

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

AUGUST, 1890.

ART. I.—THE CHURCH ARMY.

HOW to reach the masses has been the special question before the Church for the last half-century. Before that time it cannot be maintained that any very serious attempt was made to evangelize them; the population of town parishes was so large, and the machinery at hand so inadequate, that even the best of men had to leave the work undone.

In the year 1836 a new effort was made to supply the deficiency of Church-workers by the establishment of the Church Pastoral Aid Society. It was founded with the object of making grants for the employment of additional clergy in populous places, and also with the view of securing the services of pious and discreet laymen as helpers to the clergy in duties not ministerial. This introduction of the lay element as part of the existing machinery of the Church led to considerable opposition, and great efforts were made to induce the committee of the Society to abandon that part of their scheme; but, beyond some concessions in details, it still remained in its integrity. The strength of the opposition to lay help was shown in the establishment of the Additional Curates Society, in which, as the name itself implies, no provision was made for the employment of suitable lay workers. The Bishop of Exeter, Dr. Philpotts, wrote that he preferred the new society, "especially as it is free from an objection to which, under any modifications, the employment of laymen as recognised assistants in a permanent character can hardly fail to be exposed." It is clear, therefore, beyond any question, that to the Church Pastoral Aid Society belongs the credit of being the first in the field to recognise the necessity of lay agency. This was specially acknowledged by the present Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, who, in 1872, observed that to this society "belongs the great and lasting honour of

having, notwithstanding much opposition at first, invited lay assistance to aid in the blessed work of evangelizing the masses."

The action of the Church Pastoral Aid Society in utilizing the service of Christian laymen was followed up by the Scripture Readers' Association in 1844. Since then, though lay help has multiplied on every side, no fresh distinct organized effort was made, with the exception, it may be said, of the Lay Reader movement, before the period of the Salvation Army.¹

The operations of the Salvation Army were clearly a departure from all previous modes of work, and in their character were more aggressive and pronounced. The authorities of the Church were much divided in opinion, but generally it was felt that it was not desirable to take any active part against the Army, but rather to watch the result. Some clergy, indeed, went so far as to invite the detachments of the Army stationed in their neighbourhood to Holy Communion. Speaking generally, we think it will be admitted that the Army has not risen in public opinion, owing mainly (1) to a great lack of reverence, and (2) to the ignoring of the two sacraments of our faith. Yet the Salvation Army has, it must be acknowledged, certain good points about it. There is the definite effort made to band together men and women in a crusade against open forms of sin, and it pledges its adherents to lead honest and decent lives. When well officered, the excesses are restrained, and good aggressive work is more or less carried on. It was the contemplation of this good side that led the Rev. W. Carlile to feel that an organization on similar lines, yet in harmony with the Church, might be established, and in the year 1882 the Church Army first took the field as "a working man's mission to working men." The marching orders were (1) the real conversion of those living without God; (2) holiness of heart and life; (3) good, intelligent Churchmanship.

This enlisting of the services of working men and the banding them together in the interests of Christ and His Church is, we think, the most important movement that has taken place in recent years. The Wesleyans had from the first made use of laymen as local preachers, but they were drawn, for the most part, from the trading class; but to Mr. Carlile is undoubtedly due the credit of perceiving that, if the Church is to be in possession of the masses of our towns, and also, we may add, of our large country villages, it must be in a great measure through the agency of the working men themselves, and that

¹ The London City Mission, working on what is termed a broad Evangelical basis, was established one year previous to the C.P.A.S.; and societies on a similar basis subsequently in all our large towns.

not by isolated attempts, but by a combined effort, working on a definite system.

