

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

THE
CHURCHMAN

FEBRUARY, 1888.

ART. I.—TITHE RENT-CHARGE.

THE proposal to allow 5 per cent. to the landowner for paying the tithe rent-charge within three months after due, introduced in the original Bill of 1887, was withdrawn. It is, however, understood that efforts will be made on the part of some landowners (for many repudiate it) to get the allowance restored in 1888. It is therefore necessary to show the injustice of any collection cost, wrongfully imposed as it has been upon the titheowner by the action of the landowner, being transferred as a bonus to his advantage.

Through the commutation, very large values have been taken from the titheowner and handed over to the landowner. In the average of years, on the lowest estimate of elementary values, not less than three-sevenths of the whole tithe-value has been absorbed by the latter, while another seventh at least has, without loss to the titheowner, been secured as permanent profits.¹

The conditions on which the transferred value was taken from the titheowner were two. One was, that the annual income should be so varied as to keep him always abreast of the living costs of the day. The other was, that he should be assured the payment of the sum reserved to him punctually, fully, and in peace. Neither of these conditions has been fulfilled.

1. As to the intention of the Legislature with respect to the former, there can be no doubt. The variation, by the septennial average price of corn, of the amount receivable by the rent-charge owner, was so ordered, not to meet any question of the amount or value of produce to the producer,

¹ "Land Rental," p. 26.

but solely and distinctly to ensure to the owner of the new rent-charge property, in part consideration of the heavy sacrifices of his tithe property to the landowner, an income always commensurate with the purchasing power of money, which it was supposed (however erroneously and detrimentally to the new owner) would always vary as the price of corn. In introducing the Commutation Bill, Lord John Russell said: "Thus the titheowner would be entitled to receive every year payment according to the fluctuations in the value of grain, which would be taken to represent the fluctuations in the value of money."¹ And the Poor Law Commissioners' Report on Local Taxation, 1843, bearing Sir G. Cornwall Lewis's signature, says: "It was quite clearly understood at the passing of the Commutation Act, that there was to be assured to the titheowners an income as nearly as possible equivalent in real value to their then revenue, to be rendered by the provisions as to averages independent, as far as possible, even of fluctuations in the value of money. *With this assurance* of a certain value, the titheowner abandoned his prospect of increased revenue from improving cultivation and rising prices of produce."²

If there could remain any room for dispute upon the subject, it has been effectually removed by the publication of extracts from a very important and interesting letter quite recently (October 7th) written by Earl Grey, an active member, as Lord Howick, of Lord Melbourne's Government, to Lord Halifax. His lordship on this point writes:

The principle of the Tithe Commutation Act was that a permanent rent-charge, determined by the actual payments of the preceding seven years, was to be fixed upon the land, not to be subject either to increase or diminution. The variation of the payment according to the seven years' average price of corn was not meant to provide for varying the amount of the payment according to the varying value of the crops (for, if this had been intended, the payment would have been regulated according to the annual value of corn not according to its value on the average of seven years), but to guard against the loss the Church might sustain by a depreciation of the currency. . . . It was also believed that, by taking the average value of corn for periods of seven years, the variations of price from good and bad harvests would be to a great extent got rid of, and that a tolerably certain measure of value would be obtained.

Having been one of the Committee of Cabinet by which the Tithe Commutation Act was settled, and the person who chiefly communicated with Mr. Jones, its author, on behalf of the Government, I can testify that this was the object with which the seven years' average of corn was made to regulate the amount of rent-charge, and that what was intended was to make the amount of that charge as nearly uniform as possible.

Now, in the seven years ending 1880, living expenses

¹ Hansard, xxxi. 195.

² Folio ed., p. 10; 8vo. ed., p. 175.

³ *National Church*, December, 1887. Especial thanks are due to Earl Grey and Lord Halifax for allowing these extracts to be published.

averaged quite 25 per cent. higher than at the Commutation, while the gross tithe rent-charge receivable averaged under 12 per cent. higher. In 1886 living expenses were about 9 per cent. above, while tithe rent-charge was 9 per cent. below, the value of 1836.¹ There has thus been always a heavy loss, whether tithe rent-charge has been high or low. Contrary to the expectation and intention of the framers of the Commutation, the value of corn has never represented, and now less than ever represents, either the value of all farm produce merged in it, or the purchasing power of gold.

2. With regard to the latter condition, what was the assurance? Lord John Russell, in introducing the Bill, said: "I propose, as Lord Althorp proposed, that the owner of the land should stand to the tenant, not only in the situation of the landlord, but *also in that of the titheowner*. The income of the clergy would ultimately flow from the landowner, and *not from each tenant or farmer*."² Mr. Cutlar Fergusson, a member of the Government, further explained:

The *tenant will no longer* be liable to be *applied to* for the payment of this charge, and the clergyman will have the great advantage afforded him by the *liability of the landlord*. The *landlord is bound to pay the full amount* of whatever demand the clergyman becomes entitled to, although not being able perhaps to collect that amount from the tenant. With regard to the clergyman, in addition to his having the security of the landlord, is it not an advantage to him to be able to collect his tithe at once, instead of having to go among a hundred or a thousand miserable people?³

The means by which this was to be carried out was as follows:

By the Commutation Act (§ 37), in award cases in which the tithe had been taken in kind, the Commissioners were, after estimating the whole average value, to make all just deductions on account of the expenses of collecting, preparing for sale, and marketing the tithe produce; such deductions being assumed to have been already made in all cases of compositions and agreements. The evidence of numerous land-valuers proves this allowance to have been 25 per cent. In the Commutation Bill, as introduced, this allowance was definitely made. 75 per cent. was fixed as the maximum fair money value to the titheowner. For the 25 per cent. represented, not what the cost of such collection and conversion would be to the producer, but the cost to the titheowner. The actual cost to the farmer was only from 10 to 15 per cent., the difference being so much gain to him.⁴ The evidence of the Tithe Commissioners, supported by that of the land-valuers, shows that the whole actual amount of tithe rent-charge substituted did not exceed 60 per

¹ "Fluctuations of Prices," pp. 8, 15.

³ "Mirror of Parliament," i. 263.

² Hansard, xxxi. 185.

⁴ "Land Rental," p. 9.

cent. (more as regards the impropiator, less as regards the parson¹) of the gross value of the tithes. The 25 per cent. for collection having been thus allowed off, with 15 per cent. average loss besides, the full residual rent-charge, free of any further collection expenses to him, was made "*payable*" to the titheowner by two half-yearly payments, to be paid "*on the 1st day of July and the 1st day of January in every year*" (§ 67). "*For the payment*" of that sum the landowners "*executed an agreement*" (§ 17), or else, when no agreement was come to, the Commissioners "*awarded the total sum to be paid*" (§ 36). Such agreement (§ 17) or award (§ 52) was to be "*binding on all persons interested in the said lands or tithes,*" and that "*rent-charge to be paid as a permanent commutation of the tithes*" (§§ 37, 38). And, "*in case the said rent-charge shall at any time be in arrear and unpaid for the space of twenty-one days,*" the titheowner was to pay himself; first, by taking its amount out of the existing produce (§ 81) as belonging to him and not to the landowner; and then, if he should fail to find sufficient produce, by obtaining the full amount of it, together with *all costs*, from such produce as he could himself make to "*issue out of the land*" by his own cultivation of it (§ 82).

The landowner can have no sort of grievance at this, first, because the titheowner's rights to so much of the produce were, and the tithe rent-charge owner's rights now are, always anterior to his own rights to residual rent, or to produce *ultra* the tithe or tithe rent-charge; and secondly, because the amount to be paid was settled in the majority of cases by his own or his predecessor's agreement, and in the remainder by the judicial award of the Commissioners, in all cases under the terms of the Act as to dates of payment. And his compensation was enormous; while, on the faith of that settlement, something like a tenth of all the titheable lands, and no inconsiderable amount of impropriate tithe rent-charge, have been sold and bought in the interval since.

It is thus obviously incumbent upon the landowner to make arrangements for the payment of the rent-charge *when payable*; either *ipsissimis manibus*, or by his agent-tenant. If he fail to do so, the penalty he suffers is, that he loses *pro tem*, possession of his land.¹ When the land is farmed out, the tenant, if, to keep off the entering titheowner,² he pays the money, is entitled by Section 80 of the Act, *in every case* to deduct whatever amount he pays from the rent payable to his

¹ "Land Rental," p. 13.

² "Tolls are like tithes or tithe rent-charge, which must be paid to prevent the titheowner from entering."—Justice Byles in Mersey Docks case.

landlord, exactly as he does property-tax or land-tax. "The titheowner cannot recover in a civil action; he cannot bring an action against the tenant. What are we to infer from that? That it was the intention of the Legislature that all land should be let tithe-free."¹ Every rent, therefore, agreed upon subsequently to the Commutation was, in the eye of the Act, a gross render inclusive of the tithe rent-charge; for, if not, he could not be always entitled to deduct the rent-charge from it. It was thus distinctly fixed upon the landlord as a sum ultimately payable by him, and, if primarily paid by the tenant, only as his agent. The tenant can have no grievance, unless of his own making, because if he has engaged with his landlord to pay the money for him, he has nothing to do but to pay it, and deduct it, just as he does the taxes which no tenant complains of. It is his own fault and his own folly, if he agrees with the landlord to give up his rights under the Act, to undertake the risks of fluctuations of the rent-charge, and to pay a net rent from which he cannot deduct the amount. His choosing to do so can give him no moral, nor commercial, claim to a grievance, in that he is compelled to pay in full, and on the days specified by the Act, what on such days he has voluntarily undertaken to pay. The titheowner was no party to the bargain he has made with the landlord, and to the latter, and not to him, he must look to rescind or vary the bargain.

In a great many instances the tithe rent-charge is actually paid, either by the landowner or his tenant, without putting the titheowner to any additional expense, and with punctuality. But in no case is it incumbent upon the titheowner to collect, or ask for the money, or to give any notice to anybody that it is due. It is not, legally, *collectible* at all; it is *payable*. He cannot even legally claim or collect it from anybody, because nobody, neither landowner nor tenant, is "personally liable to the payment" (§ 67). Nevertheless, on the other hand, if the landlord does not make effectual arrangements in some manner, and in any manner he pleases, for its being actually so paid, he can only be regarded as a defaulter. If the money is not paid by the landowner, or by somebody for him, within three weeks' grace, the titheowner, under the Act, takes it forcibly. The landowner has no ground whatever for claiming three months for payment. He has none for claiming 5 per cent. or any other percentage

¹ Mr. H. Trethenny, of Silsoe, Amptill, at Central Farmers' Club, 14th March, 1881. He adds, "I beg to state that it is the interest of the landowners—I speak as an agent having a large practice in various counties in England, and I say it is the interest of the landowners to let all lands tithe-free."

for paying punctually. He is already bound by the Act so to pay it, or to see it so paid. Lord Salisbury's Bill of 1887 does not increase his liability one whit, for, as Lord John Russell and Mr. Cutlar Fergusson said, he is already liable to pay in full. The Bill does nothing but oust the titheowner from his right to take, in ordinary cases, the produce which belongs to him, and gives him, instead, a power of recovery by action, even retaining to him the ultimate remedy of taking possession of the lands. Either process simply intends to compel the landowner to do the duty which he undertook, as part of the Commutation contract, when he purchased or inherited his property. The enforcement of the eighty-eighth, or deduction section, as in the case of property-tax and land-tax, with a simple remedy through the County Court, would have secured the result with less trouble and more effectually.

No doubt, in practice, the titheowner does most commonly remind the person, whether landowner or his agent-tenant, who holds himself out to be the tithepayer, of the amount due under the averages, and perhaps proposes a particular day to receive it, or perhaps he sends a collector to receive it for him. But this is purely a matter of convenience and courtesy to the tithepayer. And it is only done, or necessary to be done, when and because the landowner has failed to pay up, or make arrangements that it shall be paid up, *when payable*. Whatever expense is thus incurred to save the unpleasantness to the tenant of having immediate recourse to distraint, is thrown upon the titheowner by the landowner's action. It is bad enough that he should have been subjected to such an expense at all in any year, still more in a series of years; but how can it be fair that in a redemption, or in any re-arrangement, any such sum should be *permanently deducted from his income?*

What has the titheowner, lay or cleric, done—in what has he neglected his duty, or failed in his part of the contract, that the Commutation settlement requiring the money to be paid in full on a fixed day, should be reversed to his detriment, *instead of being enforced to his relief?* Why, after the heavy transferences of his tithe property to the landowner—why, after the latter has been allowed (what is admitted to have been a beneficial allowance) 25 per cent. for collection and conversion into money of the tithe produce, so as to enable him to pay the proceeds on the days appointed—why should the titheowner now be further victimized for his further benefit?

“Why,” asked Lord Bramwell, with respect to a similar provision in Lord Stanhope's Bill in 1883—“why should the

gentlemen of England be allowed discount for paying their bills properly?"

Even this is not all. To give the landowner a discount bonus for having unjustly imposed this expense upon the titheowner is unreasonable enough. But there is rather more than this. The matter ought to stand the other way. The titheowner cannot do what the tradesman does, and add on 5 per cent. to his prices, to take it off again as discount on prompt payment. Instead of giving discount to the landowner for paying punctually according to the Act, or within three months, the titheowner ought to receive interest for his loss by any delays of payment beyond the day when legally payable. Be a single day in paying a loan instalment to the Loan Commissioners, and see if they do not insist upon interest for that day. You will not get even the commercial three days' grace. If money is withheld by the landowner or by his agent-tenant, it is because it is of profit in his hands. By just so much is it of loss to the titheowner from whom it is dishonestly withheld. Tithe rent-charge is his means of paying his living expenses. Will his butcher and baker and grocer and coal-dealer wait for three months without taking interest, by piling it in some way on their charges? Is it fair that, if paid his rent-charge so long after due—for, of course, it will be paid only on the ninetieth day, at the very extremity of the three months—a single day will save the 5 per cent.—the titheowner should have to pay both discount to the landowner, and also interest to the tradesmen for the delay?

The whole behaviour of the defaulting landowners has been so signally unjust in imposing this tax, or allowing their tenants to impose it, upon the clergy, and now in seeking to convert it into a permanent bonus to themselves, that it is hard to understand how, as Lord Bramwell says, the gentlemen of England can be parties to it. No doubt a great many have heretofore done it or allowed it unknowingly. And it is a matter of great satisfaction that so many have, immediately on becoming aware of the state of things, at once declared their determination to carry out the intention on which the Commutation Act was passed.

Those who still persist, contrary to the intention and provisions of the Commutation Act, in burdening the titheowners with the cost, or claim compensation for ceasing to do so, or who try to enforce terms of redemption which will induce a further absorption of the titheowners' remaining property into their own, can yet hardly fail to observe how rapid the progress of events which shows that land-rent is as much on its trial as tithe rent-charge; and that, as Sir Robert Peel declared, a process of spoliation which appropriates one property, will

not be long before it effects a retribution in the sacrifice of the other. It might surely be wise, in the coming struggle, for them not, on either or any point, for the sake of a little saving of their own income, to dissociate the titheowners, and especially the clergy, from interesting themselves in contending on their side. It might also be well, too, to remember that it was the extreme Liberals and Nonconformists of the day who, at the Commutation, most clearly foresaw, and whose sense of justice led them most vigorously to protest against, the enhancement of the property of the landowner at the expense of the titheowner, which has proved to be the issue of the Act.

Once more to quote Earl Grey, whose evidence is unimpeachable :

It is very clear that landowners as a body were enormous gainers by making the charge a fixed one. . . . It would therefore be in the highest degree unjust, if, after having so long enjoyed the advantage of a fixed charge, the landowners were now, because times are bad, to ask the titheowner to give up that certainty of income for which he has made so large a concession. We all came into possession of our estates subject to the charge for tithes which had existed for many centuries ; and we have no more right to ask the titheowners to give up to us a part of what belongs to them, than we have to ask our next neighbour for a slice of his estate.

In concluding this article, it is necessary to draw attention to Mr. Bridge's Welsh Report, as failing in one important respect to do justice to the titheowners, and so to leave a very unfair impression as to their case and action. His statement represents very fully the complaints of the tithepayers that, although the landowners have reduced their rents, the titheowners have not reduced their rent-charges. But he gives no similar or equal prominence to the answer, viz., that the tithe rent-charge is, through the corn averages, legally self-adjusting, while the rise or fall in rents is arbitrary. Rents are reduced, too, with reference to the value of the whole farm-produce, which has not fallen as corn has. But the whole farm-produce tenth is merged, for tithe rent-charge, in corn-value only. All the titheowner's eggs are put in one basket. Hence tithe rent-charge is not only more sensitive than rent, but falls, and has fallen, much more rapidly and severely. Between 1878 and 1885 land-rental had in the whole fallen 6 per cent., but tithe rent-charge 16 per cent. It has now (1888) fallen 25 per cent., and however corn prices and rents may revive and rise, must continue to fall to 35 per cent. Thirty cases recorded in the newspapers of rent-remissions have shown an average of 21 per cent. But there is a large extent of land in respect of which no remission is called for or has been made. Suppose, however, a uniform fall in all lands to the same apparent extent

as in tithe rent-charge—25 per cent.—the real fall, in comparison, will be something very different.

