate during the fifteenth century, the relief of the poor was slowly and very gradually falling into lay hands, there can, I think, be no doubt; though the change was very gradual, because by far the greater part of the relief given was still dispensed either by the clergy or by ecclesiastical institutions.<sup>4</sup> Upon the various *causes* of this change there is room for at least some difference of opinion. It is easy to throw the chief share of the blame upon the Church; and to speak of the rapacity of prelates and monks, and of the mismanagement of ecclesiastical property. To a certain extent these charges are no doubt true.<sup>5</sup> But other causes than these were at work, causes over which the Church had little or no control. Conditions both of life and trade were rapidly changing, and tasks for which the Church was at one time equal had to a great extent become beyond her power.<sup>6</sup> There

<sup>1</sup> Even Ratzinger admits, “Obwohl in England der Clerus die Bedürfnisse der Armen zu decken stets redlich bemüht war . . . bildeten sich doch auch wie in den übrigen Ländern schon einige Laienvereine” (“Armenpflege,” p. 431).

<sup>2</sup> Leonard, “English Poor Relief,” p. 7.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 9.

<sup>4</sup> Leonard, p. 17.

<sup>5</sup> Ratzinger, again, admits this (“Armenpflege,” pp. 426, 429).

<sup>6</sup> Cunningham, “Western Civilization,” p. 147. We must remember that, among other changes of thought, new ideas were growing in reference to the “theory” of charity.

have been parallels to these changes in other ages in other departments of life. One readily suggests itself. At one time the Church possessed almost a monopoly of the education of the people. I am not saying that when this was so the Church discharged her responsibility to the full; but she certainly did an immense amount of good work, for which she has not always received the credit. But with changed conditions this task became beyond the powers of voluntary enterprise. The State was compelled to step in and to take a very large share of the burden upon her shoulders. So it was with the municipal and national organization of relief, also with regard to the repression of mendicity, and with measures for the regulation of labour and wages. All these matters had to do with the poor and with poverty, and in regard to them the State began to take a larger and larger share.

Then there can be no doubt that both the medieval theory and medieval practice of relief, when tested by actual results, were extremely imperfect. As we have frequently seen, far too little was thought of the character and actual needs of the recipients, and also of the probable results of the charity bestowed. Almsgiving was regarded as a duty; but neither the organization of charity, nor the economic or moral results of charity, were carefully studied. There were districts in which there might be two or three rich monastic houses; in these districts far more than enough charity might be given, while in other districts the means for relief might be very small. In some districts relief might be had for the asking, in others hardly any relief could be obtained. There was no co-ordination of charity; and apparently neither individuals nor institutions took the trouble to ascertain what their neighbours were giving. They gave, and when they had given they imagined that their duty was done. If anyone wishes to learn how charity should not be given, and of the evils attendant upon unwise giving, they will find in the history of the later Middle Ages more than sufficient lessons upon both.

*The Eve of the Reformation.*

We are accustomed to regard the Reformation as almost wholly a religious or, rather, an ecclesiastical movement, produced entirely by what may be termed religious causes, and having certain ecclesiastical results—*e.g.*, the disruption of the Western Church. Such a view is very far from being the whole truth. Actually many of the causes of the Reformation—indeed, some of the most powerful among these—were not religious at all, and can only very indirectly be termed ecclesiastical; they were only ecclesiastical because they were connected with the financial arrangements of the Church.<sup>1</sup> Among the secular causes of the Reformation was the growth of both the idea and the fact of nationality which arose before or about this period in more than one European country.<sup>2</sup> This growth was accompanied by a diminution in relative importance of many of the great cities.<sup>3</sup> Another cause of the Reformation was a very widespread condition of economic, and so of social, distress, though this cause operated far more powerfully on the Continent than it did in England,<sup>4</sup> where, if the condition of the poorer classes during the end of the fifteenth and beginning of the sixteenth century was evil, it seems to have been far less evil than in Germany or Italy, or even in France.

We shall find that during the reign of Henry VIII. and his successors Act after Act was passed with the view of suppressing the mendicancy and vagabondage with which England (as other countries) at this period was rife. The undoubted enormous increase of this evil which took place at this time is sometimes attributed to the suppression of the religious houses, and to the consequent cutting off of the charities which these had disbursed. This may have increased the distress, but it cannot be regarded as its chief cause; for the increase of mendicancy took place in countries where the religious houses continued, also it began long before their suppression.

<sup>1</sup> Upon the whole subject of Papal exactions see "Cambridge Modern History," vol. i., pp. 665 *et seq.*

<sup>2</sup> Cunningham, *op. cit.*, pp. 157 *et seq.*      <sup>3</sup> Meredith, *op. cit.*, pp. 122 *et seq.*

<sup>4</sup> Ratzinger, *op. cit.*, p. 431: "Das Englische Volk lebte vielmehr in Wohlstand."

The real cause was the rapid changes which were taking place in both the structure and conditions of society. During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries there had been widespread and almost constant warfare. These wars had found employment (as soldiers) for an immense number of men. Now that the wars were largely over we find not only widespread devastation and injury to agriculture and trade,<sup>1</sup> but also bands of men roaming over England and France and other countries without work, and many of them without either training or desire for work.<sup>2</sup> Then the conditions of trade were rapidly changing. The results of the discovery of the New World were beginning to be felt; capitalism, one of the chief bases of modern commerce, was growing;<sup>3</sup> the old trade guild system was breaking up; trade was leaving many of the towns, which had been its chief centres, for the country;<sup>4</sup> also in England the custom of pasture, in place of arable, farming was rapidly extending.<sup>5</sup> Then, as I have already noticed, the estates belonging to various ecclesiastical owners and corporations were not so well managed as formerly. This last may to some degree have been due to carelessness; it was also due to the growing exactions of the Papal Court, which became a more and more severe drain upon their resources, and so upon the life of the people whom they had supported either by work or by alms. There can be no doubt that these exactions—which were surely a financial as much as an ecclesiastical factor—were among the chief causes of the Reformation. Immense sums of money were constantly going out of the country to provide for the wars, the extravagances, and the luxuries of the Papal Court,<sup>6</sup> also for the ever-increasing number of Papal officials and agents, who

<sup>1</sup> "Cambridge Modern History," p. 501.

<sup>2</sup> The majority of these men would be paid, professional soldiers, who would be discharged when a war was over; in time of peace they were among the unemployed.

<sup>3</sup> Cunningham, "Western Civilization," pp. 163 *et seq.*

<sup>4</sup> Innes, "England's Industrial Development," p. 125.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 137 *et seq.*

<sup>6</sup> Upon the whole subject see the "Cambridge Modern History," vol. i., pp. 665 *et seq.*

swallowed up the greater part of it before it reached its destination.<sup>1</sup>

It may, of course, be argued that the discovery of the New World and the consequent growth of trade should have improved the financial condition of the people. Undoubtedly it did so ultimately, as did the introduction of machinery two hundred years later; but both changes, as every other revolution in trade conditions, involved a period of temporary distress. People have to adjust themselves to new conditions, and the time of transition generally means a considerable amount of suffering.

I have entered somewhat fully into the conditions of this period because some knowledge of them is essential if we would understand the great changes which took place in the methods of dealing with the poor during the actual course of the Reformation, which must form the subject of my next article. It was not that the responsibility of supplying the needs of the poor passed entirely out of the hands of the Church into those of the State, though undoubtedly the maintenance of the poor, or rather of paupers—those incapable of supporting themselves—became gradually a civic rather than an ecclesiastical charge. The transition was a gradual one: it proceeded step by step. The men who framed the new legislation laboured under serious disadvantages, and they made many mistakes. These mistakes were due to various causes, some of which were beyond their control. They were ignorant of the laws upon which social welfare was based, and they sometimes showed themselves strangely ignorant of human nature, and especially of those rules and principles upon which character must be built up. They made law after law, and they tried method after method of dealing with both the deserving and the undeserving—with those who could not, and those who would not, try to maintain themselves in an honest calling. But this belongs to the next chapter.

<sup>1</sup> "The accounts of the Papal agent for first-fruits in Hungary for the year 1320 show that of 1,913 florins collected only 732 reached the Papal treasury" (*ibid.*, p. 667).

## Recent Continental Criticism of the Higher Critics.

BY THE REV. W. ST. CLAIR TISDALL, D.D.

1. Dr. Troelstra : "De Naam Gods in den Pentateuch," 1912.
2. Dr. Troelstra : "Organische Eenheid van het Oude Testament," 1912.
3. Dahse : "Is a Revolution in Pentateuchal Criticism at Hand?" (*Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, September, 1912).
4. Professor Eerdmans : "Alttestamentliche Studien," 1908-1912 (four parts already published).
5. Professor Van Hoonacker : "Sacerdoce Lévitique," 1899.
6. Professor Dr. Edouard Friedrich König : "Geschichte der Alttestamentischen Religion," 1912.
7. Professor Dr. Edouard Friedrich König : "The History of the Religion of Israel and its Newer Representation" (a series of articles now appearing in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*).
8. Möller : "Wider den Bann der Quellenscheidung," 1912.
9. P. Volz : "Mose, ein Beitrag zur Untersuchung über die Ursprünge der israelitischen Religion," 1907.

WE and reverence for everything German in Biblical and theological matters are still so prevalent in certain learned circles in England, that it would doubtless be in vain, at the present time, to expect the callow, the credulous, and the cocksure, to have courage enough as yet to investigate for themselves the foundations of the Higher Criticism. They find it far safer and easier to accept assertions than to test them. Thucydides has well said : Οὕτως ἀταλαίπωρος τοῖς πολλοῖς ἡ ζήτησις τῆς ἀληθείας, καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ἐτοῖμα μᾶλλον τρέπονται. But it is surely not too much to ask more thoughtful and earnest men to consider how very striking and remarkable a "counter-revolution" against the supremacy of the Wellhausen domination is now in progress upon the Continent, and more especially in Germany and Holland. A study of even a few of these books, with which we now proceed to deal, will convince our readers that there is such a movement, and that it must be reckoned with.

At one time it was computed that it took about thirty years for any rash German theory to become naturalized in England and in America, and, in fact, that only when such a theory was already on the wane in the land of its birth did people in England adopt it as the latest great discovery of the age, the magnificent

outcome of the deepest modern scholarship and thought. Things move more quickly now. Not only the *choregoi* of the Higher Critical tragic drama, but also their numerous enthusiastic (even if uncritical) disciples, very soon import nowadays the "very latest thing out" in German critical fashions, if, at least, these coincide with the Wellhausen hypotheses, or even outrun the latter in "subjective" theorizing. Unfortunately these men are far less prompt in informing the English public of the change that is so steadily coming over the spirit of the critics' dream in Germany itself, and in other Continental lands. This is possibly part of the "conspiracy of silence" which has been so noticeable of late years in this country, and which has led to the almost total "boycotting" of the views of those who are not Higher Critics. It is difficult to find a magazine courageous and impartial enough to admit an article written from any but the Graf-Wellhausen standpoint. But already, even in England, we seem to hear less (except from the lips of the half-educated) than we used to do about the "assured results" of the Higher Criticism. "J" and "E" are now, some ingenious critics tell us, intended to stand for "Judaite" and "Ephraimite," and no longer for "Jahvist" and "Elohist," as they did before Professor Schlögl, Mr. Harold Wiener, and Dr. Eerdmans had said their say on this crucial point. Such a *volte face* is itself significant of much. "There is a tide in the affairs of men," and it is hardly too much to say that in matters of Higher Criticism the tide is turning, or has turned, in a decidedly conservative direction. We shall doubtless find in the near future many a stranded hulk where we now see a fine stout vessel in all its pride of bunting. But in this country, as has already occurred in some cases in Germany, we may trust that fuller light will be vouchsafed to enable many such to avoid the quicksands which threaten destruction, and with brighter hopes to sail the ocean of certainty and truth.

Kuenen was at one time all supreme at Leyden as a theologian. His views had very great influence upon many students

in Germany, England, and America, as well as in Holland. But, as in the case of Baur at Tübingen, it has come to pass that Kuenen's critical dogmata no longer hold unchallenged sway in his old University.