The organization of this new agency, the Church Army, is in the hands of a committee denominated Headquarters. With them rest the selection and training of suitable candidates, the granting of commissions to officers, and the general oversight of them when they have taken the field. The more immediate control of the officer and the special character of his work lies with the parochial clergyman, who is perfectly free and unfettered. The great advantage of this system is to be seen in (1) The care exercised in the choice of suitable working men. "He is," according to the instructions, "to be a man of years of devout Christian walk . . . a man of sanctified common-sense, yearning for precious souls, believing in the possibility of the conversion of the worst, and willing afterwards to hand them over to the parish pastor to lead them further in the good way." (2) The definite instruction given them in the training-home. (3) The practical experience which is gained in the art of giving suitable addresses, conducting of open-air meetings, etc. (4) The change of officers, who are not allowed to remain in the charge of any station more than twelve months at the most. (5) That at the discretion of the Bishop the officers can be licensed by him, and, if desired, kept in the diocese.

The inquiry next presents itself as to what parishes are most suited for the operations of the Army, and what is the definite nature of the work. If in towns, to make the work effective, it is necessary that there should be a sufficient working-class population to cause it to be practicable to have meetings of one kind or another every day except one, which is an off-day; if in the country, a series of contiguous villages should be grouped together for the purpose. At first the work will necessarily be specially evangelistic—breaking up of the ground, heart-stirring addresses, with pointed illustrations calculated to awaken the energies of the soul, and causing the careless and impenitent to feel the need of conversion and renewal of the Holy Ghost; then those who are awakened will be invited to come forward, and to take, it may be, the penitents' form, the first in the room; or at the time of prayer, any who feel impressed and desire to be prayed for are invited to hold up their hands, and on one occasion were encouraged to do so by the Bishop of Marlborough holding up his. As the work goes forward there will be testimony meetings, where a few, at the discretion of the captain, will be invited to give evidence of what the Lord has done for them. Other meetings, such as holiness meetings, praise meetings, temperance gatherings, children's addresses, will follow as occasion may serve. If there be an early administration of

Holy Communion, the captain will very often gather together the more seriously disposed and have a short service with them before going to church. In the daytime he will visit amongst the people and strive to create an interest in the work by reading the Scriptures and prayer—in a word, he will be up and doing. If, further, the Church Army system is carried out in its integrity, the definite effort will be made to enlist soldiers, who by the regulations are required (1) to be communicants of the Church of England; (2) to be total abstainers from the use of alcohol as a beverage; (3) to confess Jesus as Lord with the mouth on all suitable occasions; (4) to wear the red cord, which is the badge of the Church Army, as often as possible. Such a body of men and women, gathered together after due probation, will tend very much to strengthen the hands of the captain, and to further the good cause of winning souls to Christ. The special character of the work will necessarily vary according to local circumstances and the wishes of the incumbent. In many parts a Church Army tent has proved itself of great service; in others, open-air preaching has been found invaluable; and there are parishes where a Church Army band has been instrumental in drawing many to the meetings who might not otherwise be induced to attend.

The question of expense has to be considered. The pay of an officer varies from nineteen shillings to thirty-two shillings per week, according to date of entry and number in family; but against this has to be set the collections which are made at every meeting. These may be looked upon to yield from one-third to one-half of the pay, the remainder of which is collected, as far as possible, from those who sympathize with the movement.

As to the general result of Church Army work, it will be variously estimated, according to the religious standpoint of different men; but the evidence of some very competent observers speaks most favourably of the results of the work. The late Lord Bishop of Durham, in his Charge of 1886, in speaking of the Army, observed: "The fastidiousness which shrinks from methods perfectly legitimate in themselves, but not commending themselves to refined taste, must be resolutely overcome." And as to its success he remarked: "I cannot for one moment doubt—the confirmations are visible proof—that in these parishes" (viz. Ven. Bede's; Monkwearmouth, and St. John's, Sunderland) "it has effected what no existing machinery could have effected: it has dragged numbers of men and women out of the gutter, has expelled the demon of drink or of some other gross vices, and has seated them, clothed and in their right mind, at the feet of Christ." When laid by from illness at Bournemouth, the late Bishop sent a message to the purport that "the Church Army had a very warm place in his heart." The Vicar of Ven. Bede's,