For between the Commutation and 1878 the rental of (all) tithable lands rose from £100 to £165; tithe rent-charge to £112 only (showing how much of tithe-produce has gone to augment land-value, for it would have risen, under the tithe system, to at least the same height as land-rental). It is of course true that the rise of 65 per cent. does not apply to a vast number of individual parishes or properties. But, upon the evidence of the property-tax returns, it is true upon the whole. A fall of 25 per cent. upon £165 rental would have brought it down to £124, while the same fall on £112 tithe rent-charge has brought it down to £84. So that rental is still, on the whole, 24 per cent. above, while tithe rent-charge is 16 per cent. below, the central unit of 1836—a difference of 40 per cental. To bring it down to the present level of tithe rent-charge, it would require a reduction, from the rents of 1878, of no less than 49 per cent.

This answer ought in justice to have been emphasized in Mr. Bridge's Report as fully as the tithepayers' complaints. The editorial remarks of the leading newspapers clearly showed that this was not the case, and that the titheowner, because he had not made reductions on the rent-charge receivable, lies, without defence from Mr. Bridge, under the imputation of being less liberal than the landowner.

Thus much on the facts; but of course there remains the further answer, that the titheowner is liable to no reduction, beyond that of the averages, as between the occupier and himself. The occupier undertook all the risks of his tenancy (or, if landowner himself, of his purchase or inheritance), and it is with the landlord (or, if landowner, with his predecessor in title) that he must, if he can, settle, if his risks have been miscalculated.

C. A. STEVENS.

ART. II.—HADES.

WHAT is Hades? From the Homily on Prayer I make the following extracts: "The Scripture doth acknowledge but two places after this life, the one proper to the elect and blessed of God." "St. Augustine doth only acknowledge two places after this life, heaven and hell. As for the third place, he doth plainly deny that there is any such to be found in all Scripture." After quoting certain passages of the Scriptures,

and of the early writers, the sermon adds: "As the Scripture teacheth us, let us think that the soul of man, passing out of the body, goeth straightways either to heaven or else to hell."¹ Now the teaching of the Church as regards the Homilies, is that they "contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times" (Art. xxxv.). The Church has not altered this doctrine. The doctrine that was "godly and wholesome" some 200 years ago, cannot be otherwise at any time: it cannot change its character. As to the necessity "for these times," we might have fondly hoped that no such necessity does or could exist at present, were it not that indications abound on every side that such teaching is an absolute necessity, when men are advocating, what I hope I do not miscall, a vast subterranean reformatory for the wicked after death; a third place, distinct from heaven and hell, into which, it is maintained, the souls of all men go on death. This place is called Hades, and it is described as being divided into two parts, separated the one from the other by a great chasm, and that there can be no passing from the one to the other, but that the souls dwelling in them respectively can see one another, and even converse. One of these divisions is called Paradise, and Abraham's bosom; the other, what? I cannot find out. One writer tells us that it is "the baneful side of Hades." Another, that it "is not Gehenna." Whence has arisen this idea of a third place, of which the Scriptures know nothing, and of the existence of which St. Augustine "doth plainly deny that there is any such to be found in all Scripture"? The only answer is, Paganism. The Jews derived the idea, like many others, from their Pagan surroundings, and we from them, or, indeed, even direct from the Pagans themselves. Early in the Christian era the Church and the State combined christened Paganism, and in so doing Paganized Christianity.

Hades is, however, a reality, not as a *place*, but a *state*. Its meaning, "unseen," is fitly represented by the old Saxon word of the same meaning, "Hell." We must carefully distinguish between these two, *state* and *place*; they are frequently confounded, as if there were no real distinction between them. On death the soul of everyone is in Hades, in the unseen state; the place of its dwelling until the resurrection is an altogether different idea. If the souls of the unbelieving dead are in conscious existence, I can only believe that they are in Gehenna. But are they in conscious existence? Old Testament Scripture is silent as to the intermediate state, as one of conscious existence. It connects the future life altogether with

¹ Pp. 355, 356, edition S.P.C.K., 1864.

the resurrection. It speaks of our Lord's soul being in Sheol, which answers to Hades, but Sheol is used for the grave in Psalm cxli. 7, "Our bones are scattered at Sheol's mouth." And it is said of Korah, and all his company, that they went down alive into Sheol, with their tents and household goods even all that appertained unto them. By no possibility can we conceive that Sheol here specifies a place where the souls of the dead are confined. So far as Old Testament revelation is concerned, we can entertain no other opinion than that on death man sleeps in an unconscious state until wakened by the trumpet-call of the resurrection.

When we come to the New Testament we find, as we shall see, sufficient evidence, yet not overwhelming, that the souls of the righteous dead are, while in the intermediate state, in "joy and felicity," conscious existence of course. Of the souls of the unrighteous dead we are left in the same ignorance as in the case of the Old Testament. The only passage that ever is, or could be, adduced in this reference is our Lord's narrative of the rich man and Lazarus. How little this applies I shall further on consider. I shall here extract from Bullinger's "Critical Lexicon and Concordance of the English and Greek New Testament:"

ᾠδης. Hades, the invisible. Gravedom. Greek for Hebrew Sheol, which denotes a hollow abyss or cavity, as does the old English word Hell, or hole. Hades therefore denotes the realm of the invisible, Graveland, Gravedom. All the graves of the world viewed as one. The one Grave of the human race, not the grave of an individual. Acts ii. 24-34 is quoted from Ps. xvi., and refers only to Christ's burial.

With regard to our Lord's promise to the robber on the cross, our interpretation will depend on the way in which we read the words. Shall we connect the words "to-day" with the verb "I say" or with the promise as to Paradise? Shall we read, "Verily to thee I say to-day, Thou shalt be with Me in Paradise;" or, "Verily to thee I say, To-day thou shalt be with Me in Paradise"? The latter is the reading both of the A.V. and the R.V. In reference to the former, I quote again from Bullinger:

Paradise. The later Jewish teaching made Paradise that part of *ᾠδης* reserved for the blessed. But *ᾠδης* is gravedom, whither all go on death, and Paradise is the place of the risen saints. The Scripture teaches that Paradise was the dwelling-place of God with men in the first heaven and earth. It was barred from man at the Fall, and destroyed at the Flood. It will reappear again at the regeneration (Matt. xix. 28), when God shall fulfil His promise, and make the new heavens and earth (Isa. li. 16, lxv. 17, lxvi. 22; 2 Pet. iii. 13; Rev. xxii.), of which the millennial earth will be at once the pledge and foretaste. Hence the Scriptures relating to Paradise now, are all future, as the abode of *risen* saints, not of *dead* ones. (1) In Luke xxiii. 43 the Lord gives the dying

robber a present assurance, instead of a future remembrance—"Verily I say unto thee to-day"—the future fulfilment being required by the absence of *ὅτι* (compare Luke xxii. 34 and Matt. xxi. 28 with Mark xiv. 30, Luke iv. 21, and xix. 9). (2) In 2 Cor. xii. 4 the verb is ἀρπάζω—"catch away," not "up." (3) In Rev. ii. 7 the promise is clearly future, pointing to Rev. xxii.

As to *σήμερον*—to-day, this day—Bullinger states the rule as to its use:

When it comes after a verb, it belongs to that verb, unless it is separated from it, and thrown into the next clause by the presence of *ὅτι* (that); e.g. WITH *ὅτι*: Luke xix. 9, *Ἐπεὶ δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι σήμερον*—"But Jesus said unto him, that to-day" (or, this day is salvation come, etc.); Luke iv. 21, *ἤρξατο δὲ λέγειν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὅτι σήμερον*—"But He began to say unto them, that this day" (or, to-day is this Scripture fulfilled, etc.); Mark xiv. 30, *καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἀμὴν λέγω σοι ὅτι σήμερον*, etc.)—"And Jesus saith unto him, Verily I say unto thee, that this day" (i.e., to-day, before the cock crow, etc.).

WITHOUT *ὅτι*: Matt. xxi. 28, *καὶ, προσελθὼν τῷ πρώτῳ εἶπε, τέκνον, ὕπαγε σήμερον ἐργάζου ἐν τῷ ἀμπελῶνι μου*, etc.—"And coming to the first, He said, Son, go to-day, work in My vineyard;" Luke xxii. 34, *λέγω σοι, Πέτρε, οὐ μὴ φωνήσῃ σήμερον ἀλέκτωρ*, etc.—"I tell thee, Peter, the cock shall not crow this day, before," etc.; Luke xxiii. 43, *καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἀμὴν σοι λέγω σήμερον, μετ' ἐμοῦ ἔσῃ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ*—"And Jesus said to him, Verily to thee I say this day, with Me shalt thou be in the paradise." The words *to-day* being made solemn and emphatic. Thus instead of a remembrance when He shall come in (in, verse 42) His kingdom, He promises a presence then in association (*μετά*) with Himself. And this promise He makes on that very day when He was dying, but when the faith of the dying robber read aright the inscription above Him and the signs around Him. . . . We place this passage in harmony with numberless passages in the Old Testament—such as, "Verily I say unto you this day," etc.; "I testify unto you this day," etc.; Deut. vi. 6, vii. 11, viii. 1, x. 13, xi. 8, 13, 18, xix. 9, xxvii. 4, xxx. 2, etc., where the Septuagint corresponds to Luke xxiii. 43.

Although a grammatical reason is assigned for this reading of our Lord's words, it meets with scant courtesy from Alford, who says, *in loco*: "The attempt to join it with *σοι λέγω*, considering that it not only violates common-sense but destroys the force of our Lord's promise, is surely something worse than silly." "The Speaker's Commentary" remarks: "An old but forced construction connects it (*σήμερον*) with the preceding words, 'I say.'" Bishop Ellicott's "Commentary" passes over the construction without remark, though it evidently favours the reading of the A.V. and R.V.

The second place in the New Testament where Paradise is mentioned is 2 Cor. xii. 2-4. St. Paul informs the Corinthians that in vision he was "caught up" (A.V. and R.V.), *ἀρπαγέντα*—caught away—*ἕως τρίτου οὐρανοῦ*—as far as the third heaven—"caught up"—caught away—*εἰς τὸν παράδεισον*—into the Paradise: combined we read, "caught away as far as the third heaven into the Paradise." This can by no ingenuity

be interpreted "descended into Hades," assumed, as it is, by some that Paradise is a region of that supposed place. St. Paul's statement implies either that the third heaven is identical with Paradise, or that Paradise is a region of that third heaven. Into this heaven ascended our Lord, and there abides "until the times of the restitution—re-institution—restoration (R.V.) of all things." And from thence "He shall come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead."

The third mention of Paradise is in Rev. ii. 7: "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the Tree of Life— $\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ $\zeta\omega\acute{\eta}\varsigma$, the life—which is in the Paradise of God." It is sufficient to say that the tree of the life is not in the region of death—it is not in Hades. This promise stretches into that region of life where the saints will enjoy their everlasting life, when Death and Hades shall cease to be.

St. Paul's statements in 2 Cor. v. 6-8, and Phil. i. 23, respectively, now come under consideration. They are, "knowing that while we are at home in the body we are absent from the Lord—willing rather to be absent from the body and present with the Lord" (R.V., at home). And, "having a desire to depart and be with Christ, which is far better." In the exposition of the passages in Corinthians, we must take into account the whole context with which they are connected. In the opening of the chapter, St. Paul contrasts the tabernacle of the present body with the habitation of the future. "In this," he writes, "we groan, being burdened, longing to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven." He then repudiates any wish to be disembodied, as in the words, "Not that we would be— $\delta\upsilon$ $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$ —unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality— $\tau\acute{\omicron}$ $\theta\nu\eta\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu$ —(R.V., what is mortal) may be swallowed up of life"— $\delta\upsilon\pi\acute{\omicron}$ $\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\zeta\omega\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ —by the life. Death triumphs until the resurrection, and then, and in it, the life triumphs. As in 1 Cor. xv., "When this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, *then* shall come to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory," but not till then. After such a repudiation of the wish to be unclothed—that is, disembodied—we surely cannot suppose that at the same time he expresses a wish to be unclothed in order that he may be present with the Lord. Must we not then understand him to say, While we are at home in the present mortal body we are absent from the Lord, and are therefore willing to leave this body, and with it the present life, in which we groan, being burdened, and to receive the immortal body, in which we shall be ever present with Him?

This view is confirmed by what follows: "Wherefore we labour that, whether we are present or absent, we may be

accepted of Him ;" and the reason assigned being, "For we must all be made manifest before the judgment-seat of Christ, that each one may receive the things done in the body, whether it be good or bad." This will only be on the resurrection. This view is further strengthened by 1 Thess. iv., where the Apostle more fully instructs us that on the descent of our Lord, at His second coming, both the dead and living saints shall be caught away together, as one body, to meet the Lord in the air, "and so shall we ever be with the Lord ;" ever with Him in our immortal and incorruptible bodies.

Phil. i. 23 must be dealt with in strict accordance with this. It is the same desire that is expressed in both passages. The Apostle here writes, "having the desire to depart and be with Christ, which is far better." The word for "depart" is unusual—ἀναλῦσαι—which implies loosing and returning, as of a ship loosed from her moorings to go on her voyage and return to her berth. This force is in ἀνά, answering to the Latin *retro*. The word is found in Luke xii. 16, "when he will return from the wedding." Now St. Paul's statement is "having the desire εἰς τὸ ἀναλῦσαι καὶ σὺν Χριστῷ εἶναι." This I can translate only, "for the return of, and the being with Christ," that is, the return of Christ, and our being with Him, in accordance with 1 Thess. iv. 17. The return of the Lord from heaven, and the return of His people from the grave synchronize, each being the complement of the other.

That this was always St. Paul's hope he himself fully declares to Timothy, 2 Epist. iv. 6-8. I give the passage as in R.V. :

For I am already being offered, and the time of my departure is come. I have fought the good fight, I have finished the course (race), I have kept the faith ; henceforth there is laid up for me the crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day : and not only to me, but also to all them that love His appearing.

The Apostle is standing on the verge of the grave, having won the prize, the crown, in the Christian fight and Christian race, and is about to retire from the stadium of life—what is his hope ? That he shall receive the crown on his death ? No ! But when the Judge shall come forth and place it on his head in that day, and on the heads of all who with the Apostle have loved His appearing. The intervening state between death and the resurrection is altogether overlooked, as if it were not.

But if these passages do not warrant the belief of the conscious existence of the souls of the righteous during the intermediate state, on what can we base the belief ? We can base it on the new spiritual life—the ζωὴ ἐν ἑαυτῷ—which is imparted to the soul by the new birth of the Holy Spirit. It is

God's own life, eternal and immortal, and which therefore can never sleep, can never be unconscious; and we can with truth use the words of the prayer in our Burial office, "Almighty God, with Whom do live the spirits of them that depart hence in the Lord, and with Whom the souls of the faithful, after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh, are in joy and felicity." Yet is it a state of expectancy: they wait for their "perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in God's eternal and everlasting glory," when the body too shall be born in this spiritual life from the grave, and the perfected man shall, like Christ the head, live to die no more.

It is necessary to examine some passages where the word "Hades" occurs. Our Lord's promise in Matt. xvi. 18 is, "The gates of Hades shall not prevail against it" (the Church). *Hades*, not *Gehenna*, whose gates will never be opened, for God will "destroy both soul and body in Gehenna." In Rev. i. 18, we read: "I have the keys of Death and of Hades;" these two are connected promises of the resurrection. In Hades is the soul, and in Death is the body. The metaphor of gates and keys is employed—the keys shall unlock the gates within which, as it were, souls and bodies are respectively confined, and let them free, and then the song of triumph shall be raised, "O Death where is thy sting? O Hades, where is thy victory?" This implies that there was a sting, and a victory too. And there was both a sting and a victory. Sin, scorpion-like, infusing its poison into the body, did sting it to death, and Hades had its triumph over the soul. But now, in the resurrection, the poison of the sting is neutralized, and the cry rises, O Death, thy sting, it did its worst; it can do no more—I live for ever! Hades, thou hadst thy victory; now is it reversed: thy gates shall close on me no more—I triumph over thee for ever!