Dr. Troelstra's lectures, "On the Organic Unity of the Old Testament,"<sup>1</sup> were delivered there recently at the invitation of the University authorities; and both in these, and in his "The Name of God in the Pentateuch,"<sup>2</sup> he wholly repudiates Kuenen's critical views. He shows that the Higher Criticism does injustice to the Old Testament, "because it approaches the Scripture with a pre-established opinion which is antagonistic to what the Scripture itself declares concerning the Books of the Old Covenant." Kuenen himself confesses this when he writes: "Either we must put aside as worthless our dearly purchased scientific method, or for ever cease to recognize any New Testament authority within the domain of Old Testament exegesis." This is plain speaking with a vengeance! Dr. Troelstra has no hesitation in denying that the Higher Critical method can in any true sense be styled "criticism" at all. He shows how distinctly Wildeboer and others admit that the Source-theory cannot be supported satisfactorily upon linguistic grounds, and that its only firm (?) foundation is acknowledged to be the distinction in the use of the Divine appellations "Jahweh" and "Ēlōhīm." He then proves how uncertain the Massoretic text is in the employment of these words, how more than doubtful it is that Exod. vi. 3 really means that the name "Jahweh" was first revealed to Moses (especially since Gen. iv. 26 is by the critics ascribed to the same "source" as Exod. vi. 3), and says: "If we start from Exod. vi. 3, a document must be evolved from Gen. i. to Exod. v. that employs exclusively the name 'Ēl Shaddai' to designate the Supreme Being. *But this cannot be done*, if it were only for this reason that 'Ēl Shaddai'

<sup>1</sup> An English translation of the first of them appears in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for July, 1912.

<sup>2</sup> An English version, by Canon E. McClure, has been just published by the S.P.C.K., with an able preface by the translator.

is employed only six times in this portion of the Holy Scriptures." The critics have built upon the sand, inasmuch as they have rashly and most uncritically accepted as the basis of their arguments the present Massoretic text of the "Hexateuch," instead of testing it by the approved methods of textual criticism. But Textual Criticism, with the help of the LXX and other old versions, shows how unsafe this conduct is. Instead of ascribing a late origin to the Pentateuch, Dr. Troelstra says: "There are certainly passages in the Pentateuch which are manifestly derived from a time anterior to Moses, even from a period prior to Abraham."

In his article "Is a Revolution in Pentateuchal Criticism at Hand?"<sup>1</sup> Dahse (as Professor Sayce observes in his preface to the English translation), by his very questions, implies an affirmative answer. Dahse admits that in Germany the Source theory still continues to be regarded "as a certain result of science," but he shows what serious assaults have been made on it of late, and how it has failed to repel them. In 1903 Johannes Lepsius wrote of it: "Within ten years not one stone shall be left upon another of the proud structure of this hypothesis." Textual criticism is the solvent which is now being so effectively employed. As a result, Dahse declares that "no investigator who employs the oldest texts would dare to make use of the names of God as a means for determining the sources of the documents" (P, E, J, *et hoc genus omne*). As to the value of the different use of the names "Jacob" and "Israel" as a mark of the distinction between the "sources," Dahse shows that we are justified by the contradictions among the critics themselves "in depriving it absolutely of any significance for the criticism of sources." Hence he concludes: "If 'Yahveh' and 'Ēlōhīm,' 'Jacob' and 'Israel,' are valueless for Source-division, if the narrative of the Deluge can be proved to be a unity, if the other show-pieces of the modern literary critics are probably in like case . . . then the only refuge left for the modern documentary

<sup>1</sup> Translated under this title by Canon E. McClure, and published by the S.P.C.K., with preface by Professor Sayce.

theory is the linguistic differences of the sources." He gives good reason to hold that the steady shrinking of the number of these differences is a proof that they cannot stand the strain thus imposed upon them. Hence he holds that the time has now come for another hypothesis to supplant that of the Higher Critics, preferring this to a futile attempt "to support with unstable pillars a building cracking in all its joints."

The publication of the first part of Eerdmans' "Old Testament Studies," "Die Komposition der Genesis," caused no little surprise to Higher Critics in this country, and attempts were made to "explain" his defection from their ranks. His position was made clear by his own statement in the Preface: "I renounce the Graf-Kuenen-Wellhausen critical school, and altogether oppose the so-called Newer Documentary Hypothesis." As a pupil of Kuenen, he at one time held that Genesis was made up J, E, and P. For many years, however, doubts on this point troubled him, until at last he found the theory untenable, principally because examination showed him that the main foundation of the hypothesis was unsound. "The Divine names 'Ēlohīm' and 'Jahveh' are no reliable guides in critical analysis." (Eerdmans' fancy that the use of the former word implied early polytheism is fully refuted by König, and so we need not dwell upon it.) He carefully, and even minutely, examines the "Priestly document" in Genesis, first giving the Higher Critical "results" in reference to this "source" and then refuting them in detail. For instance, whereas P is generally asserted to belong to the post-Exilic period, Eerdmans, calling attention to the fact that Gen. x. (part of P) omits all mention of the *Persians*, says: "It seems impossible that a writer of the Exilic or post-Exilic time should pass over a nation which at that time was to Israel the one which mattered most." Again, he remarks that surely the Jews then in Babylon must have known that, in Exilic times, the people of Elam were no longer Semites, and hence that Gen. x. 22 "cannot proceed from the post-Exilic period, as the P theory affirms." This appeal to common sense on a critic's part should not go unnoticed. Eerd-

mans quotes Wellhausen's dictum that the whole of literary criticism is "baseless and invalid" (*bodenlos und nichtig*) if Gen. xxvi. 34, 35, and xxviii. 8, 9, are not from another source than Gen. xxxvi. 1-5, 9-19. Having shown that in this last chapter verses 6-8 cannot be separated from those which precede and those which follow, Eerdmans concludes: "Thereby one bestows the deathblow on the P theory." He denies Wellhausen's view that the language of the so-called P document proves its post-Exilic origin. The examination of the J and E sections of Genesis is pursued in the same careful manner, and the existence of these "sources" is denied. "The idea that one can understand the composition of Genesis by means of the names of God has been proved erroneous. As often as one tries it, one is on a false track."

In "Die Vorgeschichte Israels," having shown how completely Ed. Meyer, Wellhausen, Winckler, Völter, Jensen, and others, contradict one another, Eerdmans establishes three theses: (1) The Patriarchs are not originally gods; (2) the stories of the Patriarchs are not mythological tales; (3) the stories of the Patriarchs are not reflections of the ethnological relations and cultus-tendencies of the kingly period.

Borrowing the expression from Winckler himself, Eerdmans wonders whether the Astral theory of the former has nothing in it of the "brain-cobwebs of the studies" (*Hirngespinnste der Studierstuben*). We fear that these "brain-cobwebs" are much in evidence at the present day, and "we thank thee, Winckler, for teaching us that word." Dealing with Ed. Stucken's "Astral Myths of the Hebrews," our author instances its absurdity by quoting Stucken's statement that the seizure of Sarah by Pharaoh (and Abimelech) is a reminiscence of the Babylonian myth of Istar's descent into the underworld, and says: "According to this method every account of a journey refers to Istar's descent into the underworld, provided it contains any reference to a lady." Similarly, of Völter's arguments in "Ägypten und die Bibel," he remarks: "In this way one can prove anything." That is precisely what many of us have felt in reading such

lucubrations. P. Jensen's arguments in "Das Gilgamesch-Epos in der Weltliteratur" are shown to consist largely of the use of the magic word "thus" to fill up missing links in the chain of reasoning, supplemented with "mihi constat."

Eerdmans certainly shows wonderful keenness and ability in sweeping away other men's *Hirngespinnste*. He is less successful in attempting to keep his own intact when others wield the besom of destruction.

In dealing with the Book of Exodus, Eerdmans points out that Hammurabi's code disproves the Higher Critical theory that the "Book of the Covenant" must be late because of its high morality. Regarding the asserted Exilic or post-Exilic origin of Leviticus, he gives good reason to conclude that it "consists of almost wholly pre-Exilic laws."

Professor Van Hoonacker, of Louvain, will not detain us long, though his book is decidedly of value. He shows that the so-called Jehovist group of laws recognizes the principle of the one Sanctuary (*cf.* Exod. xxiii. 14-19, xxxiv. 24), which has been denied. He also distinguishes between the horned altar and the lay-altar, the confusion of which with one another led the Higher Critics to their theory of the *late* introduction of the "one Sanctuary" rule. He quotes with approval Fries's statement as to "the insufficiency of the Ariadne's thread which guides the Grafian criticism through the labyrinth of Old Testament study." Van Hoonacker declares that the theory (Wellhausen's and Nöldeke's) that Melchizedek is a "personification" is absurd. In opposition to Wellhausen's contention that the High Priesthood was unknown before the Exile, he shows that there is good reason for the contrary opinion. As among the Babylonians and Assyrians priest-kings had preceded royalty—as in Saba the *makrabs*, and among the Minæans the *kabîrs*, are found in very early times—it is quite in accordance with Semitic custom and analogy that in Israel also the priesthood should exist before the rise of kingship.

Professor König, who, among other distinctions, enjoys that of being a "Geheimer Konsistorialrat," will require an answer

at the hands of the Higher Critics, if they can give it. It is true that he admits the existence of E and J, but he insists that these "sources" must be far earlier than the critics now think. He puts E "in the time of the Judges," and J about David's time, but says that the Decalogue and the "Book of the Covenant [Exod. xx. 22 to xxiii. 33] cannot be placed in any more probable time than that of Moses." Marti's statement that J's and E's narratives "can lay no claim to historical value" because of their supposed late date, is characterized as "mere assertion." König observes that the discovery of Hammurabi's code robs "of the last remnants of its probability" the oft-repeated but unproved declaration that the Hebrews, even in Moses' time, were "an illiterate horde." He adds: "How unnatural an assertion would one therefore be making, did one wish to affirm even that Abraham had no knowledge of the art of writing!" since he came from South Babylonia. Dealing with the mention of punishment about to befall Levi (in Gen. xlix. 5-7), he holds that this passage "cannot be derived from the post-Mosaic period," because Levi was then a tribe consecrated to God's service, and he says that to ascribe such texts as this to a late period, and to fancy that they were fabricated for the purpose of falsifying history, is, in his opinion, a piece of "uncritical arbitrariness."

König protests strongly against the popular practice of confounding the true religion of Israel with the corrupt "Volksreligion," saying that this confusion runs through Stade's description of the religion of Israel "like a red thread." He condemns Marti, Wellhausen, Ottley, and Cheyne, as guilty of the same error. The idea that, after settling in Canaan, or even in Manasseh's time, the Hebrews borrowed from Babylon the narratives contained in the earlier chapters of Genesis, "by no means rests upon a secure foundation." It is refreshing, after a long course of Higher Critical study, to find a scholar of Professor König's eminence writing common sense. For instance, after discussing the unproved assertion of Stade and others that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are merely local gods

transmogrified, he declares that, "in the old Hebrew sources there are a hundred proofs against, but not one in support of," this fancy. The theory of the original fetishism from which Israel's religion (according to Stade, Piepenbring, Marti, Kautzsch, Gunkel, Ottley, Astley) was evolved is shown to be destitute of foundation. Winckler's theory that Abraham's migration was due to his attachment to the worship of the moon, and his opposition to the rising tide of popularity in favour of Merodach, is declared to be entirely opposed to the distinct statements of J and E. König quotes Cornill's conclusion that Abraham is "a strongly historical personage," and Wilke's and W. Lotz's demolition of the hypothesis that the Patriarchs are myths, or "personifications" of tribes. He declares that the "Book of the Covenant" is, "on philological and especially on religio - historical [*kultusgeschichtliche*] "grounds, shown to belong to the earliest stage of Hebrew literature." Throughout his book he refutes the theory (of Robertson, Smith, and others) that the genuine national faith of Israel was at first, and in reality, much the same as that of the Canaanites.

In his article in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* the Professor shows how uncritical and unscientific are the grounds on which the Higher Critical version of the history of Israel rests. Wellhausen admits that his own conclusions are very nearly identical with Vatke's ideas on the subject. Now, Vatke's views on this point were avowedly not taken from the Biblical documents, but from the Hegelian system of philosophy. Vatke "did not try to find the history in its sources, but to evolve it out of philosophical discussions." Hence "Vatke proved that he did not know the real method of historical research." How would the history of England read, and what would be its practical value, were it to be rewritten in this way, with calm and contemptuous and utterly unscientific rejection of the statements made in our oldest historical documents? In opposition to the religion which Vatke, Wellhausen, B. Stade, Marti, Kautzsch, and others, have invented for the Patriarchs out of their own inner

consciousness, König holds that he himself has "proved by critical examination of all the newer statements about the religious conditions in the time of the Patriarchs, that the Bible is absolutely correct in calling their religion the first degree [stage] of the true religion of Israel." He casually points out that, contrary to what is often asserted, "competent Old Testament critics *do* actually exist outside the Wellhausen school, and in spite of it." He concludes "that the Patriarchs really existed, and that their religion was a power which could not have been derived from the historical circumstances of their time."

The space at our disposal will not allow us to do full justice to the thoughtful and scholarly work of Möller, but it deserves careful study. An earlier book of his has been rendered into English under the title "Are the Critics Right?" Originally an adherent of Wellhausen, further study has forced upon him the conviction of the baselessness of the Higher Critical theory. He writes thus: "After my studies, which now reach back for much more than a decade, I am strongly under the impression that it is more correct to inquire what single passages are *not* from Moses than timorously to give back to him a broken fragment here and there, and then, perhaps, consider oneself a special friend of the Bible." He shows that the Higher Criticism cannot logically continue much longer to uphold its "assured results." It must either go farther, and break up its "sources," J, E, P, etc., into more fragments, thereby applying to itself the *reductio ad absurdum* method (which, indeed, it has already done in Isaiah), thus turning the documentary hypothesis into "the fragmentary hypothesis," and leaving us nothing but a mass of broken pieces devoid of all unity, or it must grant that its division of the "Hexateuch," on the ground of the employment of the Divine names and the supposed recurrence of "doublets," is untenable. In either case this theory breaks down.

Though Völz is still to a great degree an adherent of Wellhausen, yet he very severely criticizes the views of that school in regard to Moses' position as a religious teacher. He attacks their imaginary sketch of the supposed pre-Mosaic religion of

Israel, and declares that Stade is quite wrong in describing what Genesis says on the subject as full of errors and contradictions.

The accidental circumstance that Mr. Harold Wiener has written in English instead of in German prevents us from adding a review of his valuable books ("Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism," "Studies in Biblical Law") to those already dealt with. We must, however, note how admirably he has shown up "the great illusion" which has led Wellhausen, Robertson, Smith, Carpenter, and others, to confound lay-altars of earth or unhewn stones with the one House and its brazen altar with horns. "Hence an artificial history of stages marked respectively by 'a multiplicity of sanctuaries' and 'a single sanctuary' has been constructed on the basis of laws and narratives, which in reality recognize one House and many altars."

Seeing what severe blows are now being dealt by German and Dutch (to say nothing of English, Scotch, and American) scholarship at the very bases of the Higher Criticism, we who have never "bowed the knee unto Baal" may well rejoice. Nor are we devoid of hope that many of the "Sidonians" (*ut ita loquar*) themselves may in time find a worthier object of worship, a nobler and more spiritual faith.

## The Clergyman's Duty with Regard to Reading.

BY THE REV. H. J. WARNER, M.A.

*Vicar of Yealmpton.*

MOST clergymen are tempted, in these days of multifarious calls upon their time, their strength and their money, to regard the duty of "reading" as a counsel of perfection. Other duties come into conflict with it—duties of apparently greater urgency, of more direct advantage to the souls, and, may we not say? the bodies, of those committed to their care. The opposite temptation besets those whose *compulsory* reading, for Degree or Holy Orders, has just come to an end; I mean the young Priests and Deacons. On their behalf, therefore, I should like to present to all Rectors and Vicars a petition of right, more particularly because their youthful bashfulness prevents them from presenting it themselves. As we get older, we naturally acquire "the pen of a ready writer" in the composition of sermons; but the first efforts of the newly-fledged consume much time and toil. The writer had only one Vicar, and, without drawing the parallel of the fable of the lion and the ass too closely, the said Vicar took the lion's share of the preaching himself. That the congregation appreciated this division was proved by the testimonials which they gave to each on vacating their ministerial charges respectively. And let me urge upon my younger brethren in the ministry to take full advantage of this alleviation from preaching. Too quickly will come the days when you will long for those quiet hours of study, free from the primary responsibility of a parish and a thousand and one interruptions, and long in vain. Your Vicar's library will be a better one than your own. Borrow his books, read, learn, and inwardly digest them; do not mark them; be sure to return them and that promptly. Do not emit a sigh of relief because you have no more examinations.

You have not got through your "finals" when you wear

your stole for the first time lengthwise. "Cucullus non facit monachum." On the contrary, you will now be subjected to a constant examination by a whole host of examiners, less sympathetic, because less cultured, than those you have faced in the University schools or the episcopal palace, the results of which will not be "out" until that Day when the secrets of all hearts, yours and theirs, shall be disclosed.

"Give heed to reading," was the advice of the aged and best-read Apostle to the young minister. St. Paul had proved the value of his reading when speaking and evangelizing at Athens, at Ephesus, and the neighbouring district. Apostolic succession will not weaken its claim upon that sapient individual, "the man in the street," because the clergyman proves that he has followed the Apostolic command. Reading should have the same effect now as it had then upon all seekers after truth; they will make a bonfire of all that trashy literature which previously they supposed to be so clever and found so fascinating. They will see that it is not a mere question of preference of one branch in the tree of knowledge for another, as, for instance, history for science, but the grave alternative, Diana or Christ, wrong or right, death or life. Their eyes will be opened to its real character, with its moral and spiritual consequences.

Moreover, the clergyman who is well versed in any subject is not placed by his parishioners in the same category with a layman who is a *specialist* in the same subject. It is well known that the supreme interest and work of their clergyman is religious, and that his sacred office is concerned not with the seen and temporal, but with the unseen and eternal. Studies in other directions are therefore regarded by them as ancillary to theology, to religion. Those who demand a religious education for their children expect an educated religion for themselves; and they will not accept as a substitute either an ignorant, uncultured pietism, or a pedantic, despotic ritualism.

For this advance in education and educational ideals among all classes the Church is happily very largely responsible. In

all ages the clergy have been not only preachers but teachers. Beginning as ἀγραμματοὶ καὶ ἰδιῶται in the official and popular judgment, they are known now as learned clerks. And particularly is this so with the clergy of the English Church. "Clerus Anglicanus stupor mundi." Our forefathers have gained for us, both with Romanist and Nonconformist, a prestige for sound and sober scholarship. It is for us to see to it that this prestige is not a præstigia, an illusion, or counterfeit. The highest honour we can pay the intellectual giants who were in the land in those days is not slavishly to quote them, but to confirm or correct their conclusions by independent study, albeit under the guidance and inspiration of their example and methods. "One ill requiteth one's teacher," said Nietzsche, "by remaining always his scholar." Neither by them, nor by commentators in the old time before them, has the Word of God been exhausted. It is as true now as when first spoken: "Every scribe who hath been made a disciple to the Kingdom of Heaven is like a man that is a householder which bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old." To do this every such scribe should be properly equipped. He ought to be able to read and readily translate the three languages, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. Dead languages unto the world, they are not so unto the Church. Are we straining the detail that "Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews," was written upon the Cross in Hebrew, Latin, and Greek, if we declare that if we are to preach "Jesus Christ, and Him crucified" with accuracy and fulness, we can do so only by a knowledge of these three languages? No one ought to be ashamed to take down his Gesenius, or his Bruder and Winer, and patiently investigate the various shades of meaning of some crucial word in every place where it occurs. Such systematic study will yield a more abundant harvest than many commentaries. It wonderfully strengthens the critical faculty, and lays the foundation of sound scholarship. The ditch makes the hedge. If Martin Luther's golden discovery or recovery of the true meaning of *pœnitentia* revolutionized the current religious teaching of the Dark Ages,

and gave millions "joy and peace in believing," may there not still be words and phrases which have not yet yielded up all their message from the Holy Spirit—words and phrases which, we cannot doubt, when rightly apprehended, would go far to settle many of our controversies, and bring those who profess and call themselves Christians into unity, peace, and concord? Scriptural metaphysics will be found more profitable than German metaphysics as in—

" Kant's book,  
A world of words, tail foremost, where  
Right, wrong—false, true—and foul and fair,  
As in a lottery wheel are shook,  
Five thousand crammed octavo pages  
Of German psychologies."

A clergyman, with such sure ground under his feet, steps out firmly and confidently. A word opens up to his trained eye an extensive panorama of the Holy Land. He is mighty to the pulling down of strongholds. He speaks with authority, and the confidence of the shepherd is imparted to his flock. "It pleased God to save them that believe"—*διὰ τῆς μωρίας τοῦ κηρύγματος*, not *τοῦ κήρυκος*, or even *τῆς κηρύξεως*—the message pure and simple, not the messenger or his method.

But scholarship is not scholasticism. We must make ourselves familiar, not only with the content of revelation, but with the attacks which are made upon it from without, and with the reasonable difficulties which it presents to the minds of others. To ignore either of these is to be unfaithful to our Ordination vow. Our ministry must be practical and deal with the present conditions of inquiry, but to swallow whole the latest theory of Modernism as the immutable result of critical and scientific research is to risk an acute attack of theological dyspepsia which inflicts discomfort, not only on the sufferer himself, but also on his friends and acquaintance. If anyone with the care of souls can bring himself to believe that the Old Testament, for instance, is written "backsy-vor," as they say in the West, he is bound to ask himself, before he proclaims his opinion, what effect it is likely to have upon those committed to his charge, and how he

will so guide and govern those souls that they do not make shipwreck of their faith. Reading must show to him that the spade is mightier than the pen, that the archæologist in the field does not uphold the textual critic in his study, and that the farther back the discoveries of the former reach (as, for instance, the oldest Babylonian version of the Flood, published by Professor Hilprecht) the more is the Bible confirmed. All objections, of course, are not of the same strength as that put forth with all gravity in a book on the Creation, published a short time ago—viz., that the record of the naming of the animals in Genesis could not be chronologically placed, because it occurs *after* the instalment of man in the Garden of Eden, and that would mean that the animals would not keep to the paths, but trample over lawns, flower-beds and vegetable-plots, without the slightest regard for the damage they would do!

On the other hand, we cannot repress inquiry. We cannot issue Papal Encyclical Letters like "Pascendi Gregis," of which Mr. Lilley writes: "It is indeed difficult to see how Pius X. can persuade himself that he has here discharged that duty of feeding the Lord's flock. . . . He has once more forbidden the flock to wander beyond the narrow pen of scholasticism, where every scanty blade has long since been nibbled to its hard and sapless roots." Patient study will protect a clergyman from professional suicide, as Hugh Miller committed actual suicide because he could not compress the results of geological research into the traditional six days of twenty-four hours each. We must follow the prophet's advice and keep to the old roads, but old roads have to be strengthened and adapted to modern traffic. A clergyman's duty is to ascertain "What saith the Scripture?" which is not the same as "What do men say that the Scripture saith?" and then to preach it in full assurance of faith. There cannot possibly be any final and irreconcilable antagonism between revelation and science. Let us note that "science" is derived from the *present* participle. Science is the process of knowing, not the product of knowledge. The true scientist is constantly admitting that "the last word," the settled

and unalterable result, the infallible proofs of science on many points, have had to be abandoned.

And as of God's Word, so of God's Church. The clergyman must be a good Church historian. But his duty in this respect is not discharged by feeding upon the scraps flung out by Church Defence Leaflets. Unfortunately we have no good Church history. Criticism has thrown the ordinary histories into confusion. Neander is antiquated, but has not yet been superseded. However, material is accumulating, as in the Berlin Academy's edition of Hippolytus, and the more we read and weigh such testimony, the more confidently can Churchmen exclaim: "My lines have fallen unto me in a fair ground; yea, I have a goodly heritage." We realize, as Von Hartmann points out in his "Philosophy of the Unconscious," that "Life is not only to be found in the present. It is not merely strength for which the living ring of the tree is debtor to its forefathers, but, by holding them in its embrace, expansion likewise; wherefore, for the newly-sprouting ring, as for the tree, the first law is really to embrace and enfold all its predecessors; the second, to grow from the root upward, self-independently." The orthodox, the conservative, the dogmatic position, *may* be the right one, but as right dividers of the Word of Truth we have to meet the objector on his own ground. It is in vain that in the twentieth century we furbish up the obsolete weapons of the Apologists of the first age of the Church. As Professor Eucken observes in his "Main Currents of Modern Thought" (p. 472, English translation): "There are many to-day who wish to be religious, but are not in the least attracted by ecclesiasticism; they are as much repelled by the Church as they are attracted by religion. The cause of this state of affairs is perhaps to be sought in the existence of a wide gap between the traditional form of Christianity and the civilized life of the present day. . . . While ancient Christianity attempted to communicate new power and fresh living courage to a tired and intimidated humanity, religion has now to do with a humanity full of strong desire for life and restless activity."