And again, we have these two states presented to us in Rev. xx. 13, for the last time, as first delivering up the dead—souls and bodies respectively—which were in them, and then they themselves utterly destroyed, "cast into the lake of fire," as being enemies to the perfect bliss of God's saints. In these three passages in the Revelation, and in vi. 8, we have Death and Hades connected. If Hades be a place while Death is a state, we have an incongruity unparalleled. But when soul and body are separated, Death is the *state* of the body, the grave its *place*; and Hades is the *state* of the soul, Heaven, in the case of the saints, its *place*. The reunion of soul and body is the destruction of both states: "there shall be no more death."

"He descended into Hell" now claims our attention. This Article of the present Apostles' Creed has a history of its own.

The original is "Descendit ad inferos," most wrongly translated "He descended into Hell" (Hades). The correct translation is, He descended to those beneath. "Those beneath" describes the dead in their graves. The statement is no more than "He was buried." I give the history in the words of the Dean of Wells in his recent work, "The Spirits in Prison." He writes :

The history of the insertion of this article of the Creed presents many curious features. On the assumption that the rule of Vincent of Lerius, "Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus," is the measure and test of truth, it would not be difficult to construct a tolerably strong case against it. It does not appear in any of the earlier forms of the Apostles' Creed. It is not recognised in that of Nicæa, either as first drawn up in A.D. 325, or as expounded at Constantinople, or as reaffirmed at Ephesus or Chalcedon. It is wanting so far in the authority which the consent of the first four Ecumenical Councils has given to other dogmas. It was not found in the time of Rufinus, in the creeds either of Rome or of the Churches of the East, probably only in that of Aquileia. It might even seem at first to be tainted with an heretical origin, having made its first appearance as part of any dogmatic formula in the creed which was put forward by the Arian party at the Council of Ariminum (A.D. 359). For nearly three centuries more it was still in the background, not appearing in the creeds of the East; sometimes found, sometimes not found, in those of the West. When it next meets us it is in the Confessions of Faith which serve as transition steps towards the so-called Athanasian Creed, and which was published at the fourth (A.D. 633) and seventh (A.D. 693) of the Councils of Toledo. It occurs without an explanation in the pseudo-Athanasian Creed. I have not shrunk from stating the facts of the case thus clearly, even though they may seem to make against the claims of this doctrine on our assent. They are instructive as reminding us that those claims do not rest on the decrees of councils, nor even on the most ancient formularies of Christian antiquity. Members of the Church of England might view even a much stronger case with comparative equanimity. It will be enough for them to remember that they have given their assent to this as to other articles of the faith, expressly on the ground that it may be proved by most certain warrant of Holy Writ (art. viii., pp. 75, 76).

I am not writing in reply to the Dean of Wells, so that I shall not delay to point out the very ingenious way in which he has virtually tacked the eighth of our Articles on to the third, as if the words of the former had special reference to the descent into Hades, which is the subject of the latter, and quotes as if the Articles were one.

Bullinger also notes the late introduction of the Article into the Apostles' Creed. "The Article," he writes, "of the Apostles' Creed which implies an additional thought was added about A.D. 400, and is contained in no creed prior to A.D. 400, when it was used as the equivalent for the previous fact 'buried.'" This suggests to me another thought. At what time is it maintained that our Lord descended into the supposed abode, Hades? Was it on the moment of His death? or after His burial? If the former, then the Article is misplaced, and we

should read, "Crucified, dead, descended into hell, was buried." But whether we read as here, or as generally in the Creed, what incongruity! Of such the Scriptures are never guilty. For three of the averments refer to Christ bodily, as do all the other averments of the Creed, and this one alone, according to the Dean, to Christ out of His body. However, according to the order of the Creed, as we have it now, Christ descended into hell after His burial. Verily those who slipped it into the Creed were blunderers.

Let me reason briefly on the historic facts here presented to us. The words "*descendit ad inferos*" were unknown to the Apostles' Creed for centuries, and therefore formed no part of the true ancient Creed of the Church. It was not until after the lapse of seven or eight centuries that they crept at all generally into the Creed of the West, and then absolutely without authority. The Dean's reason for insisting on the truth of his interpretation of the dogma is stated in the following words: "In spite of that absence (of authority) it entered into the Creed of Christendom almost from the first"—*almost*, Mr. Dean, you admit, but not *from the first*—"and was associated with the belief that it represented the continuance in the unseen world of the redeeming work that had been completed on the Cross." How strange, the continuance of a work completed!

The Article does not appear in the Nicene Creed. This is the Creed of the Catholic Church. Why does it not appear in that which was an expansion of the Apostles' Creed? Was the Article before the Nicene Fathers at all? Can we suppose that they were ignorant of it? This is scarcely possible. But if they were, can there be a stronger argument against its existence as Catholic truth, known to and taught by the Apostles? But on the supposition that they were acquainted with it, its omission from the Creed they drew up is most significant. It must have arisen from one of two reasons: either because it was untrue, or superfluous, being identical with "He was buried," which they retained. And this latter is confirmed by the Athanasian Creed, which omits "He was buried," and contains the other form of the same truth. There is tautology in the Apostles' Creed as in our present use. In the Scriptures the word "descended" is not used in connection with Hades. Our Lord, like all other human beings, on His death descended into the grave; "He was buried," while His soul *went*, not *descended*, into the unseen state, called Hades. It is attempted to utilize Eph. iv. 8-10. But what was the ascent decides what was the descent. He ascended from the earth to the heaven above, as He had descended from the heaven to the earth in His incarnation. "The lower

parts of the earth " mean either " the low-lying earth," or, if anything more, they refer to His burial in the grave, from which He did ascend to earth's surface first, and thence to heaven." " He led captivity captive," is interpreted to mean " He brought with Him out of Hades a multitude of captives;" but this is to invert the plain meaning of the words, which is, not that He freed from captivity, but that He took captive, made captive, led into captivity.

It remains now to consider the narrative of the rich man and Lazarus. Is this a parable? It is not so called by St. Luke. The Lord suddenly introduces the narrative without any hint that He is about to utter a parable. Archbishop Trench remarks, " The question about which there has been such a variety of opinion from the first, namely, whether this be a parable or a history (history real or fictitious, it matters not), does in fact wholly depend on the manner in which it is interpreted: if the ordinary interpretation be the right one, it is certainly not, in the strictest sense of the word, a parable." He says also, " according to that (interpretation) commonly received, it is certainly no parable, the very essence of that order of composition being that one set of persons and things is named, another is signified; they are set over against one another." Does this narrative comply with these conditions? It is a narrative—is it real or fictitious? Surely the latter. There are two kinds of fictitious narratives: one, a narrative of possibilities; the other, of impossibilities. The former is the parable; the latter, the fable. Jotham's narrative of the trees seeking a king belongs to the latter. (Judges viii. 8-15.) In this category I place the narrative of the rich man and Lazarus. It is full of impossibilities. That there should in reality be a place for disembodied souls to be gathered, divided into two quarters, separated by an impassable chasm, and where, notwithstanding, the souls of the righteous and of the unrighteous can behold each other, and hold converse, recognising each other as when in life in their bodies, is an impossibility to all except the highly imaginative, and those whose eschatology is irrespective of the resurrection; and yet the resurrection is the centre and circumference of Bible eschatology. Moreover, Abraham is represented as being lord of life and death, who had the power to raise Lazarus from the dead, and to despatch him to the rich man's house; a power that belongs to God alone. Abraham is also represented as having Lazarus in his bosom, a place totally inadequate for all the departed righteous to congregate in. For it is not the place which the Jews supposed, borrowing the idea from the Pagans, and which they designated Abraham's bosom, that is here presented to us, but the actual

bosom of the patriarch, for Abraham is addressed by Dives, and holds a conversation with him. Then finger and tongue are spoken of, which are utterly out of place when the body with all its members is separated from the soul. Then we have the cold water. Where was it to come from? Had Abraham it?—or was it in the flames? Could it be conceived as being in such a place? Moreover, the request, “dip the tip of his finger in water and cool my tongue.” A drop of water hanging from a finger in the midst of burning flame! Impossible! And equally impossible that any alleviation of suffering could result from such a touch, even if such were possible. Yes, it is a narrative of impossibilities! Further, Lazarus is represented as having been carried, on his death, without burial—not his soul, but himself, else his finger could not have been spoken of—into Abraham’s bosom. But Abraham was dead, and the dust of his bosom was lying in the cave of Machpelah. Also, the rich man was buried, and through the grave passed into the flame—not his soul, but his whole self, for he speaks of his tongue. I can well suppose that it was the mistaken view of this fable that led the corrupters of the Creed, about the seventh century, to teach that our Lord descended through the grave into Hades, which is virtually taught by the order of the Articles as we have them now.

Our Lord spake this fable to reveal great spiritual truth. He depicts a Sadducee, one who denied a future existence and connected judgment. He is not charged with anything unbecoming his station in life. He kindly permitted the poor Lazarus, loathsome with uncovered sores, to lie at his gate, and be fed with the broken meat from his table; but he was an unbeliever in the revelation of the Scriptures as to the future; and this unbelief entails eternal condemnation: “between us and you (*ὁμῶν*), there is a great gulf (chasm) fixed, that they which would (*οἱ θέλοντες*) pass from hence to you may not be able, and that none may cross from thence to us” (R.V.). He further petitions Abraham to send Lazarus to his father’s house, to testify unto his five brethren, “lest they also come into this place of torment”—testify to them that there is a future existence and future judgment, for they too were unbelievers. Abraham’s answer is that the Scriptures are sufficient, “Moses and the prophets.” “Nay,” is the unbelieving remonstrance, “but if one goes to them (*ἀπὸ*) from the dead, they will repent” (change their mind); virtually this means, not the Scriptures, but a miracle. The crushing reply is, “If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded if one rise from (*ἐκ*) the dead.” These are the lessons the narrative was intended to impress: the all-sufficiency of the Scriptures as the revelation of a future

existence and future judgment; and the fearful results of unbelief of that revelation. And that revelation, from first to last, connects that existence with the resurrection, which will be the consummation and full revelation of the now only partially and imperfectly revealed truth of the future life. The idea of a third place, distinct from Heaven and Gehenna, whose origin is remote in the paganism of Babylon, and was adopted by the Jews, and accommodated to their peculiar religious opinions, and was also accepted generally by Christendom, with further additions, is calculated to throw and has thrown into the background, if not actually disparaged, the resurrection, which is the great factor in the eschatology of the Bible, and with which St. Paul so connects the future life, that if resurrection be not, there can be no future existence for us: "What advantageth it me if the dead rise not? Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die" (1 Cor. xv. 32).

I should not pass over without notice, that in the third of the Thirty-nine Articles, "the descent into hell" is treated of as distinct from the burial. Taking into account the fact that the Homilies, which repudiate a third place, and the Articles were drawn up by the same hand, we cannot interpret Hell in the Article as a third *place*, and must therefore understand it to mean the invisible *state*, into which our Lord's human soul went on His death, and so continued while it was separated from His body. The whole Article is intended to express that our Lord's death was real, similar to the deaths of all men. We cannot, I submit, construe strictly the words "went down." They were taken from "*descendit ad inferos*," the descent being into the grave, though here applied to Hell, the incorrect translation of "*inferos*."

Briefly to state my positions:

1. The souls of all men are, on death, in Hades, the invisible *state*, not *place*.

2. The souls of the righteous dead, while in this state, are in "the Paradise," that is, Heaven, where Christ is, and are there waiting their resurrection for the consummation of their salvation, when they shall appear with Him in glory.

3. The Scriptures are silent as to the souls of the unrighteous dead, whether during this state they are conscious or unconscious.

4. There will be a resurrection of the dead, both of the righteous and the unrighteous, when all shall be made manifest before the judgment-seat of Christ, to receive the things done in the body.

5. The two states, Death and Hades, shall, on the reunion of soul and body in the resurrection, cease to be; there shall be no more death.

6. The words, "He descended into Hell," originally imported only our Lord's burial, and were blunderingly slipped into the Apostles' Creed about the seventh century, without any authority—the words "ad inferos" being in the Creed, as we have it, improperly translated "into hell."

7. As in the Creed at present they are tautological.

I cannot more suitably conclude than with the prayer in our Burial Service, already partially quoted, "that it may please Thee, of Thy gracious goodness, shortly to accomplish the number of Thine elect, and to hasten Thy kingdom; that we, with all those that are departed in the true faith of Thy holy Name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in Thy eternal and everlasting glory, through Jesus Christ our Lord."

THEOPHILUS CAMPBELL.



ART. III.—THE PRESENT PHASES OF THE MOHAMMEDAN QUESTION (SECOND ARTICLE).

THE growing numbers of its sectaries "point to Mohammedanism becoming one day dominant over a very large part of the continent of Africa. At present large numbers of negroes are Mohammedans only in name, and have not an intelligent acquaintance with the distinctive tenets of their own creed. In another generation or two they will probably be as fanatical and bigoted, and as difficult to deal with, as the Mohammedans of the Turkish Empire." These are the words not of yesterday, nor of one who criticised missionary enterprise, but they were spoken on October 20th, 1875, in the Church Missionary House, Salisbury Square, at a conference on missions to the Mohammedans, and they were spoken by General Lake, then one of the honorary secretaries of the Society. He also said, "In Africa for Mohammedans but little has been done, because little has been attempted," a statement of the case which unhappily is as true of to-day as it was then.

Of this progress in Africa, Bosworth Smith writes, "One half of the whole of Africa is already dominated by Islam, while of the remaining half a quarter is leavened and another threatened by it."¹ This is to claim the ground wherever a

¹ *Nineteenth Century* for last December, p. 796. As my references to this article, as also to his book, "Mohammed and Mohammedanism" (edition 1876), will be critical, I should like to acknowledge here the great amount of invaluable matter and suggestion there is in both. It strikes me that the author in his book did not quite do justice either to

Moslem foot has trodden, whilst the highest estimate of African Mohammedans which I have met with does not rank them at more than a third of the population. Wilfrid Scawen Blunt, just now notorious for his Home Rule pranks in Ireland, and who is equally enamoured of Mohammedans, does not rate the total higher than thirty-four and a half millions, of whom ten millions are calculated for Central Africa. But he puts a query to his own calculation, as everyone must do in dealing with figures about that continent, our knowledge is as yet so very scanty.¹ A huge impulse, however, has been imparted to the propaganda of Islam in West Central Africa. With the beginning of this century, Danfodio, an able leader and preacher of the Wahhabi type, excited a great commotion there, and "established a mighty empire, the capital of which is Sockatoo."² He has not been the only important personage of the kind in the last hundred years.³ Three features, not new to the progress of Islam, have characterized these movements. There have been *Jihads*, or religious wars, there have been the conquests of trade, and there have been men who went forth with genuine belief in and devotion to Islam, and with marvellous persuasiveness of manner. Dr. Blyden, whose encyclopedic learning, literary ability, and attachment to his African brethren entitle him to our respect, and make us grieve for the prejudices he has imbibed, says, "The Arab missionaries whom we have met in the interior go about without 'purse or scrip,' and disseminate their religion by quietly teaching the Koran. The native missionaries—Mandingoes and Foulahs—unite with the propagation of their faith active trading."⁴ This general description is in the

himself or to his cause when he relegated such important points as polygamy and slavery to a few lines (pp. xiv, xv), in a preface. People do not read prefaces. I feel that the earnestness of tone and equity of temper in the *Nineteenth Century* article are an example to all who approach the subject, although I, for one, cannot altogether accept his verdict.

¹ "Future of Islam," p. 10. Written in 1881 and published in 1882.

² Winwood Reade's "African Sketch-book," i. 316, 317. See also Barth's fourth volume of "Travels in Central Africa."

³ See Blyden's "Christianity, Islam, and the Negro Race," p. 141 and pp. 357-60.

⁴ P. 13. I will quote in this note a passage from a letter dated November 13th, which I have from Rev. J. T. F. Halligey, for six years a Wesleyan missionary at Sierra Leone and Lagos: "In its advances among these pagan tribes its work has not been one of regeneration, but compromise. It has traded on heathen credulity." It "is now percolating through the regions which lie immediately within the West Coast line," but "is of an exceedingly emasculated type. Probably its compromises with paganism have diluted its virulence against Christianity. I am bound to say I have never encountered any rampant bigotry. Of Sierra Leone one of my most pleasing reminiscences is of a Mohammedan priest,

main accurate, though with the serious qualification, that nine-tenths of the progress of Islam in Nigritia has been by the sword.