A clergyman with this theological and historical grounding is best qualified to approach other subjects, particularly the subjects which comprehend the present practical work of the Church. There is the vast and intensely interesting work of foreign missions. He cannot be content with uttering platitudes which are no longer beatitudes; with describing relationships between Christianity and other world-religions which no longer obtain. There are, also, sociological questions which are being widely discussed, especially by the so-called working-classes, from the high ideals of a Scott Holland or a Mallock to the grossness of a Boxall, who quotes with approval the German maxim, "Der weg des Tieres ist der weg Gottes." Get together a class of your more intelligent parishioners of any age or social class to study some subject *with* you. We are all members of the Pestalozzian School. "Discendo doces: docendo disces." From such a class will present themselves to you inquirers after the ways and means of "getting into the Church," an expression which you will at once be able to correct. By sympathy with such inquirers, by your intimate knowledge of their character and mental ability, gained largely in such classes, by personal help in those subjects requisite for ordination, especially in their Latin and Greek, you will have done something to relieve the stress and strain of those incumbents who are suffering from a dearth of curates. The country clergy in their seclusion, the town clergy with their access to libraries, can read papers and give addresses respectively on devotional and practical subjects; and thus it will come about that not merely "Clerus Anglicanus," but "Ecclesia Anglicana stupor mundi."

But many a parish priest will ask, "How is it to be done? Little time, little room, little money render it impossible." Well, much may be done by careful and skilful stevedoring of time, room, and money, and by brotherly co-operation. An interleaved Bible is of great value where the possessor follows the advice of Captain Cuttle: "When found, make a note on." Reading is profitable, not from the quantity of books read, but from the quality and the amount absorbed. *Res angusta domi*

demands a careful selection of books, which is a distinct gain, not an insuperable restriction. Brother will lend brother a book which he has found helpful himself. If *you* find it helpful, make a synopsis of it for future reference, and return the book quickly that some other brother may receive a like benefit. Trust not to *printed* synopses. Burn your Paley's ghosts and your Pearson's skeletons *et hoc genus omne*. You can never quicken them with the life of the originals, and they encourage lazy and slipshod reading.

Reading widens a man's outlook; makes him tolerant of opinions different from his own; enables him to respect where he does not accept another's standpoint, if he is sure that that other is as sincere and diligent a seeker after truth as he claims to be himself, and wishes to be so regarded; weans him from that obscurantism which is the besetting sin of pietism and ritualism; takes him out of the dim and dreary slum of the town or the ruts of rusticity, and sets him within the spiritual and intellectual communion of saints and seers. It makes him stable when novelties in Church and State throw the ignorant and ill-informed into a panic.

Bishop Westcott (and who had a better right to speak it?) said: "That which gives us the greatest pleasure is not the *possession* of knowledge, but the *acquiring* of it. In knowledge, as in everything else, it is the pursuit that is of first-rate importance, and nowhere does Plato better display his great wisdom than in defining man as 'the hunter of truth.'"

Let all your reading be consecrated to the service of God, and be begun, continued, and ended in prayer, that it may be said of you as was said of Bishop Lancelot Andrewes: "*Dr.* Andrewes in the school; *Bishop* Andrewes in the pulpit; *St.* Andrewes in the inner chamber."

NOTE.—The writer may be permitted to call attention to Dr. Williams's Library, Gordon Square, London, from which books may be borrowed free of charge. The only expense to readers is the postage of books both ways, and the annual list of books added to the library, price 2d. The library is open daily from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m., except Saturday, when it closes at 1 p.m.

## Friction.

BY THE REV. CHARLES COURTENAY, M.A.,  
*Chaplain of Holy Trinity, Rome.*

OUR subject introduces us to familiar ground, ground which most of us have traversed in our lifetime, and perhaps will be found traversing again some dark day. Even the mildest and meekest of men do not entirely escape it, while the imperious and proud are never out of touch with it.

It is not a pleasant feature of our existence that we should come into collision with our fellows, and nothing in life leads to such deep scars and bitter recollections. We would give much to escape friction, and one of the anticipated joys of heaven is that there it is not.

It is because friction is so universal and so noxious that we do well to look it fairly in the face, and look well, too, around it, that we may be able to find some wise way of dodging and escaping it. We may not always be able to escape an evil entirely, but we can often mitigate it and minimize it. A second best is not so good as a first best, but it is better than a third or a fourth best.

From his very position the minister is more likely than most people to collide with others, because his everyday business is with men, and by his profession he is called upon to say and do things which may rub the wrong way. Unless he pursues peace at all costs, even that of faithfulness, I do not see how he can avoid unpleasant collisions altogether.

There is the *personal* aspect of his ministry, which may easily cause friction, for no man rubs shoulders with others so often and so closely as he. He is the centre of a large number of workers who share with him the working of his parish. He also shares with them the imperfections of humanity, the tendency to sensitiveness, to love of power, to partiality, to

self-importance. And out of this complex mixture sparks may easily fly when the rough edges meet.

Then there are the *parochial* possibilities with minister and people, a people many of whom want to be let alone, want to be propitiated by material and solid attentions, who are suspicious and selfish, and who quickly imagine neglect. Here, of course, the possibilities of friction are endless, for each of your thousands or hundreds may be a centre of mischief, a hard point against which you may collide.

*Ecclesiastical friction* has become a proverb, so rife is it, and perhaps the flag of party has never flown so flauntingly as now. Men will not agree to differ, will not look at the other side of a truth, will rarely compare the agreements between them, but consider it to be their bounden duty to strike out at the other side whenever the chance offers itself. No hand is so often clenched as a party hand, and no muscle is held so tense as the striking one. That the white should go for the black is only right, but that the white should march out with banners flying against the whity-brown, so little removed from white itself, is strange indeed. Unfortunately, just as relations, when they quarrel at all, usually quarrel more than strangers, so it is the microscopic change of tint which causes the most violent friction, and all in the sacred name of principle and under the sacred plea of faithfulness.

But, probably, the most inevitable friction is the *congregational friction*, antagonism between the heart and truth. It is the minister's duty to preach the truth, and the truth has a strangely rasping power when hearts are hostile. He has to point to ways which the human spirit shrinks from taking, to insist on the performances of duties which the human will is bound naturally to resist, to press submission on rebels, and the renunciation of evil practices on unrepentant sinners. And the effect can only be the friction of resistance. It is just as it is in the heavens when an asteroid splinter strikes our earth's atmospheric envelope and bursts into flame at once. Something is gained if we recognize the necessity of friction as well as its inevitableness, for there may be profit in it, and often is.

It is in the spiritual world, as it is in the material world, an absolute necessity. You cannot drive in a nail or strike a match without it. A carpenter cannot shave and plane a board without it. The whole essence of success in life is in the right management of it. There are few things wholly evil in the world, and a little sensible management will work wonders with many apparently intractable things.

But we are bound to confess that there is a whole world of difference between necessary and unnecessary friction, and it is this unnecessary friction with which we are concerned in this paper. Most men are sensible enough to know that some friction there is bound to be. But they chafe at the friction which is gratuitous, and wilful, and painful, and misplaced.

Possibly, most of us in looking back at the difficulties of our past can see the special corner where, through a piece of clear mismanagement on our part, we came into collision with another. Some of us would like to live our lives over again, if only to handle the old misunderstandings more gently and more wisely. We fancy that the years have taught us something which would stand us in good stead had we to meet the same experience again.

Now, my object in this paper is to voice the feelings of my brethren, and to set down what, no doubt, they would write themselves had it fallen to their lot to take my place. It is not a philosophy of friction, but a contribution to it—how to avoid friction.

There is a world of good sense in that bit of matchbox direction, "Rub lightly," which is so familiar to us. Friction there must be, if you are to strike a light at all, but let there be just enough and no more. It is the excess which wears the box and destroys the head of your match. And it is the excess too, when you rub heavily and raspingly, which exasperates the tempers of men and women. If we have to come down on people, do not let us come down with too heavy a hand. If a light touch will do the work, we are foolish to rub hard.

It is good and wise also to *drive carefully round corners.*

Most of the accidents in our roads come from drivers taking it for granted that the road is clear. And so they come carelessly and furiously along, only to find that there is someone there, and to see them prostrate on the ground and violently protesting. To beg pardon and to lend a hand to repair the mischief is as much as they can do now, but it ought to be a caution to them for the rest of their lives not to drive so recklessly. I have known persons who, in spite of their being in the wrong, have tried to throw the blame on the other for not driving carefully, but that is a bit of sheer bluff and meanness. You know what I mean. Let us not drive with eyes tight shut, let us not be careless how we go, let us not drive over anybody from sheer thoughtlessness, but keep a good lookout, remembering the possibility that otherwise someone will be hurt.

We do well not to forget *what a mass of susceptibilities* may be wrapped up under one sensitive skin. A rough touch, an unduly loud voice, too much abruptness, will set some people shuddering and shivering. We rub them on the raw when we handle them inconsiderately, and little good we are likely to do them then. Sensitive people are much to be pitied, and ought to have all the gentleness we can give them.

We shall be well advised if we also *keep ourselves well in hand*. A minister can run away just as can a horse, and if he does he will do perhaps the more damage of the two. Let us keep ourselves heavily bitted. One man is run away with by his *humour*, and lets himself go to a hazardous extreme. Humour is an essential to every man, but within limits. It is easy to degenerate into the funny man, and to lose all our gravity before we know it. Sydney Smith was a philosopher and a humorist, and the humorist quite drowned the religious philosopher. It is very easy to be humorous at others' expense, and there is no surer way of causing friction. Our *zeal*, too, may run away with us, and we may lose our heads in the fury of the zealous heart. Zeal requires a heavy dose of discretion to curb it. Otherwise, like a ship without rudder, we may collide with someone else. If we have a strong *critical* faculty,

we may be so keen in our manipulation of the crucible as to see alloy in everything and everybody. Life can be better spent than in the dissection of others and the imputation to them of inferiority. We stand to lose, not gain, by passing clever judgments on our fellows. Some men run naturally to *satire*, and burn and blister everybody by their clever, cutting, biting, and vitriolic wit. They are the least lovable of men and the least useful. An over-developed *imagination* is a difficult companion for a minister to live with. It is likely to run to flowers in his discourses, to violations of charity in his judgments, to over-statements in his arguments, and to untruthfulness in his comments on others. But, above all, the *tongue* must be bridled in the minister, for, while it is his chief agent of communication with the world around him, it may easily act like the lion's tongue to draw blood wherever it touches.

The minister, too, will be well advised if he *wears blinkers*. It is not an unmixed blessing to see everything, and we may easily see too much. The use of blinkers is to circumscribe the vision, and so to enable the horse to forge ahead undisturbed. The minister will also be wise if he wears something corresponding over his ears to prevent his hearing too much. It seems a little inconsistent to cultivate the blind eye and the deaf ear, but it has its advantages, nevertheless. For one thing, the blind eye preserves us from trifling interferences which as a rule do more harm than good. The blind eye gives things a little awry the chance to right themselves, which they often do if let alone, while too keen an eye vivifies noxious things, and resurrects them when they are almost moribund. The deaf ear, in the same way, prevents the currency of tales which are probably untrue, and ought never to come into the open at all. Besides, the minister, if his ears be properly closed, will not be a receptacle for the tittle-tattle of the parish. The more he discourages the conveyance of small talk in his direction, the better for him and the peace of his parish. Yes, the use of blinkers and the ear-secluder are vital if friction is to be prevented, and they cannot be dispensed with.

It is important, too, I think, for the minister who would diminish friction to beware of *taking too many things for granted*. Our people may be very good-natured, but we may press them too far. Because they like us, we fancy we may make as many changes as we please. But we do well to remember that theological prepossessions are mightier than personal likings, and it is more disastrous to rub people's views the wrong way than their affections. We may flatter ourselves that they will not mind, but the awakening will be rude indeed. It is better to take less than much for granted in this world. We may take too many liberties, and make too little of men's sensitiveness and tolerance.

We must be careful, too, in the common practice of *insisting too much on our rights*. It is easy to find ourselves in hot water through the too great insistence on them. Besides, it is a short step to forgetting that other people have their rights as well. The law has, no doubt, given the parson a large province of authority in Church matters and arrangements, and it is, as a rule, well defined. But to push these rights to their extremest limits is fatal to the peace of the parish. The golden rule, I think, is to cover our rights and powers decently over, and to bury them out of sight until they are disputed. The more we act single-handed and unaided, the less is our influence for good. The more we call our officers and people into consultation, the better for the whole parochial concern. Co-operation should be the order of the day, and hand-in-hand work should be the rule. Now and again the noise of quarrels is heard in the ecclesiastical land, parson and people are found in opposite camps, and we often discover that one or the other is pressing his rights and insisting on them. Be the victory with whom it may, the issue is fatal.

The free *use of the imagination* may work much friction as well, unless it is moderated considerably. When we do not know we imagine, and our imagination is often taken for knowledge and certainty, with the inevitable result. We imagine slights, for instance, which might just as easily be something much more

harmless. We imagine motives which more than probably do not exist outside our own imagination. We imagine neglect, which may well be forgetfulness or absence of mind. We imagine disdainful feelings when overlooked or passed without a greeting, which may just as well be shortness of sight and the spectacles left at home. The strange thing is that, with a thousand examples of mistake on our part in imputing wrong feelings to others, we should still pursue the evil course and still imagine all sorts of slights and wrongs. We had better keep that imagination of ours in strict check, unless we want to be run away with in a downward direction.

One fruitful method of keeping the peace is *to hear both sides* before deciding. Sometimes we do not, and the results are not pleasant. For the minister, surely, ought to be the most judicious of men, and to be judicious is to be judicial, and to act as the upright judge is to hear both sides and judge impartially according to the evidence. Because one may be a friend is no reason for being unfair to the other. Right is right, be the parties who they may. We all know from our own experience what a dreadful burden the feeling of injustice brings. There is nothing so painful. He who deals unjustly with another, even though only by the simple expression of an opinion, has ruffled more feelings than he will ever replace again. And when his friends and neighbours take sides with him, the hardly treated victim, as he feels himself to be, the materials for a very ugly scandal are all ready to hand. Much of this would be prevented if we only heard both sides of the question. We should then balance one story against the other, but to leap to a decision utterly unprepared is to court inevitable disaster.

It is advisable also to *keep our own side of the hedge*. To skip to the other side is to commit trespass and to encroach on another's preserves. Yet how frequently we do not mind our own business! If we do not, we must expect the fate of meddlers and be scorched by the spirit of friction. The fear is lest we ministers should imagine ourselves the arbiters in all questions, political and social, as well as theological and parochial.

Surely, our duties are sufficient without stepping beyond our boundaries. Yet has it not been the case that much parochial friction has resulted from this very interference in other men's matters? If we be approached on certain questions not strictly our own, and be invited to come over and help, we should do well to go, but not otherwise. There is nothing men more intensely dislike than to be dictated to on matters appertaining to their own province, and we lay ourselves open to the very distressing retort to mind our own business.

We have need to *watch well over our manners* lest we grow imperious and dictatorial. Natures, of course, differ widely, and while some are too yielding others are too commanding. It is these latter who expose themselves most to the awakening of friction. Intense heat can be generated by a patronizing and superior way, and there will be frequent ructions where this proud treatment is rife. A little humility would save some of us a great measure of trouble in our dealings with others. Perhaps there are some parishioners who will immediately surrender at the word of command. On the other hand, there are many more whose backs will be set up in the most defiant fashion. But even the most submissive will feel that a soft word would be preferable, and that a less imperious manner would be more comfortable. The sharp crack of a whip may do for beasts of burden, but free men and women may be pardoned if they resent being driven with whip and spur. Small boys will obey the schoolmaster, and are wise enough to know that it is the best thing to do for sundry reasons, but the schoolmaster spirit in a minister is so entirely misplaced that he will do well to avoid it.

In truth, there is no profession in the world which so requires that everything should be *wrapped in something soft* as the minister's. Love is out and out the best of wrappings. Those sharp angles, which get in our own and others' way, love will soften and round. That sharp tongue, which is so fatally compromising, can be protected by a sheath of love, and in no other way. That sharp manner, which rasps whatever it touches, if

only folded well in love's soft texture, will be sharp no longer. Love can handle gently without hurting. Love can calculate its movement so nicely, that we can shave the closest corners safely. Love can make allowances and look at things with a merciful eye, and can take in all aspects with discrimination. Love can be hurt and yet smile kindly. Love can abate suspicions and doubts and give credit for the very best intentions on very slender evidence. Love can root out that spirit of self which throws such a veil of darkness over our dealings with others, and which is responsible for three-fourths of the frictions of life. Love sweetens the temper. In fact, love is the triple armour which protects us against the exasperating happenings of life, but which is at the same time so soft and pleasant to the touch that we may move anywhere, at any speed, without disturbing anyone against whom we may brush.

Now, in advancing all these palliations of friction, I am well aware that all the wrong is not likely to be on one side. It may be just as easily on the other. If we are blameless, and the whole cause of offence is in the misunderstanding, the unkindness and want of charity of the layman, what is to be done then? Why, just bear it as well as we can, bear it silently, bear it manfully and Christianly. It takes two to make a quarrel, and we need not make one of those two. Then it will die down without spreading or scandal. But we must fall back on that special grace which He gives Who was misunderstood more than all men upon earth, and, leaning hard on Him, keep the peace and rest happily on the Great Justifier. Certainly, "the servant of God must not strive." Rather, he must trust and be still. And so we may hope that by the oil of the Spirit, friction, if not entirely removed, may be abated and neutralized.



## The Missionary World.

THOUGH April 27 now lies some weeks behind us, all hearts are still full of what the *Spectator* well called "the haunting wonder" of the "unprecedented appeal" for prayer from the Chinese Government. In 1813, just a century ago, the edict was promulgated that "such Europeans as shall privately print books and establish preachers to pervert the multitude . . . the chief one shall be executed." Only thirteen years ago thousands of Christians were massacred in the Boxer movement. To-day, however mixed the motives may have been, the rulers of the nation have held out their plea for prayer to the Christian world. The response has been widespread and real, but it needs to be sustained. From all sides the evidence presses in upon us alike of China's possibilities and of China's need.

\* \* \* \* \*

*China's Millions* for May contains an interesting comparison of four great Conferences, representing the whole Protestant missionary body in China, held in Shanghai, at all of which the writer, Mr. F. W. Baller, was present. The first, held in 1877, met in a small hall, as only a few provinces were then occupied by missionaries. Most of the leaders who took part in it have passed away. The second, in 1900, was larger; the third, in 1907, was much larger still, and published resolutions and recommendations which have left a deep mark on missionary policy. In these Conferences no Chinese members of the Church took part. The Shanghai National Conference, which sat from March 11-14 this year, under Dr. Mott's chairmanship, had thirty-six Chinese delegates from centres as far distant as Canton and Peking. "Among them," writes Mr. Baller, "were pastors, evangelists, translators, educationalists, and editors. Many had been abroad, some of whom had passed through educational institutions in the West with distinction. Others had graduated from Christian colleges in China, and spoke

English with varying degrees of fluency and intelligibility. Their presence was not only a significant indication of progress and development in the Chinese Church, but also was a prophecy of the day, not far distant, when they will take a prominent part in the administration of the Church and its varied activities. . . . This Conference registered the progress of mission work, as shown in the presence of Chinese delegates, and the part they took in the Conference. In 1877 the waters were to the ankles, in 1900 to the knees, in 1907 to the loins, and now they are waters to swim in. Such a focussing of ability, talent, experience, and administrative power has not been seen in China before. It was illuminating to hear the views of those present, and to realize that, in response to the prayers and gifts of Christians in all parts of the world, Christian activities of so many kinds had sprung up and borne such good fruit." It is indicative of the change in China that the proceedings were in English, though the Rev. Ch'eng Ching-yi, of the London Missionary Society, well known in connection with the Edinburgh Conference, acted as official interpreter. Mr. Baller notes that an extraordinary number of new words have been introduced into the Chinese language to meet the new requirements, words which were wholly unknown in 1877.

\* \* \* \* \*

There is a general sense that the May meetings this year, and, perhaps, especially those of the British and Foreign Bible Society and of the C.M.S., have been unusually good, with a close-knit purpose which is full of promise. The financial position of the C.M.S., though there is no cause for panic, maintains a perplexing situation which thousands had hoped to see left behind. Full statements have been made in the Society's periodicals and elsewhere. The test is a severe one, alike for the missionaries on the field in touch with crippled work and vast opportunities; for the central committees and the officials on whom the responsibility of leadership falls; for the local associations and the supporters through the country whose prayer and work have been concentrated for the past year on

an effort to raise sufficient funds ; and, perhaps, most of all, for the little group of young men and women who know that God is calling them to missionary service in C.M.S. ranks, and who find their way closed.

\* \* \* \* \*

No interpretation of the situation—one far wider than the C.M.S. itself—has so far been found. But slowly and painfully the attitude in which it should be met is being learned. Men are beginning to turn more to God Himself as the only source of help ; the quality of the work and the workers is being realized as of more importance than the quantity ; the need for co-operation and co-ordination is being faced on the mission field and at the home base ; the relation of modern habits of life to the lack of support of missions is being thoughtfully admitted. The waiting time is being utilized with far more purpose, and there is a deep desire to prepare the way for a fresh coming of the Lord. Much prayer is being offered that the Conference to be held at Swanwick in the closing days of May may see the beginning of a new era of advance. Mr. Bardsley and Mr. Baylis have come home thankful for the work already done by the Society, but deeply impressed with the urgent and varied needs in China and Japan. They bring not merely their individual impressions, but the results of full deliberations of the whole body of C.M.S. missionaries. When these are laid before representatives of all the local home organizations, a new community in responsibility and in service will result. This principle will be carried further at the C.M.S. Summer School at Ilfracombe, from June 20 to 28, for which a programme of special interest has been arranged.

\* \* \* \* \*

The May magazines as a whole are well worth careful study. The Wesleyan *Foreign Field* is a specially good number, so is the Baptist *Herald*, containing the story of the year's work. The *Missionary Review of the World* has some striking illustrations, and three articles above the average : on "Bible Distribution in Hunan" ; on "The Chinese Republic as a

Mission Field"; and on the "Conversion of Mohammedans, the Strategic Time, Place, and Method." With this latter paper should be read the account in the *C.M.S. Gleaner* of "A Moslem Missionary brought to Christ." The current number of *Blessed be Egypt* is also packed with instructive matter, including a report of the Nile Mission Press, a sketch of "A Fortnight among the Colporteurs in Upper Egypt," and a parable called "The Blood Feud of El Hanouchi," by Miss I. L. Trotter.

\*                 \*                 \*                 \*                 \*

Two widely different matters are noteworthy concerning Jewish missions. The *Bible in the World* has a most interesting account of the new Yiddish version of the New Testament by Professor A. S. Geden, chairman of the committee of revisers. Yiddish is the language of common life among the Jews on the continent of Europe, in Great Britain, in America, and in South Africa. There are said to be 150,000 Yiddish-speaking Jews in East London alone, and Whitechapel has a permanent Yiddish theatre. The new version will be largely used by the various Jewish missions, and should be followed up by prayer. From the *Jewish Missionary Intelligencer* we learn that on his appointment to the office of Vice-Patron of the L.J.S., Bishop Azariah wrote:

"From boyhood I have had the privilege of contributing my mite towards the work of your Society, and hearing about its work. I had also the pleasure, two years ago, of seeing the Society's work in Jerusalem and of worshipping in their church. The Good Friday offertories throughout my infant diocese have always gone towards your work. We shall continue to do so *for our own sakes*."

\*                 \*                 \*                 \*                 \*

Recent statements as to the unsatisfactory conditions which exist at the centre of the theosophical propaganda initiated by Mrs. Besant and her colleagues have received endorsement by the decision of the Madras High Court, whereby the lad Krishnamurthi and his brother were returned to the custody of their father. The *Times* of May 8 recorded the judgment, and in a leading article indicated the harm which "the sort of teaching

described as theosophy" was likely to work in India. Miss McNeile's article in the current number of *The East and the West*, to which we referred last month, thus receives fresh confirmation.

\* \* \* \* \*

Dr. R. F. Horton has been visiting India, and the *Contemporary Review* for May contains a fourteen-page record of his impressions. Although the article adds nothing to expert knowledge, it has distinct value in such a periodical, owing to its Christian outlook and its unreserved endorsement of missionary work. Dr. Horton deals with five topics: The beneficence of the British Raj; the diversity and effect of missionary effort; the subtle charm of the Indian people; the gangrene of Indian life, resulting from "essentially non-moral Pantheism"; and the hopefulness of the task before us in India.

\* \* \* \* \*

Miss Roberts, head-mistress of the Grammar School for Girls, Bradford, and Miss McDougall, Classical Lecturer at Westfield College, London, who have spent the winter in India investigating educational conditions, promise to do exceptionally valuable work in the missionary cause at home. Educational experience and trained faculty qualified them to make full use of the remarkable opportunities afforded them in Government and missionary circles, and also by Indian reformers. Those who have had the privilege of hearing these two ladies speak are impressed by the breadth and accuracy of their observation, the soundness of their deductions, and the sympathy with which they enter into the great problems waiting to be solved. Their special message is, of course, to University women engaged in teaching. A large and influential conference of such met in London to receive their report on May 9 and 10. It is impossible to overestimate the importance of this movement, which brings the claims of foreign missions before those who guide the thought of the educated girlhood of our land. Let the mistresses be won and the schools will follow. Missionary committees will be enriched by the addition of qualified educa-

tionalists, and more than one mission field will welcome a visit from leaders experienced in educational work at home. Further, among the young mistresses there are many who may be led to offer themselves for personal service as missionaries.