At the present moment the most important missionary body is that of the Snousi, about which I should like to learn very much more than I have been able to do, for they may prove themselves formidable. It is not impossible, indeed, that those dervishes who are occasioning trouble in the Soudan are connected or in intimate relations with them. Their headquarters are in an oasis of some 7,000 people in the corner of the Libyan desert verging on Tripoli and Egypt. They have been in existence a little over fifty years, and they number thousands of devotees. They are ascetic in their habits, monkish in the regulations of their order, and pledged equally against infidels and modernizing Mohammedans. They are ready to preach, or to trade, or to fight, but always with the one central object of propagating Islam. The ramifications of their work extend for thousands of miles, and in every direction from the northern seaboard to the Equator. There is a power in them that must be reckoned with in all judgments about Islam's future.

But when this advance of Islam is contrasted with the supposed slowness of Christian progress, a wider outlook must be had. Bosworth Smith, in his own captivating style, writes: "Leaping from oasis to oasis of the Great Desert [*i.e.* the Sahara] with almost the speed of its nomad horsemen, and subduing to its message, as it passed, even some of the wild and wandering Touariks, we know that before the year 1000 it had reached Timbuctoo."¹ That was within three hundred years of Akbar's springing his horse into the Atlantic in sorrow that his triumphant course was stopped by the sea. Yet at the end of another seven hundred years Mungo Park enters Timbuctoo, and up to this time there were pagan kingdoms not far away, whilst the country between the Senegal and Niger was in a transition state, and the advance of Mohammedanism there had all the signs of being recent.² In the

who frequently visited me for friendly conversation on the Koran and the Bible, and who when we said farewell assured me that he believed in Jesus, and gladly accepted an Arabic copy of the Scriptures. In Lagos also I have had intercourse with Mohammedans, have exchanged visits, have been welcomed at some of their schools, and on one occasion took a photograph of the pupils. Moreover, one of the principal Mohammedan merchants in Lagos is an annual subscriber to our funds."

¹ "Mohammed and Mohammedanism," p. 37. Barth, however, dates the founding of Timbuctoo at 1087 A.D. (vol. iv., p. 584).

² Park's first journey was, 1795-97, and his second in 1805. I shall quote as vol. i. the edition of 1800, in which his first travels were described, and as vol. ii. the edition of 1816, which has the journal of his second journey as far as Sansanding.

Countries he traversed "the religion of Mohammed has made, and continues to make, considerable progress; but in most of them, the body of the people, both free and enslaved, persevere in maintaining the blind but harmless superstitions of their ancestors, and are called by the Mohammedans *Kafirs*, or infidel."¹ In Sansanding, a town of 10,000 inhabitants, on the Niger, there was a regular beer-market where were "often exposed for sale from 80 to 100 calabashes of beer, each containing about two gallons."² If, therefore, it took seven hundred years for Islam to travel about as many miles, we are forced to infer, either that during those periods it was somewhat apathetic, or else that Africa is a hard nut to crack.

We are assured, however, that Christianity has "failed," because in three hundred years "no single African tribe as a tribe, and no leading African chief as a chief," has been converted on the West Coast.³ I reply that this ought to be regarded as a cause for gladness and thankfulness. In all Church history the faith of Jesus has prospered most where it has won its adherents by units and not by masses. In the light of this recollection there are many who view even more hopefully the few distinguished converts from Islam in the Punjab, than the multitudes of Tamils in Tinnevely. We rejoice greatly over both, but as earnest for the future Church of India it is possible there is more of real promise in the North-West. Other and less kindly writers declare that the Christianity of Sierra Leone is threatened. But is not the Christianity there of the second and third generation? And will it not be liable to such trials as assail us in England? We are not startled, nor do we shriek out that English Christianity is threatened when Mormon missionaries carry off, from London or Liverpool their converts to Utah. Besides, there is a condition of trial in Sierra Leone to which we are not exposed, owing to the great influx there of heathens as well as Mohammedans. The population of the colony has increased from about 41,000 in 1861 to over 60,000 in 1881. This is about twice the rate of increase of population in England and Wales, and indicates an immigration of at least 10,000 from outside. Now in 1861 there were 1,774 Mohammedans and 27,000 Christians. In 1881 there were 5,178 Mohammedans and 39,417 Christians.⁴ If, therefore, we exclude the immigrants, and gauge by normal growth of population, it will be seen that Christianity had made a gain by conversion of heathens of not far from twenty per cent. in the twenty

¹ Vol. i., p. 21, cap. ii.

² Vol. ii., p. 215.

³ *Nineteenth Century*, p. 808. Blyden, p. 25.

⁴ The figures for 1881 I have extracted from the Census Report; those for 1861 are from Livingstone, as copied by Bosworth Smith, p. 351.

years. The increase in the number of Mohammedans is due slightly to conversions from the heathen, but mainly to newcomers from without, whilst the conversions of nominal Christians to Islam have been few and seldom. An inspection of the race-table accompanying the census leads me to suspect that the Moslem gains, such as they may be, have been chiefly amongst the Timmanees. The state of affairs since 1881 up to the end of 1886 may be conjectured from the fact that the Church of England and Wesleyans unitedly were, a year ago, over 42,000, and if we add to these some 3,500 for the other denominations, assuming that they have remained stationary, we have some 46,000 Christians, or an increase of more than twelve per cent. in the five years.

These results must be considered as a complete reply to alarmist guesses, provided the quality of the results is as good as the number. But Vice-Consul Johnston steps out, and in the *Nineteenth Century* for November challenges the good repute of these West Coast native Christians. "Their religion is discredited by numbering among its adherents all the drunkards, liars, rogues, and unclean livers of the colony. In the oldest of our West African possessions, all the unrepentant Magdalenes of the chief city are professing Christians, and the most notorious one in the place would boast that she never missed going to church on a Communion Sunday." Such assertions as these are discredited by their wholesale nature, and tainted at the source. What are they but the gossip of steamer-decks, hotels, and factors' dinner-parties? Surely *all* the drunkards and *all* the sinners are not nominally Christians; the heathen must contribute their quota. One is driven, although most reluctantly, to speak a word about the general character of the white residents along the West Coast, since it is their common conversation which is thus retailed for the public at home. Captain Ellis, a man who is no believer in Missions or native Christians, writes,¹ "Ladies there are none," except very occasionally. "Society at Sierra Leone is in a very bad way; in fact, from an English point of view one may say that there is no society at all. The only Europeans in the place are the officers of the garrison, the colonial officials, and a few shopkeepers." "Most of the so-called merchants appear to have sprung from the lower strata of English life; many of them have black wives." "The retailing of scandal seems to be the principal occupation of the town society; and if we were to place implicit credence on the tales and gossip which abound, one could inevitably arrive at the conclusion that there was not an honourable man or a virtuous woman in the place."

¹ "The Land of the Fetish," pp. 152, 153; published in 1883.

Much in the same tenor is Winwood Reade's "Pastor's Daughter," a supposed sketch of Sierra Leone life.¹ I should not myself receive, without ominous discount, either the testimony of Captain Ellis or of Mr. Reade. The latter mingles fact with fiction, novelettes with narrative, in such a manner that a plain man may be excused for not always distinguishing which is fact and which is fiction. I have quoted them to show the ease with which classes of society, white or black, may be robbed of reputation, and the amount of scepticism with which such censure should be met. Small coteries are frequently scandal-mongers. I must, however, express my wish that we had in West Africa more of that noble element which has purified and honoured Anglo-Indian society.

If then Christianity has not "failed," we scarcely need seek for new methods of missionary endeavour. But when persons of Bosworth Smith's and Blyden's position and information, place their ideas distinctly and sincerely before us, we ought to be grateful, and are bound to canvas them. I will, therefore, go seriatim over the five obstacles to missionary success which they have enumerated.² First, "Christianity has come to the negro in a foreign garb." Blunt has the same sentiment in a passage which is worth introducing here:³ "The Christian missionary makes his way slowly in Africa. He has no true brotherhood to offer the negro except in another life. He makes no appeal to a present sense of dignity in the man he would convert. What Christian missionary takes a negress to wife, or sits with the negro wholly as an equal at meat? Their relations remain at best those of teacher with taught, master with servant, grown man with child. The Mohammedan missionary from Morocco, meanwhile, stands on a different footing. He says to the negro, 'Come up and sit beside me. Give me your daughter, and take mine. All who pronounce the formula of Islam are equal in this world and in the next.'" That is a caricature, but may contain useful lessons. If a missionary is ever tempted to lord it over the Negro, let him reflect on this. But is the Moor such a cosmopolitan individual? He would no doubt take the Negress to wife, but would he not hesitate about offering his daughter? The universal testimony about the Moors is, that they are unsurpassed for haughty contemptuous insolence. This complete mingling and fusion of classes has not taken place everywhere.⁴ There is none of it for instance at Sokoto, accord-

¹ "African Sketches," vol. ii., pp. 327-48.

² *Nineteenth Century*, pp. 808-12.

³ "Future of Islam," p. 26.

⁴ I observe that Blunt uses the small "n" for Negro, a common usage, of which Blyden (p. 11, note 12) complains as an indignity to the race.

ing to Joseph Thomson's evidence. Mungo Park came across no traces of it. In Andalusia, Syria, Bagdad, and Turkey, the aristocracy were feudal in their severity, and traced their descent to the first conquerors. If Negro missionaries are now propagating Islam, so are Negro missionaries proclaiming the Gospel. Give them time and the issues will be glorious. Blunt himself, on another page (*i.e.*, p. 128), has this, "The negro races will not only be Mohammedanized; they will also be Arabized." Is that not a "foreign garb"? Again, what Africa needs socially is to be elevated. This must be by a lever which has at first an external fulcrum. One of the Rev. James Johnson's touching pleas was for English ladies to go out and exhibit to his African sisters something of English domestic life, and habits, and home-thoughts. The process of Christianization may be the slower one, for the deeper the well and the longer the chain, or the higher the mountain and the further to climb, but it is best in the end. Besides, are we not making altogether too much of these secondary considerations? The power resides not in the agent or the agency, but in the Spirit of God. It is the Gospel itself which must soften the heart, and both at home and abroad we are constantly being taught, by what men account as surprises, that the battle is sometimes to the weak, and that the victory is not always to the strong.¹

"Secondly, Christianity came to the Negro, not as a development from within, but as a system from without. The white man's religion was a part of the white man's civilization." "From the lessons he every day receives, the Negro unconsciously imbibes the conviction that to be a good man he must be like the white man." Is not Dr. Blyden here drawing upon his American and West Indian experiences rather than upon his African? The story of "the lily-white hands," and of the "white man with blue eyes, rosy cheeks, and flaxen hair," whom the Negro wishes to be like in the future life, are stories not racy of the African soil; they possess a decidedly Yankee flavour. Although of negro blood, Dr. Blyden is American born, and his first associations were not African, nor does he write as would a man of his ability born and brought up in the country. It is highly honourable in him to have sympathized so profoundly and to have identified himself so thoroughly with his African kindred; and yet his

¹ I have a notion of my own that when there are more Moslem converts in India they might some of them be sent to Africa as missionaries. The other day two Arabic-speaking students from the American College at Beyrout offered themselves to the C.M.S. for mission work in East Africa. I hope they may be fit and able for that work. It is a happy omen.

sentiments are not African—at least that is my conviction, and I have, as best I might, studied and tried to understand African life and character. Nor do I believe that our having formerly participated in the slave-trade has during the present century been an impediment to our missions. It has left with us an hereditary arrogance, it may be, in our treatment of Negroes which has had to be got rid of. But slavery was so entirely built up in African custom that it did not seem to them the sin it is, and therefore they have not shared in the deserved indignation against us. That Sierra Leone has become as much Anglicized as it has, is I think a pity; and I fear it somewhat affects the mission on the Niger, but not to the extent nor in the way supposed. All missionary societies are agreed in this—Africans for Africa, and by patient waiting we shall obtain them.

“Thirdly, Christianity has hitherto come to the Negro weighted with the shortcomings and crimes of its professors.” This is mournfully true, and we abundantly deplore it; but it scarcely bends the balance in favour of the Mohammedans, as though he had been free from crimes and shortcomings. The bad white has been the curse of the heathen, and the aggrandisement of stronger governments has obliterated weaker races. This is not due either to missionaries or to Christianity. They have alleviated what has been the age-long struggle of the weak against the strong. The Mohammedan merchant is certainly not less exacting and unscrupulous than the Christian; the Mohammedan conqueror not less ferocious. This, however, rather belongs to the question of relative civilization, which I shall have to discuss presently under another head.

Fourthly, Christianity has hitherto “been offered chiefly to the least promising of the races,” and under “the least promising physical conditions,” and what we ought to do is to travel away from the malarious coast-line to the interior. With this I entirely agree; and believe that the blessing on the Uganda Mission attests it. Yet about this there are differing opinions. The late Bishop Fraser hardly ever presided at a missionary meeting without objecting to what he considered the way in which societies straggled away from their base of operations. I should myself like to see James Johnson consecrated Bishop, and sent to the heart of the land.

Lastly, “Christianity has with very few exceptions hitherto been offered to the Negro by the European missionary, not in its native simplicity.” I venture to think that the “very few exceptions” are just the other way.¹ All instructions to

¹ I dealt with this objection in the *C.M.S. Intelligencer* for last February, p. 80.

missionaries, to which I have listened, have insisted upon presenting the Gospel in its simplicity. Evangelicals have even been reproached for this. Nor do I perceive how missionaries could possibly do otherwise. Narrative must precede doctrine. The language in which teaching has to be conveyed has not at first abstract terms; these have to be formed in it. The missionary cannot at first do more than tell the story, whatever might be his personal predilections. If occasionally missionaries have made their instruction too abstruse, it has been through human infirmity and against the regulations of the Society which commissioned them.

Amid the ocean of rhetoric about Islam with which the press has lately been flooded, four points have emerged. Our opponents contend that: (1) Islam has been spreading; (2) with greater rapidity than Christianity; (3) Christian methods of missionary enterprise require remodelling; (4) this spread of Islam ought to be hailed as a boon. I have, I trust, frankly and straightforwardly examined all of these but the last. About this last, as I must be brief, I will, for Africa, quote the Rev. James Johnson, and for a general survey go to Palgrave's last book. The former writes¹:

If it is incorrect to say, as some have done, that Africa owes whatever civilization may be found in any part of it wholly to Mohammedanism—since very many large towns and cities and important tribes, wholly heathen, may be found amongst whom constitutional governments, laws regulating marriages, divorce, succession, etc., various native manufactures, large regular and active markets, etc., exist; *e.g.*, Dahomé, Ashantee, and Jebu, and the Okiti country in Yoruba, etc.—it is also wholly incorrect to say Mohammedanism has done no good whatever to Africa.

Mr. Palgrave says²:

That the adoption of Islam may be, and in fact is, a real benefit and an uplifting to savage tribes, amongst whom the lowest and most brutalizing forms of fetishism would else predominate, does not admit of a doubt. . . . But not less does experience show that, sooner or later, the tribe or the nation that casts in its lot with Islam is stricken as by a blight; its freshness, its plasticity disappear first, then its vigour, then its reparative and reproductive power, and it petrifies or perishes.

Of course all these valuations of Islam and its advantages are limited to the material and mental, and we may not forget that "man does not live by bread alone." I am sometimes inclined to doubt whether in anywise the condition of a people is raised higher by Mohammedanism than it would have been by Greek or Roman dominion. I have an intense appreciation of the worthy lives of many Moslem; I bow before the

¹ Letter to the *Record* newspaper, dated Sierra Leone, November 25th, and appearing on December 30th.

² "Ulysses," p. 153.

sublimity of many a sentence in the Koran ; I know that were there no truth in the system, it would have fallen to pieces long ago : but it is a serious reflection, and a riddle I confess myself incapable of determining, as to whether it had not been better for some tribes to have remained in their savagery till Christianity had reached them. It is just one of these inscrutable problems about which we may vainly speculate. Of this at least I am certain, that Mohammedanism has never so far been a preparation for Christianity ; and I have no confidence that unreformed Islam ever will be. Yet I have utmost faith that the pride of Islam will one day lie prostrate before the cross of Christ.

There is one race, the Mandingo, whose fate I can never contemplate without a sense of pain. They have been no gainers by being absorbed into Mohammedanism, unless we count the slight knowledge of letters they have acquired, and some increased trade. They were so near to European communications, and so soon would have been in contact with the better European influences, that had they been left alone, I believe long ere this they would have become Christian, and then what splendid missionaries they would have made ! To establish my opinion I go to Mungo Park. He was present at the transition, and he is an eminently impartial narrator of facts ; so much so that in his own day slave-traders and abolitionists each claimed him as on their side. And yet he was only thirty-four when he passed away along that then mysterious river Niger in his oddly joined canoe, with four surviving companions out of forty-four, and one of them a maniac from the hardships he had undergone.

Now even so candid and careful an author as Bosworth Smith speaks of these Mandingoes as already " a Mohammedan tribe,"¹ and proceeds to name as a specimen of their character the case of a lad murdered by the Moors. But not half the Mandingoes were Moslem, and this particular lad and his mother were heathen. The story is so touching and withal so characteristic that I reproduce it. The Moors had swept down upon Funingkey in a cattle-lifting raid. A young herdman threw his spear, and had in turn a shot which fractured both bones of his leg below the knee. Park, who was a surgeon, told them the only chance for him, even that a precarious one, was amputation of the limb. They were horrified at this novel surgery, and went off to some old Bushreens, *i.e.* Mussulmans. These endeavoured to secure the lad a passage into Paradise by whispering in his ear some Arabic sentences, and

¹ P. 45.

desiring him to repeat them. "After many unsuccessful attempts the poor heathen at last pronounced, *La illah el allah, Mahamet rasowl allahi*, and the disciples of the Prophet assured his mother that her son had given sufficient evidence of his faith, and would be happy in a future state. He died the same evening."¹ Now it was when this lad was carried home mortally wounded that the poor mother, wailing and frantically clapping her hands, kept crying out, "He never told a lie—no, never," and I observe that in the Sierra Leone Census the Mandingoes are still credited with veracity and with affection for their old people as distinguishing traits. According to Park they do not appear to have had much idolatry, except a worship of the new moon, and they believed in an invisible God, and in a future state. They were kindly hearted, and laudably inquisitive. They were very eager about any written thing; a man who persuaded Park to write a charm for him on a board, washed off the penmanship and drank the water.² When Islam brought them a certain kind of learning they were delighted with it. Yet they were, with rare and peculiarly brilliant exceptions, like the schoolmaster at Kamalia, in the wondering stage. Park's great friend Karfa Taura was as much pleased with an English Book of Common Prayer that had fallen into his hands as with the Arabic MSS. The Slatee, or slave merchant, on the Gambia, who offered Park an ass and sixteen bars of gold for Richardson's Arabic Grammar, must have entertained a superstitious regard for the Arabic characters, as he could not have comprehended the English text. About their women Park makes a striking remark:³ "They permit their wives to partake of all public diversions, and this indulgence is seldom abused; for though the negro women are cheerful and frank in their behaviour, they are by no means given to intrigue. I believe that instances of conjugal infidelity are not common." Now these

¹ Vol. i., p. 154, cap. viii.

² Vol. i., p. 351, cap. xviii.

³ Vol. i., p. 400, cap. xx. I cannot refrain from reproducing in a note another paragraph, at p. 469: "To me it was not so much the subject of wonder as matter of regret to observe that while the superstition of Mahomet has scattered a few faint beams of learning among these poor people, the precious light of Christianity is altogether excluded. I could not but lament that although the coast of Africa has now been known and frequented by the Europeans for more than two hundred years, yet the negroes still remain entire strangers to the doctrines of our holy religion." He speaks of our libraries being full of Arabic and Asiatic literature, and our parsimony in distributing to them religious truth. "The natives of Asia derive but little advantage in this respect from an intercourse with us; and even the poor Africans, whom we affect to consider as barbarians, look upon us, I fear, as little better than a race of formidable but ignorant heathen." This was written in the very year the C.M.S. was founded.

people smelted and wrought iron, washed gold, wove and dyed a pretty blue cloth, cultivating the cotton and indigo for it, made butter from the Shea-tree, grew Indian-corn, rice, and other plants, caught fish in cotton nets, and placed them in wicker-baskets, and dressed themselves much as the Moors did, save for the turban. Were they then much benefited by their change of religion ?

Having thus, in this and the former article, sketched the progress of Islam, and marked its quality, it remains for me to say that I believe we are witnessing the last expiring effort of that religion ; and I am led to this belief by the following amongst many considerations. First, its comparative inactivity from the fifteenth to the nineteenth centuries, and the changed political condition of the world to-day, since England and Russia hem in Persia, the neighbouring European nations close in Turkey, and neither empire is likely to burst these barriers ; France holds Algiers, Egypt and Morocco will be under the tutelage of European powers, whilst colonists and traders from England, Germany, France, Italy, and Belgium are attaching various other parts of Africa. Secondly, the vitality of Mohammedanism has always consisted in its faculty of absorbing and utilizing strenuous pagan races. It consecrates the Crescentade, and thus sets free and sanctions that lust for conquest which is essential to robust paganism. But this material is pretty well used up. Berbers, Turks, Mongols, Mandingoes have successively been adopted. Where is there a like race left ? The blank places upon our maps are very few. By a process of natural exhaustion Mohammedanism must soon be spent. It must then either enact the astounding reform of ceasing to be a political religion, or else it will commit suicide. If it commences a career of intellectual and moral reform, which it may do, and which some of its ardent well-wishers prophesy that it will do, what must be the final goal ? It must in that event be Christianity, for nothing else, nothing short of that, will satisfy the spiritual needs of humanity. "Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled." Are we to stand idly by and lend no helping hand towards this glorious consummation ?

WILLIAM JOSEPH SMITH.

January 5, 1888.



ART. IV.—CHURCH LIFE AT CAMBRIDGE.

THE University of Cambridge, like many other of our national institutions, has not escaped the reforming influences of modern times.

Some familiar features have disappeared, others have been modified, while, at the same time, new ones have been added. Many regret these changes; and perhaps, from an excessive spirit of loyalty to what *was*, are somewhat slow to acknowledge the permanent and distinctive value of that which *is*, and are apt to imagine that the time-honoured University has shifted hopelessly from her traditional moorings, and become utterly secularized. But this is not really so. In the words of Professor Westcott, from which the most faint-hearted may well take courage, "It would be mere affectation to pretend that nothing has been lost which belonged to the ideal fulness of our organization"—such as the widening of the range of reading, the abolition of religious tests,¹ and the excessive importance attached to the minutest results of particular examinations—"but it would be utter faithlessness not to acknowledge that enough is yet left at Cambridge to enable the University to exercise the authority of a true spiritual power, more widely and more beneficently than it has yet done." Regret is apt to make us blind, continues the Professor, and the keen sense of what is lost dulls the power of seeing what remains. Meanwhile the old landmarks, which have through many centuries given a distinct religious tone to the University, survive at the present day. The very Act of Parliament which abolished religious tests, describes its scope as being the extension of the benefits "of the Universities as places of religion and learning" to the whole nation "under proper safeguards for the maintenance of religious instruction and worship," distinctly recognising and ratifying all that is essential to the true religious character of the Universities; "the old epithets, hallowed by the memories of a thousand years, are solemnly rehearsed;" the College-chapel system, with its sanctifying influence, still remains; the preacher in the pulpit of Great St. Mary's—that great power for good in stimulating and directing the religious tendencies of the day—still, in the ancient bidding-prayer, speaks of the religious foundation of his own particular College; permanent and adequate provision exists, in the Theological Professorships and College Lectures, for imparting religious instruction to members of the Church of England; offices formerly restricted

¹ By which certain clerical fellowships were thrown open to others than members of the Church of England.

to persons in holy orders remain restricted as before; and "special dogmatic tests are retained for those graduates who desire to enter the theological faculty." It is felt that the extension of the University system is not an unmixed evil, but that "as the area from which students are drawn becomes wider, its influence will become more effective, and College tutors have heartily and unanimously combined to provide efficient public instruction in the subjects proposed for the Theological Tripos; while two Colleges—Trinity and Emmanuel—have appointed distinguished scholars without their own bodies to Theological Prælectorships." It is also a hopeful sign, and one that speaks much for the increased reality of the Theological Degrees, that they are sought in greater numbers by the clergy now than formerly.

The present position, therefore, may be best explained, perhaps, by stating that though the old monopoly has gone, the old and cherished *genius loci* remains. Henceforth, both the University and its several Colleges present a twofold character, individual and corporate. "So far as they are regarded in their individual members," says Dr. Westcott, "they have no standard of opinion; but as societies, they retain exactly the same religious character as they have had since the Reformation;" and experience has widely shown "that a distinct religious character in the body can be reconciled with complete personal liberty. The true safeguard lies in preserving intact the autonomy of the Colleges, which are already endowed with powers adequate for successful action; and as long as free scope is given for the exercise of these internal spontaneous forces, the highest work of the University will remain possible.

Religious life, or Mission work, is a subject, from its very nature, difficult at all times to handle, as it eludes, in its deeper and more interior sense, the ordinary tests of reality and success. It will readily be acknowledged that the difficulty is much increased when the largely shifting element of University life is remembered. We can but look at the outward material facts which lie around, and find in them the index of that inner religious feeling which has called them into existence.

Another reflection renders the inquiry of especial value. Unlike the sister University of Oxford, which, ever since the revival there of fifty years ago, has been prominently before the mind of the nation, no circumstance of like importance has forced the claims of Cambridge upon public attention. The spiritual and intellectual atmosphere of Cambridge has ever been of a quiet and retiring tone, as if she had caught her inspiration from worthy old George Herbert. But "still

waters run deep," and it is the object of the present paper to record the increasing flow of religious life in recent years—which has quickened beyond all expectation—reflecting in these restless and practical days the deep, earnest, quiet spirit of Charles Simeon, Henry Martyn, and others, accentuated, possibly, by contact with the practical activities of later times. Our subject divides itself into three sections:

I. Church Life at home, represented by the several "College Missions" in London.

II. Church Life abroad, represented mainly by the "Cambridge Mission to Delhi."

III. Church Life at Cambridge itself, represented by the recently erected "Henry Martyn Memorial Hall."

Such a triple development of the subject is necessary to its completeness.

I. The establishment of missions in the Metropolis, supported by individual Colleges, is a distinct recognition, on the part of the University, of that missionary spirit of Christianity, which is its very essence, as well as its due sense of the duty and privilege of imparting to others the spiritual blessings we ourselves enjoy.

At the present time, six such missions are in full working order. St. John's College led the way in 1884 by starting a mission in the parish of St. John's, Walworth. The original impulse, which has been quickly followed by other Colleges, was given by a sermon in St. John's College Chapel in Lent, 1883, by Mr. Allen Whitworth, one of the Fellows, at that time Vicar of St. John's, Hammersmith, but now Vicar of All Saints, Margaret Street. Clare followed in 1885 with a mission in All Saints, Rotherhithe; and Pembroke in All Saints, Newington Butts; Trinity, 1886, in St. George's, Camberwell; another mission to the needy parishes in the South of London was started by Corpus, in Christ Church, Camberwell, in 1887; while, more recently still, a further mission is being organised by Caius.

II. Closely allied with this branch of the subject, is the action of Cambridge in regard to foreign missions. They obtained its earnest sympathy fully ten years ago. In this case, the impetus was given by Professor Westcott, in a sermon preached in Advent, 1872, before the University of Cambridge, in which, while pleading for a special effort on the part of Cambridge for a mission to India, he made the following stirring appeal:

The conversion of Asia is the last and greatest problem which has been reserved for the Church of Christ. It is through India that the East can be approached. It is to England that the evangelizing of India has been entrusted by the providence of God. It is by the concentration

of all that is ripest in thought, of all that is wisest in counsel, of all that is intensest in devotion, of all that is purest in self-sacrifice, that the work must be achieved. Can we, then, fail to see what is required of us? Can we fail to recognise what we have to give? However unworthy I am to plead such a cause, I must speak of the fulness of my heart. I must ask, not less through the love which I bear to Cambridge, than through the sense which I have of the office of England, for your thoughts, for your offerings, for your prayers, in furtherance of such a plan as I have indicated.

How entirely such an appeal found an echo in the Christian conscience of Cambridge, let the story of the "Cambridge Mission to Delhi" answer. Four years later, in February, 1876, Dr. Westcott's words bore their first-fruits in two papers, read by the Rev. T. V. French (since then Bishop of Lahore), and the Rev. E. Bickersteth, now Bishop in Japan, before the "Cambridge University Church Society," and the "Cambridge Graduates' Mission Aid Society," respectively. In 1877, the scheme was consolidated, and, in connection with the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, Mr. Bickersteth, of Pembroke,¹ and Mr. Murray, now Vice-Principal of Wells Theological College, joined Mr. Winter, at Delhi. A succession of graduates, since that time, has never been wanting to maintain the work so auspiciously begun. Details of this work cannot, of course, be given here, but they can be found in the very interesting Annual Reports of the Mission, supplied by the home committee.

In recording this latest enterprise on the part of Cambridge as a corporate act in regard to foreign missions, representing the entire University, we are not unmindful of the share she took in the year 1861, when the "Universities' Mission to Central Africa" was taken in hand as a permanent memorial to Bishop Mackenzie. No words can place in too strong a light the heroic devotion of those who have so successfully carried on this noble work in the face of a deadly climate. As one after another have succumbed to its fatal influence, others have fearlessly stepped into their place. Indeed, the history of these two missions has a very distinct and lasting value, as indicating the latest and most intellectual offering on the part of Cambridge University to the great cause of Christianity. They are efforts, voluntarily made, which must have an abiding effect on succeeding generations, as well as a present benefit, when they read how Cambridge gave the best of her sons to the best of all work.

III. The erection of the "Henry Martyn Memorial Hall," quite recently opened, is, perhaps, the most direct witness to the reality of the religious life in Cambridge itself at the present day, and may well claim to be the most important addition

¹ Now Bishop of Japan.

to the institutions within the University for many years. It is not only a memorial to the departed, and an evidence of the veneration in which Henry Martyn is held—showing, by the way, how the influence of a good and holy worker for God lives long after him—but it is also a proof that his spirit still survives and largely dominates the religious atmosphere of Cambridge at the present time. It seems like the embodiment of the devotional instincts of the University, focusing, as it were, its manifold spiritual agencies to a common centre.

The scheme originated with the Rev. John Barton, Vicar of Holy Trinity, who took advantage of the centenary of Henry Martyn's birth, six years ago, to propose the erection of a Hall in Cambridge, which should serve the double purpose of perpetuating the memory of his saintly life, and, at the same time, afford a local habitation for the meetings of the University Church Missionary Union and the numerous other religious societies which have greatly increased of late, both in numbers and influence. Such a proposal, offering such practical advantages, met at once with the hearty support it deserved. A difficulty was at first experienced in procuring a suitable site; but an excellent one was eventually secured, very appropriately adjoining Holy Trinity Church. The cost of the site alone was £2,960; but the committee—which included eight Bishops, besides the Archbishop of Canterbury, two Deans, several Heads of Colleges, all the Divinity Professors, and many other distinguished Cambridge men—feeling "that, for the purpose they had in view, a central position and a good frontage were indispensable," the property was purchased, so that the undertaking should, in every way, be worthy of its object. About £4,000 more have been required for the building itself, of which all has been collected, except the small sum of £350. The Hall is situated in Market Street, and includes a spacious Gothic hall capable of seating 175 persons, with committee-rooms attached, besides a library and quarters for a custodian. The lower story will, for the present, be rented as a shop, the "rental of which will, it is hoped, more than cover the interest on the mortgage, and leave a surplus to form a sinking-fund."

There can be no doubt "that it is far easier now than it was a few years ago for a man to make the most outward profession of religion, without its being regarded (by almost any set) as at all remarkable." Of this important sign of religious progress, the "Henry Martyn Memorial Hall" is a standing witness.

Some earnest words of the Rev. J. Barton are very much to the same effect. He says:

These are days, the Lord be praised for it, in which meetings of

undergraduates for prayer, Bible study, and religious or missionary addresses, are not only possible, but matters of everyday occurrence; the Church Missionary Union, the Church Society, the University Daily Prayer Meeting, the Inter-University Christian Union, the University District Visiting Society, the Jesus Lane Sunday-school Teachers' Association, all have their regular meetings, some daily, some weekly or fortnightly, or at least frequent intervals, but all numerous attended.

Some reference to these various societies, naturally very brief, may appropriately close this section of our subject.

(a) Jesus Lane Sunday-school Teachers' Association was founded in 1827, by some undergraduates of Queen's College, and has now a widespread and important organization. In 1877, as a Jubilee memorial, "The Albert Institute" was built, as a youth's club; it has now 200 members. In 1867 a branch of the school was opened for the choristers of the various College chapels; about 120 boys now attend. Of late years, also, gatherings for the elder choristers, numbering about 50, have been held on Sunday evenings. Total number of teachers, 100; of children, 550. There is a terminal prayer-meeting, and also a terminal celebration of the Holy Communion in St. Benet's Church.

(b) Cambridge University District Visiting Society, founded 1833, has drawn together a number of men, who, under the general superintendence of the clergy, work systematically in the parishes of St. Giles, St. Matthew, and Holy Trinity.