\* \* \* \* \*

The report of the British Board of Study for the Preparation of Missionaries for the year ending March 31 shows what real advance is being made in this most important scheme. A valuable Bibliography for Missionary Students has been issued (1s., Oliphant). A second Vacation Course for Missionary Training is planned to be held next August at Cambridge, that held last year at Oxford having been a complete success. A conference on the Training of Women Missionaries, held under the auspices of the Board at Selly Oak, near Birmingham, with a membership of fifty, has issued some suggestive "findings." Courses of lectures have also been arranged. The Board has found its field a wide one to survey, and its full uses are not manifest as yet, but we believe it has a large significance for the future.

G.



## Discussions.

*[The contributions contained under this heading are comments on articles in the previous number of the CHURCHMAN. The writer of the article criticized may reply in the next issue of the magazine; then the discussion in each case terminates. Contributions to the "Discussions" must reach the Editors before the 12th of the month.]*

### "EVANGELICALS AND THE PROBLEM OF RITUALISM."

(The "Churchman," May, 1913, p. 352.)

As an Evangelical by tradition, who has strayed (or is supposed to have strayed) into the sacerdotal fold, and as one who has been keenly following these discussions, may I add a personal note? What was it that I could not find among the Evangelicals?

Not personal piety, as Mr. Norman Baptie suggests, for no school of thought has a monopoly of those who are the salt of the earth. Nor was it *lack* of ritual that alienated me. Rather it was the slovenliness, which also one not infrequently finds; say, a lack of due decency in the ablutions; a church untidy and locked during the week; the

faded flowers and the dust-sheet atmosphere, which is so unnecessary and so depressing. Again, it was the lack of definite Church teaching on the Sacraments, the Ministry, and the Church; the insistence on personal piety, almost to the exclusion of corporate religion. Surely we do not need a new Evangelical use to remove these.

But is one who has been brought up in a saintly Evangelical atmosphere ever lost, really, permanently to the Evangelical cause? Nay, the Evangelicals have but lent one of their party to teach others great truths.

The youth, because he is a youth, may go over with rather a hasty swing, and, for a time, designate as "Protty" much that he really holds sacred. But will you ever find him, at thirty, a member of the E.C.U. or the C.B.S.? Will you find him talking of "the Mass," and insisting on the Sacraments, to the exclusion of the Word? Will he ever lose his love of the Bible? Will he become a backboneless frequenter of the confessional? I trow not.

As he settles down and reads he will see that no party has a monopoly of truth, and that we have much to learn from each other. If he be ordained, you will find him proclaiming the old Evangelical Catholic Faith, and bringing out of his treasure things new and old.

ANGLO-CATHOLIC.

## "EVANGELICALS AND THE PROBLEM OF RITUALISM."

(*The "Churchman," May, 1913, pp. 357, 359.*)

With reference to Mr. Herklots' suggestion to substitute the Comfortable Words for the Ten Commandments, was he not rather meaning the Beatitudes? For we have the Comfortable Words after the Absolution; and how would he bring in the Kyries?

The Kyries could easily be adapted as a congregational response to the Beatitudes, or to the shortened summary of the Decalogue in the Scotch and American Liturgies.

Again, with regard to his concluding suggestion of "scarf or tippet of rich black silk," why should we always be in mourning? The varied colour of the hood of one's University might be well maintained in the scarf or tippet, or the three English colours used alike for the holy table and the minister—red for most times, white for festivals and administration of the Holy Communion, and blue for penitential seasons.

I was once present at a baptism at a church in Torquay where the minister wore a reversible stole or scarf of black-and-white silk, which I at first thought was meant to harmonize with his Cambridge M.A. hood, but as he proceeded with the service I found he used it to symbolize the turning from darkness to light—the "death unto sin, and new birth unto righteousness."

W. S. BARKER.

## “THE DECIDING VOICE OF THE MONUMENTS.”

(The “*Churchman*,” *March*, 1913, p. 239, and *May*, p. 387.)

Dr. Kyle has done me the honour of noticing my review of his book ; whether he has strengthened his position remains to be seen. He deals seriatim with my criticisms, and, at the risk of being tedious, I must briefly examine his replies.

1. With regard to the “*Encyclopædia Biblica*” and archæology, while it is quite true that the theme of the chapter is “the function of archæology in criticism,” his exact words about the work are: “The ‘*Encyclopædia Biblica*’ (Cheyne) has no article on either archæology or antiquities, nor is there anywhere in the work sufficient place given to the subject that it should be indexed.” I venture to think that to the ordinary reader, unacquainted with the “*Encyclopædia Biblica*,” this sentence would convey the view that, in Dr. Kyle’s words, “this great dictionary made little reference to archæological materials.” And Dr. Kyle fails to quote his own book correctly. He says: “On pp. 11, 12 I say, ‘Biblical *archæologists* generally . . . have not given this subject a place at all.’” In my copy of his book the charge is brought against “Biblical *encyclopedists*,” a different class of people.

2. He most ingeniously turns the edge of my remark that the methods of literary and historical criticism have been applied to the Bible only *after* their value has been proved in other fields, by extending the terms of my reference. The “other fields” to which I referred were old literatures, apart from the Bible, such as the Homeric poems. I do not think that in the case of literatures about the origin and authorship of which we have ample evidence anyone would waste his time by unnecessary analysis ; but it is just in the case of such works as the Homeric poems, the authorship of which is only traditional, that there is very general agreement as to their composite origin, established by the same kind of analysis as has been employed on parts of the Old Testament. In this section he passes over the matter of historical criticism, but that may be dealt with next.

3. Dr. Kyle makes merry over my questioning of the exactment of his statement that certain archæologists have by their discoveries “shown the ghostly heroes to have been substantial men of flesh and blood.” I never questioned but that cities and walls were built by “substantial men of flesh and blood,” but his language is calculated to leave the impression that the individual heroes named in Greek legends about Troy and Crete have been demonstrated to be real personages. That, so far, is not the case ; and historical criticism, which welcomes all the aid that archæology can give, is still sceptical about the historical existence of the individuals named in early Greek story, not one of whom has received as yet attestation like that given in Egypt to Menes.

4. I need not dwell on the matter of the Hittite inscriptions, where Dr. Kyle pleads extenuating circumstances for an error of fact.

5. My positiveness as to the date of the entrance of the Hyksos into Egypt astonishes Dr. Kyle. It is true that I should, more strictly, have spoken of the establishment of their rule in that country; but, with this correction, I venture to think that my assertion is justified by two considerations:

(a) The date is fixed, not primarily by Cretan synchronisms, but, as I said in my review, by a definite astronomical datum—"the rising of Sirius [which] fixes the advent of the Twelfth Dynasty at 2000 B.C., with a margin of uncertainty of not more than a year or two either way" (Breasted, "History of Egypt," p. 22); and the length of that dynasty does not allow the domination of the Hyksos to begin before 1788 B.C.

(b) The view has rapidly won acceptance, not only in Germany (the papyrus making the statement is at Berlin), but also in England, and, as the above quotation shows, in America.

And Dr. Kyle has failed to note that when I speak of Khammurabi's date I only assert that the *latest possible* date of that king is 1958-1916 B.C. It makes no difference to my argument if the date be three centuries earlier; it would only make Dr. Kyle's position even more hopeless. All I was concerned to point out was that the latest possible date for Khammurabi was separated from the generally received date of the Hyksos by 140 years, and that therefore Abraham could not have been entertained "at the Bedouin Court in Egypt."

He protests against my criticism of his ethnographical arguments as "unjust," and says that as it is "almost entirely insinuation it is very difficult to reply to it." Let me be more explicit. Dr. Kyle claims to state facts, and asserts that *all* that archæology reveals as to the origin of the Sumerians is that they were not a Semitic people. He seems to have overlooked certain facts which go beyond this—the type of face in the portrait statues, the affinities of the language, and the forms of the earliest hieroglyphic writing (from which the later cuneiform sprang), all of which point, not to a Hamitic (*i.e.*, Ethiopian) origin, but to a Mongolian. The facts are not merely negative in their indications, but positive; and they point not towards, but away from, Dr. Kyle's theory. And, once again, Dr. Kyle is not quite accurate in his reference to his own work. He quotes from p. 196, where he states, quite correctly, that "the first Babylonian civilization, according to the Bible, was Hamitic, by a son of Cush"; but he claims that this is "everything that *I say on the subject*" (the italics are Dr. Kyle's), and yet on the next two pages (197, 198) he goes on to assume, without any qualification, that the early civilization of Babylon *was* Hamitic—a statement for which archæology gives him not a shred of support, but rather the opposite, and in these passages he goes beyond the assertion on p. 196, which he quotes as his last word on the subject.

In my review of the book I was constrained to say that it abounded in "loose reasoning and incorrect statements." Dr. Kyle has given me no reason to alter my opinion; rather has he confirmed it. In the four pages of his reply he has misquoted his own book, he has misquoted my review; he has quoted, as his final statement upon a point, words beyond which he makes a distinct advance in the two following pages; and he has obscured clear issues by irrelevancies. The deciding voice of archæology, whatever it may be, in the delicate problems raised by the literary and historical criticism of the Old Testament will need to be interpreted with a more rigorous accuracy and a clearer vision of the issues before it can hope to come to its own.



## Notices of Books.

THE INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY ON ISAIAH. Vol. I., by Professor G. Buchanan Gray, D.D., D.Litt. Edinburgh: *T. and T. Clark*. Price 12s.

The late Professor A. B. Davidson had undertaken to contribute "Isaiah" to this well-known series of Commentaries. His lamented death, in 1902, was an irreparable loss to all students of the Old Testament, for no other English scholar had so profoundly and sympathetically entered into the spirit of the Hebrew Prophets as he. The preparation of a commentary was then entrusted by the editors to two other scholars—Professor G. B. Gray, of Mansfield College, Oxford, and Professor A. S. Peake, of Manchester University. Professor Gray alone is responsible for the present volume, which consists of an Introduction and a Commentary on the first twenty-seven chapters. The author's wealth of scholarship, no less than his desire to be fair to those from whom he differs, is evident in almost every page. Nevertheless, many of his assertions about the date, the authorship, and the interpretation of crucial passages seem to us, on purely objective grounds, to be highly speculative and contrary to all historical evidence. We single out for examination a few of the assertions made in this volume, and, for the sake of clearness, will arrange them under separate headings:

### I. THE CANONIZATION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

We are told that the Canon of the Jewish Scriptures was fixed "about the end of the first century A.D." (p. 33). What evidence have we for such an assertion? Dr. Gray gives none, but refers us to standard books on the Canon, and evidently has in mind the so-called "Council of Jamnia." It is alleged that between the years A.D. 90 and 118, a "Council" of Jewish Rabbis was held at Jamnia (= Jabneh) to finally decide the Canon of the Old Testament. This is pure assumption. From the Talmud, our only authority, we gather the following facts: About the Fall of Jerusalem (A.D. 70), Rabbi Yohanan ben Zaccai removed the Sanhedrin ("Council") from

Jerusalem to Jamnia, a city between Joppa and Ashdod. At this Council, distinguished by the new name of "Beth-Din," or Courts of Justice, Rabbi Yohanan and his successors were in the habit of delivering expository lectures on the Law, as well as on the Prophets and Hagiographa. Free discussion was encouraged, and divergent opinions were expressed by different scholars on almost every conceivable topic. A very fragmentary account of some of these discussions has come down to us. For instance, we read in the Mishna (Yadayim iii. 6, 7): "All Holy Scriptures *defile the hands*; the Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes defile the hands. Rabbi Judah says, 'the Song of Songs defiles the hands; as to Ecclesiastes there is dispute.' Rabbi Jose says, '*Ecclesiastes defiles not the hands*; as to the Song of Songs there is dispute.'"

Modern critics, taking the phrase "defiles the hands" as equivalent to "canonical," have jumped to the conclusion that at the time of the discussion the Canon of the Old Testament was not fixed, for had the Canon been fixed, Rabbi Jose would not have questioned the Canonicity of Ecclesiastes. This contention is based on two erroneous assumptions. *First*, that the private opinion of an individual Rabbi is the same thing as the deliberate judgment of the Synagogue. Every student of the Talmud knows that individual Rabbis from time to time have given expression to extravagant views, which by no means represented the deliberate judgment of the Synagogue. For instance, Rabbi Hilbel II., who taught Origen Hebrew, said: "Israel need no longer expect any Messiah; all the prophecies concerning Him have already been realized in the reign of Hezekiah." Nevertheless, the Synagogue has never given up the hope of the Messiah's advent. Certain Rabbis also advanced the view that Adam and Abraham wrote some of the Psalms! *Secondly*, it takes for granted that the phrase "defileth the hands" is the same thing as "canonical." This is wrong, for in the same part of the Talmud we are told that "the thongs of the phylacteries defile the hands." Can thongs be regarded as "canonical"? Again, we read that "the upper and lower edges of the Book, as well as those at the end, defile the hands" (Yadayim iii. 4, 5). Can we term these "canonical"? The phrase simply indicates that certain articles, for fanciful reasons, were regarded with such a sanctity or superstition that a person touching them would have to wash his hands before he touched anything else. Accordingly, we conclude that the discussion at the Council or Academy of Jamnia was *not to determine the Canon of the Old Testament*, but only to find out *what articles, when touched, would necessitate a ritual ablution*.<sup>1</sup>

That the Canon of the Hebrew Scriptures had been fixed long before the Council of Jamnia is proved from the following considerations:

1. *Josephus* (circa A.D. 38 to 95) clearly states that the Canon of the Old Testament was closed in the reign of Artaxerxes (Ahasuerus), and that "no one hath been so bold as either to add anything to them, to take anything from them, or to make any change in them" (Contra Ap., i. 8). Could Josephus have spoken so strongly if there was any doubt about the Canon?

2. *The Son of Sirach*, in 280 B.C. (or in 180 B.C. according to others), is not only aware of the three divisions of the Old Testament—*i.e.*, "the Law,

<sup>1</sup> The Sadducees ridiculed such discussions (Yadayim, iv. 6), and said: "It wants but little for the Pharisees to try and wash the sun."

the Prophecies, and the rest of the Books" (τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν βιβλίων), but quotes from each of these divisions in their present form and sequence (Ecclesiasticus, xlv.-xlix.). In the "Prologue" he refers to them as "the Books of our fathers," and, therefore, not of recent origin.

3. *The Synagogue*.—Besides the Pentateuch, the Prophets were read in the public services of the Synagogue at least in the third century B.C. (See "Ryle's Canon of the Old Testament," second edition, p. 126). They were discussed in the schools, and appealed to as the Word of God.

In the face of these facts, the assertion that the Canon of the Old Testament was fixed about the end of the first century seems contrary to all historical evidence.

## II. A NEW CANON OF CRITICISM.

The earlier critics worked on the principle that "what cannot be clearly proved to be later than the age of Isaiah is the work of Isaiah." One would have thought that no Englishman could have taken exception to this common-sense rule, for it is the principle adhered to in all the English Courts of Justice—a man is held to be innocent till he is proved guilty. Dr. Gray, however, regards this method as "illegitimate." He lays down the new canon that only "what clearly proceeds from Isaiah is to be regarded as his" (p. 58). We have no hesitation in saying that, if the Commentary under review were to be judged according to this new canon of criticism, not ten per cent. of its contents could be proved "clearly" to have proceeded from Dr. Gray's pen.

## III. DATE AND AUTHORSHIP.

Dr. Gray tells us that the Book of Isaiah "did not as yet exist about 300 B.C.;" in fact, it "did not exist any long time before 180 B.C." (p. 52). Even "after 180 B.C. the Book of Isaiah may have received some additions, such as xix. 17 to 25; possibly even, though less probably, 24 to 27, 34 f." (p. 56).

The following analysis will show how little of the Book is ascribed by Dr. Gray to Isaiah:

Chap. i. is a prophetic fly-sheet by the editor; it is not a unity, but a collection of several "fragments of poems."

Chaps. ii.-xii. "may well have formed a Book of Isaiah," but in its present expanded form "must be the work of the post-exilic period" (p. 51). The prophecies about the "Prince of Peace" (ix. 1-6), and "the Branch" (xi. 1-8), cannot be assigned with certainty to Isaiah (p. 94). Dr. Gray favours "an exilic or post-exilic" date for these (p. 166).

Chaps. xiii.-xxiii. consist of: (a) a series of "oracles" which are post-exilic, with the probable exception of chap. xvii., which belongs to the age of Isaiah; (b) Sections not entitled "oracles." This section is not Isaianic, and part of it was written "as late as 160 B.C."

Chaps. xxiv.-xxvii. are "certainly post-exilic," very late and "contain no word of Isaiah."

Chaps. xxviii.-xxxiii. "Some almost certainly, and possibly all, of the passages of promise are of post-exilic origin." In these chapters "we appear to have a record of a period in Isaiah's career and made the basis of a (late) post-exilic work."

Chaps. xxxiv.-xxxix. are post-exilic, "containing no word of Isaiah."

Chaps. xl.-lxvi. "appear to contain work of at least two periods" (*circa* 540 and *circa* 450 B.C.), and, of course, contain no words of Isaiah.

As to the *authorship*, we are told that "Isaiah i.-xxxix. may contain the work of nearly as many different writers as the book of 'the Twelve'" (p. 49). Inasmuch as the prophecies of no Prophet included in the book of "the Twelve" is ascribed by modern critics to less than two or three authors, we are to believe that Isaiah i.-xxxix. was written by two or three dozens of "Isaias"! Really this makes too great a demand on human credulity. Dr. Gray, however, is an eminent scholar, and we must not reject his deliberate verdict without due examination.

As space will not allow us to examine all his conclusions, we will test only his verdict as to

#### IV. THE AUTHORSHIP OF CHAPTERS XXIV. TO XXVII.

Of these chapters, Professor Gray tells us that they are *certainly* post-exilic, and that not one word of them was written by Isaiah. He gives us four reasons:

1. *The belief in the resurrection of individual Israelites* (xxvi. 19) points to the Maccabæan period, and so could not have been written in the days of Isaiah. Now, let us admit that the bulk of the Hebrews in the eighth century B.C. held hazy ideas about the departed souls in Sheol. Is this a sufficient reason for supposing that a man of such a profound spiritual insight as Isaiah could not rise higher than the mass of the people? In fact, as Dr. A. B. Davidson has pointed out in his "Theology of the Old Testament," p. 528, the idea of a resurrection of *individuals* was familiar to Hosea, who was a contemporary of Isaiah (see Hos. xiii. 14 and *cf.* vi. 2).

2. *The prediction of the abolition of death* (xxv. 8) is considered of late origin. But if such a belief was entertained by Hosea, it could not be of late origin. "O death, I will be thy plague; O grave, I will be thy destruction" (Hos. xiii. 14, R.V., Margin).

3. *The style and language*, we are told, are "certainly post-exilic." Dr. Gray admits, however, that these chapters are free from Aramaism, and contain no Greek or Persian words (pp. 464-466). "The style is fluent; it is that of a writer whose mind is retentive of, even saturated with, earlier prophetic writings, including, but by no means confined to, those of Isaiah" (p. 401). We ask, in the name of common sense, why invent a new writer, "saturate" his mind with the prophecies of Isaiah, and then endow him with the power "to reproduce the style of [his] prophecy," while idea, style, and language all clearly indicate that Isaiah was the author?

4. *The constant use of paronomasia* is alleged to be another proof of non-Isaianic authorship. This argument is really in favour of Isaianic authorship, for, in the accepted works of Isaiah, such plays upon words are quite common. In v. 7, for instance, we read that God "looked for judgment ('mishpāt'), but behold oppression ('mispah'); for righteousness ('tsedāqāh'), but behold a cry ('tse'āqāh')." *Cf.* also i. 23.

Having examined Professor Gray's reasons and found them unconvincing,

we will give four short reasons for believing that after all it is not so certain that Isaiah did not write chapters xxiv.-xxvii.

1. The writer of these chapters lived in Jerusalem and not in exile (xxv. 6, 7, 10, "in this mountain").

2. The Hebrew exiles are in *Assyria* and in *Egypt* (xxvii. 13). Therefore this section must have been written before the Fall of Nineveh in 606 B.C.

3. Moab is a prominent nation (xxv. 10). In the days of Nehemiah, the Nabatæans had brought the Moabite power to an end (see Hastings' 1-vol. Dict., art. "Moab").

4. Isaiah xxvi. 1 admirably fits the days of Hezekiah, when the Divine Presence served as the bulwark of Jerusalem against the attack of Sennacherib.

#### V. DID ISAIAH WRITE ANY OF THE MESSIANIC PROPHECIES?

Dr. Gray tells us that none of these Messianic passages (ix. 1-6, xi. 1-8, xxx. 19-26, xxxii. 1-8) "can be assigned with certainty to Isaiah" (p. 94), who is essentially a "prophet of judgment." "It would be difficult to believe that in one and the same speech Isaiah drew alarming pictures of coming disaster and bright pictures of coming glory" (p. 95). This is simply an amazing statement to be made by an Old Testament scholar, for if any one word was to describe the chief characteristic of the Hebrew Prophets, it would be the word Hope. There is no prediction of a Prophet of Israel which is unrelieved by some rays of hope. In the case of Isaiah, this is so unmistakable that one wonders how any scholar can question it. Take, for instance, the following facts:

1. At his call, Isaiah experienced Jehovah's *free forgiveness* (vi. 7). After such a personal experience, could he doubt God's grace of forgiveness to His nation? (*cf.* vi. 16, "How long," vi. 13).

2. Is not the invitation in i. 18-20 a bright picture of sovereign grace?

3. The symbolic name, Shear-jashub (= "a remnant shall return"), given to his elder son, was "a prediction at once of judgment and hope." Israel will be carried into exile, but the exile will not be for ever; the future is bright, for "a remnant shall return" (vii. 3).

4. In Ecclesiasticus xlvi. 24, Isaiah's work is summed up thus: He "comforted the mourners in Zion."

In the preceding pages we have tried to point out some of the defects of this learned commentary. Nevertheless, advanced students who can discriminate between subjective speculations and sober criticism, will find in this volume a great deal of philological, historical, and archæological information in a convenient form.

K. E. KHODADAD.

JUDGE FAIRLY. By the Rev. William Lockett. London: C. J. Thyne. Price 1s. 6d. net.

The second edition of an excellent little Manual of the Romish Controversy. It takes the form of a reply to that mischievous and widely circulated book, Faa Di Bruno's "Catholic Belief," which had reached its twenty-third edition in 1909. Mr. Lockett has taken his title from the opening sentence of the Introduction to Di Bruno's plausible book: "To judge fairly of any case, one should hear both sides." He very rightly points

out that this is just what the Church of Rome forbids, not permitting her people to read the Protestant side. The pity is that Mr. Lockett's book is not, like Di Bruno's, published in a cheaper form, so as to secure its wider circulation.

VOLUNTAS DEI. By the Author of "Pro Christo et Ecclesia." London: *Macmillan*. Price 5s.

To review this book at all adequately would require many pages. It is so full of suggestion, so packed with thought, so valuable in its analysis, that we can do little more than commend it to the careful attention of our readers. The book is not easy reading, but it grows upon one as one studies it. It is in very truth a philosophy of religion; but it is also more, for it comes home to us in touching the springs of emotion, as well as by making an appeal to the intellectual faculties. The eighteenth chapter deserves special attention; it deals with the question that is moving many hearts to-day—Christian unity. The writer points out that the achievement of voluntary union with adequate scope for variety still lies before the Church. A religion and civilization concentrated merely on the defence of a good already attained are bound to be opposed to a forward-looking Christ. And it is upon a vision of the "Christ that is to be" that the eyes of the Church must ever be fixed, if her mission is to find any adequate fulfilment in time. E. H. B.

THE BIBLE TO-DAY. The Second Part of a Charge delivered at his Primary Visitation, 1912, by Bertram Pollock, C.V.O., D.D., Bishop of Norwich. London: *John Murray*. Price 2s. 6d.

This book contains a very moderate and wisely conceived statement of the progress and results of recent Biblical criticism, and of its influence on the Church. The Bishop has in mind "those who believe, and wish to believe, the central Bible truths, and yet, in this period of transition, do not know how to deal with the difficulties, and tremblingly wonder how much of that which they have come to care for must be abandoned." He points out that Israel shares with other nations some of the literature and literary forms of an alien and foreign civilization, though it consecrates them to a Divine use (p. 63). There is nothing that need disturb us here, for, as the Bishop justly says, "truth can never be unsettling to our faith in Christ or to the real witness of the Book which speaks of Him and leads to Him" (p. 35). The writings of the Bible are addressed to a religious and not to a critical antiquarian mind, and it is in this spirit that we must accept them. Very interesting and important are the words of the Bishop when he is dealing with the attitude that teachers may be expected to take up to the Higher Criticism in the class-room and the lecture-hall, for he speaks as a former schoolmaster, with a clear understanding of the difficulties involved (see pp. 89-92). His conclusion is as follows: Let the would-be teacher approach these questions with simple faith and sincerity, and all that he will "unsettle," as the phrase is, will be ideas which, if not unsettled now, may later vanish with more distress, and drag with them that which should not be shaken. The young are sharp critics; they quickly detect who is teaching what he does not believe. If the teacher be frank, reverent, and sincere, his teaching will be effectual, not otherwise.