(c) Cambridge University Prayer Union, founded 1848, with a membership of 68; it has risen in 1887 to 1,575. Its object is combined intercession and thanksgiving, subjects for which are circulated in quarterly papers. The subjects have included—the Church Universal; the University and Colleges of Cambridge; the C.U. Prayer-Union and kindred Unions; the Church at home; the Church abroad; the Extension and Success of the Christian Church; Religious Education.

(d) Cambridge University Church Missionary Union, founded 1858, in connection with the C.M.S., to promote increased interest in missions, and intercession on behalf of them. There are weekly meetings in term time, consisting of prayer, and an address by some invited speaker, on some special missionary subject; also an annual service of intercession for Foreign Missions on the eve of St. Andrew.

(e) Cambridge University Church Society has for its object the promotion of a spirit of sympathy among all communicant members of the Church of England. Professor Westcott reminded the Church Congress at Leeds, in 1872, how he had seen, within the last two years, "a large body of the younger men among us, including many of the highest University distinctions, unite themselves in a society on the basis of communion with the Church of England, with the twofold

object, to quote their own words, of 'increasing the number of devoted and duly prepared workers in the cause of Christ, both clerical and lay, who go forth from the University,' and 'of promoting unity within the Church of England, to the extent of their opportunities.' The means by which this is sought to be accomplished, include (i.) weekly devotional meetings, with an address; (ii.) fortnightly meetings, when a paper is read on some subject connected with theological thought, or practical Christian work. Recent papers have comprised the following subjects: (a) The Unity of Christendom; (β) Apostolical Succession; (γ) Our several Christianities. (iii.) A terminal service, with a sermon by a special preacher; (iv.) an annual celebration of the Holy Communion.

Other meetings of a less formal but no less real kind are of such frequent occurrence, that it must suffice merely to mention them categorically.

(f) *Bible and Prayer Meetings* are held in almost every College; *Evangelistic Services* are held on Sunday evenings by undergraduates for undergraduates in the Alexandra Hall, which have a wide influence and attract great numbers; *Sunday Evening Essay Society*, at Trinity, Jesus, and Pembroke Colleges, including Nonconformists and Romanists, which illustrates the sympathetic spirit of Cambridge at the present time; *Social Purity Society*; *Church of England Temperance Society*; *The Confraternity of the Holy Trinity*, founded in 1857 by the late Mr. George Williams, to combine the study of Divinity with some practical work of a religious or charitable nature—work among fallen women, tramps, coprolite diggers, and the like.

Among other hopeful signs may be named, an increase of early celebrations of Holy Communion in the College chapels—with a weekly service of preparation, usually on Friday—and choral services; prayer-meetings for medical students in the interval between the hours at which the dissecting-room is open; and the fact that many athletic men are zealous Christians, and that numbers of "Blues" have entered at Ridley Hall.

While these things are so—while young men are found, as they are found, to unite for religious and devotional work of such varied character, to deepen their own spiritual life, to confess Christ, not of ostentation, but of set purpose, humbly yet openly before their fellows, and to work for His Church—there is no need to fear that the old religious spirit of Cambridge will fail.

A brief reference to what may be termed University action in the direction of the subject of this paper, must bring it to a close. Selwyn College, opened 1882; Ridley Hall, opened

1881; the Clergy Training School, opened 1881—all three designed for distinctly religious purposes; the inauguration of the Preliminary Theological Examination, preparatory to ordination; the recent Lectures on Church Doctrine in Great St. Mary's; the founding of Ely Theological College; the new Divinity Schools (1879)—all point in the same direction.

This paper cannot be more fittingly closed than in the words of Professor Westcott—taken from his “Religious Office of the Universities,” already quoted at the commencement:—

And, to rise to the highest region of life and thought, no student of theology who has been allowed to work at Cambridge, in these later days, will refuse to acknowledge, with gratitude, the increasing opportunities which are afforded there, for realizing the power of that final synthesis of thought and experience and faith which is slowly unfolded through the ages, and yet summed up for us for ever, in the facts of our historic creed.

And in a letter to the present writer, the same author says, referring to the above-mentioned work: “Every hope which I expressed in it, has been, I think I may say, even more than realized in the fourteen or fifteen years which have passed since the papers were written.”

DONALD J. MACKEY.



ART. V.—RECENT ATTACKS ON THE MOABITE STONE.

THE story of the discovery of the Moabite Stone has often been told, but it will bear repeating.

In the summer of 1868 the Rev. F. A. Klein, then a missionary at Jerusalem, made an expedition through the district on the eastern side of the Jordan. He passed through Gilead, and continuing his journey southward, crossed the Jabbok and entered the land of Moab. The wild, lawless character of the natives makes a tour in that land dangerous, and Mr. Klein therefore took with him a native chief, named Zattam, who acted as guide and protector. The party met with no opposition from the tribes through which they passed, and on August 19 arrived at an encampment of the Beni Hamîdé, about three miles north of the river Arnon. The roving Arabs had spread their tents about ten minutes' walk from the ruins of Dhibân, the ancient Dibon of the Bible, and in a friendly way received Zattam and his friends.

Carpets and cushions were spread in the tents of the shiekh, and coffee was prepared with all the ceremonial of Bedouin etiquette. Before the

operation of preparing and drinking coffee had terminated, my friend Zattam, who was always most anxious to make my tour as pleasant as possible, had informed me that there was among the ruins of Dhibân, scarcely ten minutes' walk from our encampment, a most interesting stone, with an ancient inscription on it which no one had ever been able to decipher, which he would take me to see. As sunset was drawing near I was anxious to be off at once, but Zattam was not to be persuaded to get up from his soft couch, and leave off smoking his narghileh, while I was burning with a desire to see the inscription, which the shiekh of the Beni Hamîdé also described to me as one of the wonders of the region which no Frank had yet seen, and which he now offered to show me as a mark of honour to his friend Zattam, and to me, who was travelling under his protection. I of course took this for what it was in general meant to be, a Bedouin compliment calculated to bring out a nice bakshish. Still, I afterwards ascertained that his assertion as to no European before me having seen the stone was perfectly true: none of the distinguished travellers in those parts had ever seen or heard of it, or they would not have shunned trouble and expense to secure this treasure. I am sorry to find that I was also the last European who had the privilege of seeing this monument of Hebrew antiquity in its perfect state of preservation. When I came to the spot where this precious relic of antiquity was lying on the ground, I was delighted at the sight; and at the same time greatly vexed that I had not come earlier, in order to have an opportunity of copying at least a good part of the inscription, which I might then, under the protection of Zattam, have done without the least molestation. I, however, had time enough to examine the stone and its inscription at leisure, and to copy a few words from several lines at random, chiefly with a view, on my return to Jerusalem, to ascertain the language of the inscription, and prevail on some friends of science to obtain either a complete copy of the inscription, or better, the monument itself. The stone was lying among the ruins of Dhibân perfectly free and exposed to view, the inscription uppermost. I got four men to turn it round (it was exceedingly heavy) in order to ascertain whether there was any inscription on the other side, and found that it was perfectly smooth, and without any inscription or other marks. What time was left me before sunset, I now employed in examining, measuring, and making a correct sketch of the stone, besides endeavouring to collect a perfect alphabet from the inscription. What I have I now enclose, and vouch for the perfect correctness of what I give, having taken it down on the spot.

At that time a young Frenchman, named M. Clermont Ganneau, was official interpreter to the French consulate at Jerusalem. He was an enthusiast in oriental literature, and on hearing of the discovery of this ancient relic, eagerly sought to purchase it. With considerable difficulty he obtained a squeeze, which unfortunately was torn into seven tattered fragments. For nearly a year negotiations were carried on for the purchase of the stone, but the Arabs kept raising the price of it, until the sum ultimately demanded was quite exorbitant. At length an application was made to the Turkish Government, requesting that the Arabs should be compelled to deliver it up for a reasonable sum. On hearing that the Modir of Ramoth-Gilead, acting on the authority of the Government, was about to compel them to give up the stone, the Beni Hamîdé were filled with indignation, and lashed

themselves into a paroxysm of fury. Accordingly they assembled amid the ruins of Dhibân, kindled a bonfire around the precious relic, and heaved great stones upon it, so that this ancient Hebrew relic was smashed into a hundred fragments. Thus did the wild sons of the Desert bring about the lamentable destruction of the monument, and it appeared as if the triumphal pillar of the land of Moab was for ever lost to the world. Two large fragments, equal to about half the stone, and twelve small pieces were afterwards purchased by M. Ganneau, while eighteen fragments obtained by Captain, now Sir Charles, Warren, were generously sent to the scholarly Frenchman. By means of these, and a squeeze of the whole stone before its destruction, M. Clermont Ganneau was enabled to make a restoration of the inscription. He executed his work with great ability in a careful, conscientious manner; and the monument, skilfully fitted together, was ultimately deposited in the Louvre, Paris, where it may now be seen. The inscription consists of thirty-four lines written in the ancient Phœnician characters, and has proved to be an inscription of the highest interest. From it we learn that the monument was set up by Mesha, the warrior-king whose bloody campaign is recorded in the Second Book of Kings. It records his struggles and victories in his campaigns against Omri and Ahab, kings of Israel, for the independence of his country. The monument therefore carries us back almost to the time when David, the poet-king, wrote his psalms, and when Solomon erected on Moriah his magnificent temple. The inscription was probably carved about 900 B.C., and therefore leads our thoughts to the days of Omri and Ahab, Jehoram and Jehoshaphat, Elijah and Elisha. In the domain of Hebrew antiquities there exists no monument of greater interest than this patriarchal stone of the land of Moab.

During the nineteen years that have intervened since its discovery, the inscription has been studied by the highest Semitic scholars of England, France, and Germany; and it may safely be said that the genuineness and authenticity of the monument have been confirmed and established beyond all reasonable doubt by the unanimous verdict of Oriental savants. The great importance of the inscription and the unexpected discovery of the monument have, as a matter of course, called forth some hostile criticism. It is desirable in the interests of truth to give expression to honest doubts, and thus permit valid objections to be carefully weighed. Doubts have been cast upon the high antiquity of the inscription, and anomalies, real or imaginary, have been pointed out in the inscription; but the genuineness of the monument has not

been seriously impugned, and it has firmly stood the test of criticism. Two hostile attacks may be noted.

In 1879, ten years after the discovery, Mr. S. Sharpe, well known as an ardent Egyptologist, published a small pamphlet under the title "An Inquiry into the Age of the Moabite Stone," in which he tried to prove that the text of the inscription might have been carved in the third century of our era by order of a Palmyrenian prefect of the land of Moab, named Maeonius. The inquiry displayed both learning and originality; but it was only regarded as a pretty theory of an enthusiast, and was never seriously discussed by either the public or the press. A somewhat severe attack, claiming greater attention, appeared in April, 1887, in the *Scottish Review*, under the title of "The Apocryphal Character of the Moabite Stone." This was written by the Rev. Albert Löwy, the secretary to the Anglo-Jewish Association, who contends that the Moabite stone is a skilfully executed fabrication made a few years ago, and being only a "stone of stumbling" ought to be consigned to the limbo of marvellous impositions. The very severity of the attack weakens its power; and the dogmatic tone of the article indicated to thoughtful men that Mr. Löwy was not a safe guide in the domain of literary criticism. His assertions were utterly opposed to the calm verdict of the most qualified savants; and seekers after truth are disposed to ask with M. Ganneau, "Has Mr. Löwy any good reason to bring forward? Has he discovered some unheeded fact which may be considered as a proof, or even the beginning of a proof? Not at all."

In 1876 the notorious Shapira imposed upon the German Government, and obtained a high price for some forged Moabite pottery. Again, in 1885, he endeavoured to impose upon the authorities of the British Museum, and offered for sale an ancient synagogue-roll, containing, in old Phœnician characters the book of Deuteronomy. This, also, turned out to be a fraudulent fabrication. These deceptions caused a cloud of suspicion to rest upon genuine antiquities, and a superficial scepticism confounded the false and the true. The tares had been mistaken for wheat, and by an easy transition the wheat is suspected of being tares. Suffering from the influence of some such hallucination of scepticism, Mr. Löwy declares the inscription of Mesha to be the work of a forger, who took possession of a dressed block of stone left in the land of Moab from the time of the Romans, and carved upon it an inscription after the style and phraseology of the inscription on the celebrated sarcophagus of King Eshmunazar. The main proof of the forgery is, in his own words: "Whilst the surface of the stone is pitted and indented in consequence of exposure to

varying influences, extending perhaps over thousands of years, the characters inscribed on the stone have in no instance suffered from similar influences, because the dressed surface is ancient, whereas the inscription is modern." This bold assertion turns out to be utterly erroneous; and M. Ganneau expresses the conviction of all qualified savants who have examined the monument when he writes: "The characters are contemporary with the dressed surface upon which they are engraved; if they are modern, it is also modern." This being the case, it follows that Mr. Löwy's fragile superstructure, built as it is upon a sinking foundation, falls to the ground. To discuss the groundless objections of the attack is beyond the scope of the present article; but it may be well to state that this has been done, and ably done, by M. Halévy, in the *Avril-Juin*, 1887, number of the *Revue des Etudes Juives*.

The attack has utterly failed, and even the scholars, such as Professors Kautzsch¹ and Oppert, whom he mentioned as sharing his suspicions, have somewhat indignantly rejected his theory and expressed their firm conviction in the genuine antiquity of the monument. Even had Mr. Löwy succeeded in establishing his objections, drawn, as he asserts, from internal and external evidence, there remains still an inner wall of defence within which Mesha's epigraph remains in safety, and although he makes no allusion to this stronghold, yet it is manifest that until it was demolished, the genuineness of the monument could not be overthrown.² This inner defence

¹ Professor E. Kautzsch, writing from Tübingen on July 4, 1887, says: "In the *Academy* of June 25, p. 454, Dr. A. Löwy quotes an old publication of mine, dating from the year 1876, in which I held the view that the genuineness of the Mesa stone was not yet absolutely established beyond all doubts. How one at that time, in the middle of the ardent disputes about the well-known Moabite forgeries, could have been induced to express such an opinion, everyone who retains a remembrance of these disputes will easily understand. Dr. Löwy, however, in quoting me, has overlooked the fact that I soon after expressly retracted my doubts when I had seen a fragment of the stone at Dr. Niemeyer's in Jerusalem. Besides that, I have repeatedly stated my present views about this question in the several editions of Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar published by me (22nd-24th editions). Professor Socin, therefore, was quite right in pointing out our agreement on this question. To me, also, it appears perfectly unnecessary once more to enter, even with a single word, into a renewed discussion of the question of the authenticity of the stone."

² M. Halévy writes: "One notices that the arguments of M. Löwy are almost entirely of a linguistic order, which have their importance as additional proofs, but which vanish almost entirely in the presence of palæographical considerations, which surpass all others. Now the palæography has been entirely forgotten by M. Löwy. He has not even given himself the trouble to tell us from what Phœnician monument the forger could have borrowed the archaic characters in which the inscription

is the substantive evidence of palæography, which primarily is conversant with letters and the changes they undergo. As in architecture the date of a building can be determined by the character of the mouldings, inasmuch as there is a regular progression in the development of architectural details, so the date of an inscription in Phœnician characters can be approximately determined by the shape of the letters. The Tyrian Epoch of Phœnician writing dates from 1000 B.C. till 700 B.C., and the letters on monuments of this age have a certain distinctive form. The epigraphs on the "Baal Lebanon Bowls," Moabite Stone, and the Bronze Lions of Nineveh, belong to this early era. The Transitional Period extends from 700 B.C. till 600 B.C., and during this period many of the letters changed considerably their form. To this type and date belong the Siloam inscription.

The Sidonian Epoch dates from 600 B.C. until the Christian Era; and to this age belong the inscription on the sarcophagus of Eshmunazar, as well as that on the recently discovered tomb of King Tabnit (CHURCHMAN, December, 1887). It was impossible that the letters on the tomb of Eshmunazar could have served as a model for Mesha's inscription; for palæography, apart from the subject matter, indicates that the former dates from about 400 B.C., while the latter dates from about 900 B.C. This chronology is confirmed by Phœnician inscriptions discovered a few years ago. The Siloam inscription discovered in 1880, dating from the seventh century before Christ, shows that the Moabite Stone belongs to an earlier period; while the Baal Lebanon bowls discovered in 1872 indicate that Mesha's inscription cannot date as far back as a thousand years before Christ.

The testimony of the leading Semitic scholars during the last few months, as we have said, turns in one direction. M. Renan, Professor J. Euling, M. Halévy, Professors Socin and Kautzsch, M. Oppert, and M. Clermont Ganneau, are all in agreement. Such a consensus of opinion among the most qualified savants places the genuineness and high antiquity of the Moabite Stone beyond all reasonable doubt; and shows, moreover, the groundless assertions of recent hostile criticism. Mesha's monument, cleared of the doubts that surrounded it, now rises from the mists of antiquity, and, hoary with the age of about thirty centuries, like a venerable prophet of ancient days, brightens our hopes and strengthens our faith.