Nothing could well be more tenderly considerate than the Bishop's treatment of these and similar matters, and we cordially commend this book to all those—and they are not a few—who are perplexed in mind and heart by recent critical movements. All truth, critical or otherwise, is the gift of God, who is Truth.

E. H. B.

ENGLISH CHURCH LAW AND DIVORCE. By Dibdin and Chadwyck Healey.

London: *John Murray*. Price 5s. net.

MARRIAGE IN CHURCH AND STATE. By T. A. Lacey. London: *Robert Scott*. Price 5s. net.

THE DIVORCE COMMISSION: SUMMARY OF REPORTS. Westminster: *P. and S. King*. Price 1s. net.

MARRIAGE: ITS ETHICS AND RELIGION. By Principal Forsyth. London: *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 2s. 6d. net.

DIVORCE AND REMARRIAGE. By Dr. Darwell Stone. London: *Longmans*. Price 1s. net.

The Report of the Divorce Commission is a momentous document for Churchmen, and naturally its issue has created a literature. The summary of the two reports named above is an excellent piece of work, and will be valuable to everyone. Sir Lewis Dibdin and his colleague give us a volume of legal and historical research. Dr. Darwell Stone puts his views in brief compass and excellently well. Mr. Lacey writes a longer book, full of information and shirking none of the issues involved. Dr. Forsyth represents the orthodox Nonconformist, but does not write in relation to the Commission. His book is a treatise on the ethics of marriage. The other books are intended for the student of the subject and for the leader of men, Dr. Forsyth's is intended for the married couple and for ordinary folk. It is a fine piece of work, full of good things. Here is one: "Egoism cannot bear egoism. Two of a trade cannot agree. And two egoisms mean one divorce." Parliament can pass laws; the Church can frame rules and regulations and excite public opinion; but religion, and religion only, can solve the problems of married life and of all life which lead to divorce. Dr. Forsyth sees this, and so his book, after all, goes to the root of the problem. We want a cure, not palliatives nor concessions, nor even cast-iron laws and canons; we want Christ in the home, and divorce disappears.

GREAT TEXTS OF THE BIBLE. JOB TO PSALM XXIII.; EPHESIANS TO COLOSSIANS. Edited by Dr. Hastings. Edinburgh: *T. and T. Clark*. Price 10s. each volume, or 6s. subscription price.

This, by far the most useful book of its kind, grows in size and in value. The texts are well chosen, the general discussion of the passages clear and full, the illustrations, especially those from the poets, admirably selected. The first of these two volumes takes in the twenty-third Psalm, and no one will be surprised to find every one of its six verses among the Great Texts. The second volume deals with the three epistles of the first Roman Captivity, a very fruitful source for sermon texts. No more need be said: these two volumes maintain the standard of an admirable series, and reflect credit upon publisher and editor alike.

THE SHORT COURSE SERIES. *JEHOVAH JESUS*, by T. Whitelaw, D.D.; *THE SEVENFOLD I AM*, by T. Marjoribanks, B.D.; *THE MAN AMONG THE MYRTLES*, by J. Adams, B.D. Edinburgh: *T. and T. Clark*. Price 2s. net.

Three more volumes of this unique series, making nine in all, with the promise of many more. If they are all to be as good as the first nine, they will be warmly welcome; certainly these three are. Mr. Adams deals with the visions of Zechariah, Mr. Whitelaw with the Old Testament words which are compounds of Jehovah, and Mr. Marjoribanks with seven of the images which our Lord uses in description of Himself. Perhaps "The Man among the Myrtles" is the best; but it is ill comparing when all is so good, and perhaps we are most attracted to this particular volume because the visions of Zechariah are so difficult, and we are glad of a new explanation of them.

PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY AND ITS NON-JEWISH SOURCES. By Professor Clemen. *T. and T. Clark*. Price 9s. net.

A cynical philosopher remarked recently that historians could do what lay beyond the power even of the Almighty—they could alter the past; and one rises from the perusal of this book with the feeling that a good many exponents of the "religious-historical" method have made great efforts to that end. The exhaustive enumeration of the various attempts to explain Christian teaching and the Gospel history as dependent on, and derived from, Babylonian myths, Mazdean teaching, and the legends and doctrine of Buddhism and Hinduism is almost as impressive as is the successive crumbling and dissolution of their results before the learning and logic of Dr. Clemen. He insists that the mere resemblance in phrase or feature between Gospel story or teaching and some legend or saying of Buddha is not sufficient evidence of the dependence of the former upon the latter, unless there is reasonable ground (which rarely exists) for holding that the derivation is chronologically possible; the writing from which the parallel is drawn must be shown either to be earlier in date than the Gospels or to contain material clearly so anterior; and before this simple and reasonable test the formidable list of parallels which was to rob the Gospel of its originality rapidly disappears. With regard to Babylonian and Persian influence, the case is rather different; especially in apocalyptic imagery that influence can reasonably be found; but even here the New Testament writers only used that which had already passed through the filter of Judaism. Particularly valuable is Dr. Clemen's examination of the relationship of the New Testament teaching about Baptism and the Eucharist with the mystery religions; for here he refuses to admit the glibly repeated assertion that in St. Paul at least a magical element is to be found, closely akin to that which prevailed in the popular Oriental cults of the Christian era. The book is not easy reading, and the author labours under no delusion as to his style, against the stiffness of which he frankly warns the reader; but the work is one of massive learning, up to date enough to refer to magazine articles appearing in 1912, and singularly judicial in its tone. Dr. Clemen never seems to wish to score a point, nor does he indulge in severity of comment even where that seems well earned; he lets the facts speak for themselves. Nor is the

value of the book as an answer to the extravagances of irresponsible or hostile criticism diminished by the fact that the author himself does not hold the orthodox position; rather do the blows fall heavier on those views he attacks from the very fact that he belongs to the Liberal wing of Christian scholarship. It is well that the assertions on which the popular rationalism (or irrationality) of J. M. Robertson and Drews is founded should be demolished by one against whom no charge of theological obscurantism can be brought. The translation is admirable, and the use of the book for reference, which will be its chief value, is facilitated by a very complete series of indices.

SUNDAYS AT THE ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE. Sermons by M. G. Archibald. *Macmillan*. Price 3s. 6d.

We like the sermons. They are direct and practical, and of suitable length and style. Mr. Archibald has wisely preached so as to "do good" rather than to supply literary essays wonderfully learned and wonderfully dry, and in printed form they prove more helpful than many such volumes. With a special class of hearers there is naturally a special style, and the military illustrations (and even the college slang) are welcome and apt. Sound, positive teaching on the Faith and Sacraments is given in a sensible way, and the Gospel message rings true in such sermons as those on "Sin," "Faith," "Temptation," "Prayer," which are among the best in the book. Although the sermons have often special reference to the spiritual needs of young men, they are quite suitable also for general use.

TRANSACTIONS OF THE VICTORIA INSTITUTE. Vol. xlv.

A series of a dozen or more papers read before the Institute during 1912, with discussions thereon. The writers include acknowledged scholars, and the subjects treated vary from those definitely Biblical to others purely scientific, such as the question of the habitability of Mars (Walter Maunder, F.R.A.S.) and directivity in plants (Professor Henslow). We welcome papers from Mrs. A. S. Lewis, Professor Milligan, and Professor Orr, who deal with the genealogies of our Lord, the Greek papyri, and the Mosaic Tabernacle respectively. The Bishop of Down discusses "Difficulties of Belief created by Modern Science and Modern Criticism."

The Victoria Institute is a philosophical society which is not afraid to investigate scientific matters in a scientific way, while at the same time holding fast the Christian faith, and there is much in this volume which will help the clergyman who feels the need of a little hard reading of a varied kind.

R. F. L. BLUNT, BISHOP OF HULL. A. S. V. Blunt. *Macmillan*. Price 3s. 6d.

Life is too busy in the twentieth century for time to be found to separate the pages of uncut books, and the fact that this is so sent out by the publishers constitutes a distinct drawback.

Bishop Blunt has found in his son an affectionate and reverential biographer, who has given us an intimate family record of a useful life. Two curacies and two livings make up the story, for Blunt became Vicar of Scarborough after only six years in Orders, and left Scarborough for Hesse only when he was over seventy, and with not five years more to live.

The forty years at Scarborough, therefore, fill up nearly all his life, and it was there that his chief work was done. There were a few controversies, especially in connection with his reluctance to divide his parish, but on the whole it is a plain story of a plain man told in a plain way. In no sense was he extreme. He discontinued Evening Communion, but would not take the Eastward position. He was fortunate in his early preferment to an important living, and there were some who objected to his retaining this while also Archdeacon, Rural Dean, Residentiary Canon, and finally Suffragan Bishop; and one wonders whether this last honour would have fallen to him at all if Maclagan had been appointed as the immediate successor of Thompson, for his views on such matters were not those of Magee. The See of Melbourne, however, was refused in 1886.

The book will be of chief interest to those who knew Bishop Blunt personally, and desire some record of the life of one they knew.

Received: SCRIPTURE POST-CARDS. By Harold Copping. London: *The Religious Tract Society*. Price 6d. per packet. A WOMAN'S MOVEMENT. By L. H. M. Soulsby. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 3d. An address by a wise woman to some younger than herself. A valuable little gift for an educated girl. PIONEERS. By Sarah Comstock. London: *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 6s. An exciting story of a girl's pertinacity and heroism. A clean and interesting novel, based on the life of the Far West. FORGOTTEN TRUTHS. By Sir Robert Anderson, K.C.B. London: *James Nisbet and Co., Ltd.* Price 3s. 6d. A devotional treatise, mainly dealing with the Second Coming of our Lord. FROM BOYHOOD TO MANHOOD. By David Williamson. London: *The Religious Tract Society*. Price 1s. net. An excellent gift for a boy on his leaving school. Manly and helpful in every way. WILD FLOWERS OF THE YEAR. By A. Pratt. London: *The Religious Tract Society*. Price 3s. 6d. A new edition of an excellent gift-book. MORAL EDUCATION AND THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL. By Rev. W. Hume Campbell, M.A. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 3d. THE CHURCH SCOUT'S PRAYER-BOOK. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 1d. Prayers for boy scouts, compiled on High Church lines. ROME, TURKEY, AND JERUSALEM. By Rev. E. Hoare. London: *Chas. J. Thyne*. Price 1s. net. The reissue of some remarkable sermons, preached thirty-six years ago, and still well worthy of thought. WHAT HATH GOD WROUGHT. By Rev. Canon Richard Hobson. London: *Chas. J. Thyne*. Price 2s. net. A second and enlarged edition. FAITH HEALING; A REPLY TO MR. MAURO'S TEACHING. London: *Marshall Bros., Ltd.* Price 6d. net. THE GIFT AND THE LIFE. By Theodore Monod. Price 1s. net. FOUNDATION TRUTHS OF THE GOSPEL. London: *Morgan and Scott, Ltd.* Price 1s. net. Two new issues in this firm's "Golden Treasury" series. THE OLD LIEUTENANT AND HIS SON. By Norman Macleod. Price 1s. THE VOYAGE OF THE DISCOVERY. Vols. I, and II. By Captain Robert F. Scott. Price 1s. each. WILD ENGLAND OF TO-DAY. By C. J. Cornish. London: *Thomas Nelson and Sons*. Price 1s. SEX EDUCATION. By Ira S. Wile, M.S., M.D. London: *Andrew Melrose*. Price 2s. 6d. net. A difficult topic carefully and reverently treated. THE SON OF A SERVANT. By August Strindberg. London: *William Rider and Son, Ltd.* Price 3s. 6d. net. LIFE OF MUHAMMED. By Canon Sell, D.D. London: *Christian Literature Society for India*. Price 3s. net. THOUGHTS IN HIS PRESENCE. By Rev. Wilfred M. Hopkins. London: *Robert Scott*. Price 2s. net. A very valuable preparation for Holy Communion; a real help to all communicants. A FRIENDLY GERMANY: WHY NOT? By Lady Phillips. London: *Constable and Co., Ltd.* Price 2s. 6d. net. THE WIND BEFORE THE DAWN. By Dell H. Munger. London: *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 6s. A well-written story of Canadian life. THE OXFORD HELPS TO THE STUDY OF THE BIBLE; BIBLE ILLUSTRATIONS; THE OXFORD CYCLOPÆDIC CONCORDANCE. London: *Oxford University Press*. Price 3s. 6d. net. A new edition, better than the old for two reasons. It has been brought up to date, and it has been better arranged. An invaluable book to the intelligent Bible student.