JAMES KING.

has been engraved, doubtless with the object of extolling the value of his statement of the case."

Correspondence.

BIRKS AND ELLIOTT ON PROPHECY.

To the Editor of the CHURCHMAN.

SIR,—My father would have been extremely sorry that any difference between himself and Mr. Elliott should have been adduced, as it is by Mr. Garbett [review of Mr. Guinness's "Romanism and the Reformation"] in your December number, as a proof of such dissension among historical interpreters as might warrant a general distrust of their principles of interpretation.

Those who wish to know how far the *rapprochement* to Mr. Elliott, which my father admitted, had at one time extended, may consult my father's "Outlines of Unfulfilled Prophecy" (published in 1854, *i.e.*, six years after his "Mystery of Providence," and two years after the 8th edition of my grandfather Bickersteth's "Practical Guide," but eight years before the 5th edition of the "Horæ Apocalypticæ"), and may turn to pp. 257-260, where they will find my father entertaining Mr. Elliott's view of the vision of the 6th seal as referring to the overthrow of heathendom in time of Constantine.

At first, and at the last, my father's views were somewhat widely different from Mr. Elliott's; but to say that they differed from first to last completely is to make an assertion in direct contradiction to Mr. Elliott, and not directly warranted by my father. Such an assertion should not be made the occasion of distrusting both my father and Mr. Elliott on points on which they certainly were both, from first to last, at one.

That the Book of Daniel is authentic, and that the five visions there each and all reach from the Seer's own time to the end of the world, and that of the Apocalypse the like is true; that the ten-horned beast both in Daniel and the Apocalypse denotes the Roman Empire, and that the little horn of it in Daniel denotes the Papacy; and again, that a day *may* symbolize a year—a point that might be proved even by one scriptural instance; that "a time, times and half a time" will be equivalent to 1260 year-days, or to 42 "months" of years, if a time denote a period of 360 years: these are points on which the Protestant historic school agree. No differences between my father and Mr. Elliott affected their agreement in these fundamental principles.

To enrich the historic scheme by the adoption into it, where this is possible, of elements of truth from other systems, is not the same thing quite as to disparage it and them as alike dubious and uncertain.

One word more. Only those who perceive the Papacy to be both blasphemous and cruel *can* recognise the Papacy as that which is predicted in the prophecy as a blasphemous and cruel thing. Only for such, therefore, if the Papacy be the thing intended, can the teaching of the prophecy respecting it be meant; and it must be meant to teach them something more than what its teaching presupposes that they already know. This further teaching is not therefore superfluous. But those who do not see the Papacy to be blasphemous and cruel may yet have much piety and a good deal of learning, though statements of fact that lack novelty to Mr. Garbett might be quite new to them.

Yours faithfully,
E. B. BIRKS.

Trinity College, Cambridge,
January, 1888.

Reviews.

The Growth of Church Institutions. By the Rev. EDWIN HATCH, D.D.
Hodder and Stoughton.

THIS work is described by its author as "designed less for scholars than for general readers who are interested in theological subjects." It is, however, rather ecclesiastical than theological in the proper sense of the word, for its contents altogether concern not the truths of which the Church is a witness and a keeper, but the institutions by the agency of which she has striven to acquit herself of her commission. The work is, in fact, a series of historical sketches which profess to indicate the origin, and do propound theories about the development, of the outward machinery of Church government and administration, and deal also with Church property, its tenure and acquisition. The chapters have no very close cohesion. They resemble rather a series of papers put together for some periodical of the more serious order, and now collected and revised. Or are they choice extracts from lectures delivered by the author as "Reader in Ecclesiastical History" at Oxford? Dr. Hatch possesses an admirable style. He is always perspicuous and lively—the reader is never tired or puzzled; and the choice of themes is certainly one that will recommend the book to general perusal. Historical Chapters on the Diocese, the Bishop, the Parish, National Churches, and so on, are not likely to want readers, especially when so ably and cleverly penned as are these. Dr. Hatch, too, has chosen his field well chronologically, for he has undertaken to give us light upon a period that certainly very much needs it—so far, at any rate, as the general reader is concerned. He deals specially with the centuries which lie "between the fall of the Roman Empire and the political settlement of mediæval Europe."

At the same time, this limitation of his field gives opportunity, as we are constrained to think, for the practice, as regards some matters at least, of that very fallacy which so seriously impairs the same author's general argument in his very ingenious "Bampton Lectures." That argument undertook to set forth the organization of the early Christian Churches, and propounded some novel notions as to the origin and functions of primitive Church officers, specially the Bishop. But Dr. Hatch opened the course by pointedly disclaiming any reference to the New Testament. We do not deny, of course, that a writer is at liberty to determine for himself the limits of any subject with which he proposes to deal. But, on the other hand, the critic is no less at liberty—indeed, is bound—to point out when strange and startling conclusions are reached that the advocate only makes out his case for them by pointedly refusing to look at an important portion of the evidence. To us it seems absurd to discuss the organization of the early Christian Church, and to disregard altogether the Book of Acts, in which the first and the leading historical data are contained, and the Pastoral Epistles, in which St. Paul lays down with an authority which determined the future basis and the lines on which later organizations assuredly assumed to proceed. Would it be really possible for any intelligent man who accepts the Epistles to Timothy and Titus as St. Paul's to maintain, as Dr. Hatch appears to do, that the primitive Bishop was primarily, if not solely, a financial and eleemosynary functionary—a sort of ecclesiastical relieving-officer? Does the *Didaché*, which has some important things to say about the Bishop, lend any colour to such an idea? Early Church history has been aptly said to pass through a tunnel. There is light, much light, at the further end, where the

Apostolic writings illuminate the very outset of the Church's career. There is light, again, at the close of the second century, when the Fathers and the historians come forward to illustrate matters for us. Between the two epochs lies a space in which only casual and doubtful glimpses are afforded, as of the objects which one passes in traversing a tunnel. Now, Dr. Hatch, when he takes in hand to disclose what is to be found within this obscure interval, begins by sedulously and completely shutting out all the light and help to be obtained from the remoter end, and we feel accordingly utterly distrustful as to his accuracy of discernment about those things which he describes to us.

The present series of sketches follows very much the same line of subjects as that along which Dr. Hatch travelled in the "Bampton Lectures," and it is up and down affected, if not throughout pervaded, by the same fallacy. The writer starts with the fall of the Roman Empire, and is to be our guide in studying the subsequent development of Church institutions. Yes, but they did not originate at the fall of the empire; they were even then some centuries old, and their after-growth was certainly continuous with their origin and their earliest progress. But Dr. Hatch seems to cut arbitrarily in at a certain date—we cannot say at a certain fixed stage—and turns his back altogether upon the preceding history, although really the after-development was very largely conditioned and regulated by what had passed in the earlier processes.

This fact has always to be borne in mind throughout the book; and we are convinced that many statements, suggestions, opinions presented in these pages could only possess even a colour of probability or verisimilitude to one who looks at them as Dr. Hatch dexterously puts them, not in the light which their earliest records afford, but in that only thrown by the witnesses which it pleases him to interrogate for the purposes of his argument.

Then, again, we notice throughout the book many very broad generalizations which appear to be based on an extremely imperfect induction of facts. Dr. Hatch makes some rather large and unqualified assertions—say, to take an example almost at hazard, about the establishment of the Metropolitan organization, which he attributes mainly to Charlemagne, and then quotes at the foot of the page one or two authorities belonging to some one century or country, as though they proved the statement set down in the text about the Western Churches altogether. Now, the principal work of organizing the Western Church and its dioceses under Metropolitans has been usually assigned to Boniface, backed actively by the Pope, two generations or nearly so prior to Charlemagne's great Council at Frankfort in 794; and, indeed, was itself nothing else but a revival of a system which was in vigour in the fifth century, but had been brought low by the subversion of the Roman power. Still, if Dr. Hatch can show that this Church "institution" was mainly indebted to the strong hand of the Frankish conqueror, and was principally an arrangement effected by the secular power, so be it. All we say is that Dr. Hatch asserts it here and does not prove it. Altogether, we demur to the habit he has of quoting some local Canon, Constitution, Capitulum, or what not, and then drawing some inference which is presented as though it held true of the whole Western Church. In truth, the various Churches of the West—those of Italy, Spain, Gaul, Germany, Britain—were, during the period of which Dr. Hatch professes to treat, in very various and ever-varying degrees of development, and had institutions differing greatly from each other. The times were often times of confusion and disorder. There were gains and losses—periods of growth and of decline; and nothing can be more hazardous than to argue from some enactment or record belonging to one date and country to the Churches of the West generally. In the times later than those with which Dr. Hatch

deals an approximation to uniformity was doubtless effected under the Papal tyranny. It might not be unfair in the fourteenth century to reason as regards ecclesiastical institutions from what is shown to hold about one European country, to the state of things in another European country about which less is actually recorded. But such a process is most unsafe as regards the centuries here in question.

Dr. Hatch's witnesses, then, are those who can have seen and known but some passing aspects of Church life in parts or corners of Christendom. But further, we are not always satisfied that he construes correctly the evidence which they do give. Take, *e.g.*, what is said in the chapter upon "National Churches" about the share of laymen in the ecclesiastical synods. Dr. Hatch tells us broadly that these synods consisted of laity as well as clergy, and that they took cognizance of ecclesiastical and doctrinal affairs as well of secular affairs. In a word, we are given to understand that the "nobles and officers of the palace," and such as they, sat co-ordinately with the archbishops and bishops, the king or emperor oftentimes presiding also, and determined dogmatical controversies together with the clergy just in the same way and with the same vote, voice, and authority. Now it may be a very proper question to raise and discuss whether the laity ought to have equal vote and voice with the spirituality in a National or Provincial Synod. This is not the place to enter upon such a discussion. But as regards the centuries which Dr. Hatch passes in review, it is certain that the laity exercised no such powers. Is there not, indeed, something rather like an anachronism in supposing—the instance is Dr. Hatch's own—the Carolingian counts discussing the subtleties of Adoptionism? The English Church has laymen who are perhaps as learned in theology as are their reverend brethren. Lord Selborne, we do not doubt, would be as well qualified personally to give an opinion about a controversy of faith as almost any one of our bishops. But we should not look for much guidance about such matters from a Frankish noble of the eighth century. The lay members present at Frankfort undoubtedly accepted what the three hundred bishops defined, and signed the decrees and canons only as assenting. Dr. Hatch refers to several of the long list of Councils of Toledo. But he ignores what the very records of those councils themselves again and again make clear: that the synod was regarded as consisting of the ecclesiastics present, and that the laymen were sometimes, perhaps always, simply *viri illustres* who were invited to attend, and only signed by way of intimating their acceptance of canons to the drawing up of which they had certainly contributed nothing whatever. This appears constantly in the acts of the councils themselves. The signatures are sometimes those of bishops or their deputies only; when the laymen sign also, a different formula is used by them. The bishop writes (*e.g.*), "Ego subscripsi" or "definiens subscripsi;" the layman, "Ego annuens" or "consentiens subscripsi." How Dr. Hatch came to ignore plain facts like these, which appear on the face of the records of these councils, we cannot even surmise. He has overlooked a distinction which Bishop Bilson long ago pointed out. "To be present in synod is one thing: to deliberate and determine in synod is another thing." In a word, we do not believe that during the centuries in question there can be demonstrated to be any clear instance in which lay members sat co-ordinately in Church Synods with the clerical ones, or gave conclusive and determining votes about spiritual or doctrinal questions. It is quite true that there are abundant instances of "*mixta concilia*" in which bishops and laymen sat together, and that these, as Dr. Hatch points out, furnish the lines which our own organization of Church and State has followed. But these "*mixta concilia*" were no more synods than the House of Lords is so. These State Councils, however, are often confounded with synods by those who study history only superficially.

Perhaps we ought to remark that Dr. Hatch exhibits a consciousness that he offers very weak evidence for his bold and broad assertions. He tells us in his preface that as the work is designed for general readers, he "has not thought it desirable to encumber the pages with more than the most necessary references to his authorities." But we are not to infer that "the evidence also is scanty;" he is ready to support his statements "by sufficient proofs." These, we presume, are to be forthcoming in "the more elaborate work which the writer has for some time had in preparation." Now this seems to us to be inverting the proper order of things. If Dr. Hatch, in giving what he terms a "summary of results," were generalizing for us the issues of inquiries and studies about matters on which all the world is in principle agreed, we might think that he had provided a very useful manual. But to throw out a number of dogmatic assertions for "general readers" about topics controverted on all sides, and to set down as though they were certain or demonstrated statements which Dr. Hatch must well know are contradicted by leading authorities both ancient and modern, and then to tell us that he is about by-and-by to publish a more elaborate work in which these strange or doubtful propositions will be proved, is surely not to deal with us fairly. We ought first of all to have had the "elaborate work" and the "sufficient proofs;" then afterwards might have come in its natural order the "summary of results." At present the "results" are very often only examples of "ipse dixit."

One of the most remarkable chapters in the book is that on "Tithes and their Distribution." Dr. Hatch writes as though he held a commission from the Liberation Society to furnish historical grounds which they might allege as they try to despoil Dr. Hatch's brethren. He tells us that "Tithes, as a Christian institution, date from the eighth century. They are one of the results of the great Carolingian reformation." It is not quite clear what is meant by this statement. If Dr. Hatch means that tithes did not become a fixed legal payment until the eighth century, he is probably not far from being right. If he means that the duty of dedicating at least a tenth to the service of God is first definitely heard of then, he is manifestly wrong. There are plenty of references to the payment of tithe as a Christian duty to be found in the ancient Christian writers from Irenæus downwards, and in Canons of Councils almost from the beginning of conciliar activity in the Church; and, indeed, Dr. Hatch in the sequel of his chapter quotes or refers to several of these. What does he mean then by asserting that tithes as a Christian institution date from the eighth century? It is quite plain that as a religious and moral obligation they date from primitive Christian times, and that they were enforced by synodical rule two or three centuries before "the Carolingian reformation." What Charlemagne really did was to make legally imperative that which previously had been a Church rule.

Very strange then it is to find Dr. Hatch affirming that tithes "are not ecclesiastical in their origin, but come to the Church from the State." On the contrary, Dr. Hatch's own witnesses, adduced in the later part of this very chapter, prove that their payment was first enjoined by the Church as due to God, and afterwards insisted on by the State as a thing its subjects ought to do. Dr. Hatch tells us, by way of further explaining the State origin of tithes, that originally they were a rent paid for the leasing of Church lands; that "the tenth or tithe of the produce was a traditional and customary rent for lands so leased;" that the amount of the rent, and the fact that it was paid to the Church, gradually created a new conception of its nature, and it became "identified with the Levitical tithe." How this explanation is to be reconciled with the testimonies quoted by Dr. Hatch himself, as to the principle of the Levitical tithe having been quite familiar and recognised by Church authority for centuries previously to "the Carolingian reformation," we do not see. What

we are apparently asked to believe is that this payment of a tenth as the rent for leased Church land first suggested the idea of a tithe being a sacred debt. It is intimated that people, from paying rent in this proportion, gradually came to think that they ought also to bestow a tenth of everything they had on the Church! And yet a page or two afterwards Dr. Hatch refers to Alcuin's intercession on behalf of the Saxons. Alcuin remonstrated with Charlemagne for imposing tithes on the newly converted Saxons, thus making Christianity a heavy burden to them, and adds that "even those who had been born and educated in the Christian faith scarcely consented to pay tithes of their substance." Yet in the face of this manifest indication that tithes were not a popular impost, Dr. Hatch, by way of inventing a secular origin for them, wants us apparently to take it for granted that those who had to yield a tenth of their produce for rent, found the process of decimation so delightful that they proceeded to extend it to all their other property that was not rented of the Church! And we are referred, as the only authority that is quoted for this incredible assumption, to a decree of the Council of Valence in 855. And the decree certainly does direct that a tenth of the produce of Church lands should be paid as rent; but far from substantiating Dr. Hatch's position on the question it directly subverts it, for it orders that "the ninths and tenths" be paid to the Church—that is, that the tithe should be paid and another tenth besides for rent. In other words, the solitary authority which Dr. Hatch gives for his assertion that tithes took their origin from rent, proves distinctly that they did not, for it provides that the tenth should be paid as rent in addition to the tithe; it assumes the pre-existence of the tithe. We had better give the canon as it is rendered into English, and correctly rendered, by Dr. Hatch.

"With respect to the properties and farms which were once offered by the faithful to the ownership of the Church, but are now subject to the power of laymen, it is resolved that *ninths* and *tenths* be faithfully paid to the churches from which they have been withdrawn; nay, let all the faithful most readily offer to God their tithes of all that they possess."

Dr. Hatch dwells at length upon the ancient arrangement by which the tithes were originally at the disposition of the Bishop, who allotted them to various holy purposes—his own maintenance, that of the churches, that of the clergy, and the relief of the poor. And he argues that if tithes are to be defended as "an ancient right of the Church, resting on divine law, and independent of, though recognised by, the State," then the claim of the poor to a share in them cannot be questioned. On the other hand, if we claim them because of the civil enactments which enforce their payment to the clergy, and which make no mention of the poor, why, then, says Dr. Hatch, "the right of the State to make new regulations respecting them cannot be questioned." Such is the dilemma on which Dr. Hatch seeks to impale the defenders of the rights and property of his brother clergymen, or rather of the parishes of which they are incumbents. But Dr. Hatch must be very well aware that the old arrangement by which not tithes only but all Church revenues went into the hands of the bishop did not last long anywhere; and as landowners desired to secure a resident priest for their own tenants and dependents, they did so by endowing the incumbencies which they founded with tithes and glebe. This process was encouraged by zealous bishops, and legalized and established by Christian kings. Dr. Hatch intimates that there is a great mass of existing deeds of donation. So far as England is concerned, we think that there must be, as regards parochial endowments, many more deeds of apportionment of tithes extant than deeds of gift. But there has never been one quoted, so far as we know, and we do not think there is any one extant, or that there ever was one, which allotted any share of the parochial tithes to the poor. The incumbents who receive ancient parochial tithes

do so because the founder of the parish or some subsequent owner of property in it left the tithes to maintain in perpetuity a clergyman for the spiritual oversight of the parish. The State came in afterwards to ratify and to secure the gift; but the tithes are not in any sense the creation of civil enactment—they are the offspring of individual munificence. This is the true answer to Dr. Hatch's dilemma; though the parochial clergy who pay poor-rates might well plead that the poor and needy have even now a goodly share in the tithes.

We hope when Dr. Hatch's "elaborate work" appears that it will exhibit a more complete and impartial examination of the authorities on which we must ultimately depend for our acquaintance with Church institutions between the fall of the Roman Empire and the mediæval settlement of Europe. And if Dr. Hatch will really interrogate the witnesses on all sides, and not pick and choose what suits his theories, we anticipate that some adventurous statements made in this volume will have to be reconsidered and very much modified. It is a clever book, but we cannot commend it as a fair one. Moreover, it is Erastian to the core.

CANON.

Literary Epochs. By G. F. UNDERHILL. London: Elliot Stock.

The keynote of this little book is the tendency of intellectual power to gather in clusters. This, of course, is a well-known idea, and is very generally admitted, but at the same time it can be pushed to excess. Stirring times, says Mr. Underhill, procreate striking men, and he seems to imply that their genius is called into existence by the surrounding circumstances, whereas it is more reasonable to say that their genius is coloured by the prevailing tinge in the social being of the period. We need not go to the length of asserting that some famous literary man would never have written at all but for the accident of being born at a particular time; rather, that his mind acquired a bent conformable to the period in which it grew up and expanded. We should always carefully inquire into causes which induced an author, or congeries of authors, to write as they do, and examine the signs of the times which influenced them; anything beyond this is beside the mark. Much praise is due to our author for the careful way in which he investigates and discourses on the causes of literary excitation, but the good old rule of *μηδὲν ἄγαν* is occasionally forgotten.

After a couple of chapters devoted to the periods of Athens and Rome that are associated with the names of Pericles and Augustus, more modern literature is investigated, beginning with that of mediæval Italy. Dante, Petrarch, Boccaccio, and their lesser brethren, who helped in the crusade against priestly tyranny, are discussed with a sympathetic and discriminating touch. The Elizabethan era succeeds, and meets with more attention than is vouchsafed to any other; nor will any one fall out with this. Bacon is compared with Plato, to the latter's disadvantage; the remarks on Shakespeare are apposite and well chosen. Mr. Underhill hardly does justice to Spenser, the "poet's poet." The "tediousness and obsolete language" that he speaks of are impalpable, while we are borne away on that wealth of quick imagination and rich description which is pre-eminent in his writings. He is certainly like Longfellow in one point; that he is more eagerly read by the young and the old than the middle-aged; and the reason is not far to seek, for he is poetry personified, and his dreamy and romantic verses are not practical enough for those who are confronted by the stern reality of middle life.

The age of *le grand monarque* Louis comes next, and the keynote of the literary history of his reign is clearly laid down. His famous dictum *L'état c'est moi* applied equally to letters as to statecraft. No one man has ever influenced authors so much as this famous sovereign. The time of

Anne succeeds, followed by the French Revolution, and a bird's-eye view of the literature of the United States concludes the "Epochs." Surely Mr. Underhill sets somewhat too high an estimate on the development in America. Its authors, he says (p. 197) "have blossomed forth into a spasmodic growth of intellect which brings them on an equality with their rivals in Europe." Many will regard this as undue praise. In every department of literature but one, they are in the rear; immeasurably so in poetry. The sole point in which they surpass European writers is in that humour which depends for its interest on exaggerated hyperbole, and this is surely no great conquest. In this section of Mr. Underhill's book occurs an extraordinary and unaccountable blunder. Amongst the American authors is cited no less a person than the old Puritan, Richard Baxter, author of the "Saint's Rest!" Milton, we may add, is misquoted once. Occasionally the language is very vigorous: *e.g.* (p. 182):

The same propensity which causes silly feminine society to idolize the lawn-tennis-playing, drawing-room, washing-his-hands-with-invisible-soap curate of the present day;

and again (p. 214):

Even at the present day we have hardly expelled the insane thrasonical meretriciousness of pseudo-æstheticism, which, but for the foolish gullibility of weak-kneed calves calling themselves men, and women distracted on account of their painful inability to attract, would never have existed.

The general tone of the book is just and refined; and the one or two blemishes we have pointed out will not irreparably impair its interest. Nothing comes seriously amiss to a true book-lover which is tendered in such a spirit of love towards literature as this.

B. A.

Short Notices.

Girl Neighbours. By SARAH TYTLER. London: Blackie and Sons.

This is a case of old-fashioned girls *v.* girls *à la mode*, in which the arguments on both sides are very fairly set out, and judgment is given for the former. The "neighbours," Pie Stubbs and Harriet Cotton, are true and realistic specimens of girlhood. A very attractive story, and beautifully illustrated.

An Exposition of the Apostles' Creed. By the Rev. J. E. YONGE, M.A. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

This, the latest volume of the Theological Educator series, conveys full and accurate information. Every point is carefully explained and illustrated, numerous references to Holy Scripture are given, and there are valuable notes; the whole supplies a condensation of the standard authors on the subject which will be extremely useful to candidates for Holy Orders.

Remarks on the Supplement to the Church Catechism. Proposed by the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury. By the Right Rev. CHARLES PERRY, D.D., Late Bishop of Melbourne. Elliot Stock.

It is only necessary here to remark that this pamphlet is a reprint ("with some alterations") from the December CHURCHMAN.

The Story of Some Famous Books. By F. SAUNDERS. London: E. Stock.

Of late a great deal has been said about the evils of desultory reading, and a great deal also on the other side. Here we have the very essence of it, for a pleasant flow of literary small-talk glides on from one work to another under no apparent system and guided by no particular rule. The result is a series of desultory and discursive remarks which, while not profound or very original, show much delicate and acceptable literary taste. The book is enriched, and not clogged, with numerous apt quotations and extracts. One typographical error may be pointed out—*Mens curva in corpore curva*. The volume is admirably printed, and, like its companions in this series, in all ways tasteful.

Story of the Niger. A Record of Travel and Adventure from the Days of Mungo Park to the Present Time. By R. RICHARDSON, author of "Ralph's Year in Russia," etc., etc. With 31 Illustrations. T. Nelson and Sons.

This "Story of the Niger," interesting and informing, is a welcome addition to the "Boy's Library of Travel and Adventure" published by Messrs. Nelson. Mr. Richardson has done his work well, and supplied a want. After Mungo Park come Clapperton and the Landers, Burdo Gallieni, Dr. Barth and Mr. Thompson.

Cæsar in Kent. An Account of the Landing of Julius Cæsar, and his Battles with the Ancient Britons; with some Account of Early British Trade and Enterprise. By the Rev. F. T. VINE, B.A., Rector of Eastington. 2nd edition. Elliot Stock.

It is no matter of surprise that this interesting work has quickly reached a second edition. Many of the general-reader class, to whom, as a rule, archaeological books are by no means acceptable, will welcome Mr. Vine's. The present edition, enriched with maps, is printed in clear, large type.

Of *The Englishman's Bible*, by Mr. Newberry (Hodder and Stoughton), three large volumes, we can only say at present—in recommending it—that it is a very suggestive work, and that so far as we have examined it is extremely accurate, showing industry and patience of a rare type.

A new edition of Mr. Withrow's able and interesting book, *The Catacombs of Rome* (Their Testimony to Primitive Christianity), has been sent us by Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton. It differs in no respect, so far as we can see, from the edition of 1876. The volume has many illustrations.

Scripture Natural History—Trees and Plants—(R.T.S.) is a good and useful little book; illustrated. "By-paths of Bible Knowledge," No. 10.

In the *Art Journal* (Virtue and Co.) appears the usual variety of illustration and description. "Hard Hit" (Orchard Son's) is a fine etching. "The Seine; as a painting ground," and "Notes on Japan," are attractive. Altogether, this is a good number of a favourite Magazine.

Little Folks, enlarged (Cassell and Co.), is excellent.

Messrs. Seeley and Co. have sent us a cheap edition of the *Life of Bishop Hannington*, and we heartily commend it. It is no matter of surprise that this interesting Biography should have reached a "twenty-first thousand."—*Cædwalla* is a well-written Tale of the Saxons in the Isle of Wight, by F. Cowper, M.A. Illustrated by the author, tastefully got-up, this is a really good gift-hook or prize.

In the *National Review* appears an able paper on the "Church and the Poor Law," by the Rev. Morris Fuller.

Blackwood gives a readable and suggestive paper on Darwin. *Blackwood* says: "There is a sufficient exposition of his own sentiments given in the

"chapter entitled 'Religion' in the first volume of the present work. The picture it gives is interesting, but not encouraging :

Formerly I was led by feelings such as those just referred to (although I do not think that the religious sentiment was ever strongly developed in me), to the firm conviction of the existence of God and the immortality of the soul. In my journal I wrote that, whilst standing in the midst of the grandeur of a Brazilian forest, 'it is not possible to give an adequate idea of the higher feelings of wonder and admiration and devotion which fill and elevate the mind.' I well remember my conviction that there is more in man than the mere breath of his body. But now the grandest scenes would not cause any such convictions and feelings to rise in my mind. It may be truly said that I am like a man who has become colour blind. . . . Another source of conviction is the existence of God connected with the reason and not with the feelings. This follows from the extreme difficulty, or rather impossibility, of conceiving this immense and wonderful Universe, including man, with his capacity of looking far backwards and far into futurity, as the result of blind chance or necessity. When thus reflecting, I feel compelled to look to a First Cause having an intelligent mind, in some degree analogous to that of man : and I deserve to be called a theist. But then arises the doubt, Can the mind of man, which has, as I fully believe, been developed from a mind as low as that possessed by the lowest animals, be trusted when it draws such grand conclusions ?

"Words more profoundly mournful than these [says *Blackwood*] were never spoken ; but Darwin does not seem to have felt them to be so. He states this appalling thought very calmly as one of many reflections —grave, but no more important than a hundred others ; yet how deeply it goes to the root, not only of every hope, but of all imagination, reason, every noble faculty with which our race has credited itself."

The new *Quarterly* has reviews of the "Life and Letters" of Darwin, Mr. Layard's "Early Adventures," Mr. Howorth's "The Mammoth and the Flood," and "The Cruise of the *Marchesa*." The Darwin review is good as far as it goes. "The Roman Catholics in England" is a well-written and encouraging article. For country parsons, as well as for country landlords, the *Quarterly* remarks on "Depression," and a paper on "Landed Interests and Landed Estates" will have a special interest. We hope to return to this paper. In the "Contest with Lawlessness," we find what we expect in the way of statement and suggestion. This is a very good number of the *Quarterly*, a review which we look forward to as eagerly now as we did thirty years ago.

The *Leisure Hour* begins the new year well. Its contents are judiciously varied, and the illustrations are excellent. "The Late Edward Thring," with reminiscences of Uppingham, by the Rev. J. G. Wood, will be specially welcome to many. There is a readable paper on the Queen's Homes. In "Some Experiences of an Editor" we read : "What is intended for a monthly periodical should not be written against time. It should be the result of not only careful and deliberate work, but of work taken up when the writer feels such fire as he has to be warm within him." The would-be contributor should bear in mind that the matter is intended for "final enshrinement in a volume."

The *Rosebud*, a magazine for the nursery (now published by Jas. Clarke and Co., 13 and 14, Fleet Street), has some amusing verses, with suitable illustrations.

From the Religious Tract Society we have received four cheap and attractive volumes of Tales of Adventure. *The Black Troopers, Strange Tales of Peril, Remarkable Adventures from Real Life, and Adventures Ashore and Afloat*. Capital gift-books or prizes, and well suited for a parochial library.

THE MONTH.

THE *Record* of the 6th was an issue of singular interest and importance. It contained the results of a minute and exhaustive inquiry into the religious condition of London south of the Thames :

For months past [said the *Record*] we have been engaged in collecting facts and examining places in South London. We now publish the result, under the belief that the public are utterly ignorant of the grave and dangerous condition of things which a variety of exceptional circumstances have combined to produce, and that the surest way to find the remedy is to make the want of it known. South London, eighty years ago, was only a few streets and courts ; to-day it is a great city of 800,000 souls. It is increasing with tremendous rapidity. As it grows bigger, it gets poorer. What South London will be eighty years hence it is terrible to conceive. *Christianity is not in possession in South London.* There are 98 parishes and 238 clergy. Immense efforts have been made, especially in the last ten years, during which the forces of the Church of England have gained greatly both in quality and quantity. But, meanwhile, the population has poured in : miles upon miles of new streets have sprung up as if by magic ; a new city of apparently boundless extent has developed ; and, relatively to the work to be done, the Church of England remains, not perhaps as weak, but certainly as inadequate as ever. The Nonconformists are in still worse difficulties. Voluntaryism cannot cope with a whole city of level poverty. The religious future of South London seems to be dependent on the Church. Leaden indifference, the result of hopeless penury, is settling down more and more into the hearts of the people, and is making religious work harder and harder. The clergy are keeping up the fight bravely, but year by year the resources procurable on the spot dwindle as one well-to-do parishioner after another goes away southwards ; and it is difficult to see how, if nothing is done, the struggle can be long maintained, even on its present scale.

At a meeting (in the Jerusalem Chamber) in support of the Pembroke College Mission, the Master of Pembroke (Rev. Dr. Searle) in the chair, Archdeacon Farrar quoted from the *Record* Report,¹ and spoke of the duty of Mission work at home.

Archdeacon Earle is to be the new Suffragan for London.—A paper on the "Completion of the Wakefield Bishopric Fund," by Canon Straton, will appear in an early CHURCHMAN.

At the Islington Meeting, on the 10th, the Vicar (the Rev. W. H. Barlow) presiding, at least 400 clergy were present. An admirable report of the papers and speeches appears in the *Record*. The four subjects were "The One Church," "The One Offering," "The One Life-Giver," "The One Life;" opened by Canon Bernard, Archdeacon Perowne, Principal Moule, and the Rev. H. W. Webb-Peploe. The proceedings of the day were summed up by Canon Cadman.

The death-roll of the month includes the names of Bishop Ryan, Rector of Stanhope, and Mr. Bonamy Price, who filled the Chair of Political Economy, Oxford.²

¹ Several leading journals have spoken of the service done to the Church by the enterprise of the *Record*. The *Times* wrote : "When the condition of the East End has been eloquently and forcibly described, it has occasionally been pointed out that other districts of the Metropolis have equal claims upon our sympathy. In a vague way many people know that south of the river there is a very large population of the lower classes of labourers, of people not far above the line of pauperism, and of the reckless and dangerous classes who form the last results of the attrition of the social mill. But a careful perusal of the details given by the *Record* will have the effect of bringing home the real state of affairs to men's minds with a vividness which will be found not a little disquieting."

² From the Bishop and the Professor we received, on more than one occasion, tokens of kindly interest in this magazine.