Monkwearmouth, alluded to by the Bishop, "rejoiced that soon after the Church Army came to his parish he heard the rattle of clogs on the chancel tiles, showing that the very poorest were drawn to value the Holy Communion." The Bishop of Bedford, Dr. Billing, bore the following testimony at the Training Homes anniversary: "I wish it to be understood that I do identify myself thoroughly with the work of the Church Army. Having ascertained its methods of procedure, and tested its work in different parts of London and the country, it has my entire sympathy. I say, God bless the Church Army! I am grateful to God for raising up the Church Army, because it has settled for ever one question which has distressed the hearts and minds of many—How the masses are to be reached." It would be easy to add to these favourable comments, but we must content ourselves with a notice with reference to Aberystwith:

The Church Army has certainly fulfilled our highest expectations. Fishermen, labourers, tramps, and others have been reached through the instrumentality of the Church Army. Frequent services in mission-rooms, in lodging-houses and cottages are held. A Sunday-school which is started is now in a flourishing state, and other means for influencing men and women have been established. The earnest, manly addresses of the captain appeal most strongly to men of different characters, and the result has been that drunkards have been reclaimed and scoffers brought to pray to Him whom they have blasphemed. For example, one of the waifs of the East-End of London, who had tramped down to this place in search of employment, and who before he came under the influence of the Church Army in the open-air meetings was a scoffer and blasphemer, is now a faithful and regular attendant at our services, and was confirmed on Saturday last. A number of people who had hitherto neglected to attend the means of grace provided in the Church are now regular communicants. And on Saturday last, April 6th, when the Lord Bishop of St. David's held a confirmation in our parish church sixteen soldiers were confirmed, and among those were two women and one man, whose ages were respectively 75, 69, and 72. The distinctive feature of the Church Army in this town is its work among men, the number of men attending the services being about equal to the number of women. We hope that the blessing of God may attend the efforts of the Church Army in other parishes as it has attended its efforts here.¹

The testimonies here given make it plain that the Army is an undoubted success in many places.

What, then, may be said to be the causes of failure?—for that is freely confessed by the authorities. First, it is our belief that it is due to the character of the people: they are either respectable, decent, well-conducted folk, but without any religious sentiment; or, on the other hand, they are hard-headed people of a sceptical or socialistic turn of mind. The simplicity of the Gospel message is an offence unto

¹ Church Army Report for 1888-9; full of interesting matter. The writer of this paper feels it only right to acknowledge his indebtedness to the publications of the Church Army, to which he would refer all who desire fuller information.

them, and if they are to be reached, they need the truth to be set before them in a more thoughtful and convincing manner than is possible by the average type of officer to be found in the Army. Where the work is most successful is, we are of opinion, amongst those who both feel and know that they are sunk low, and need a strong arm to be stretched out to them to lift them from their low estate. It is the old, old story: "The Son of Man is come to seek and to save that which is lost." Secondly, failure may be traced to the want of sympathy between the Incumbent and the Church Army system. If there is no cordial acceptance of the leading principles of the Army, it is necessarily impossible for the officer to work effectively—the wet blanket is thrown over him; or if he gives in, the failure is equally disastrous, for the officer is trained to work in certain lines, and if these are not those of him who for the time being is his superior, no good lasting work can result. We are not to be understood by these remarks as casting any reflection upon the parochial clergymen, but only as illustrating the old saying, "Two cannot walk together except they be agreed." Thirdly, a want of care in the selection of an officer may have resulted in the round man being in the square hole. As illustrating the first cause of want of success, there is a striking instance of a clergyman being very successful with the Church Army, but on introducing it into another sphere of labour to which he was appointed, it met with hardly any response.

The Army, it need hardly, perhaps, be said, is established on a very wide basis, and seeks to commend itself to the large body of earnest-minded, devout Churchmen who are yearning after souls; but it is probable that the extreme men of different schools of thought, with some exceptions, might find it difficult to work in harmony with it. Since it first took the field, the work so successfully carried on has been supplemented by the training and employing of mission nurses. Their duty is set forth: "To visit, nurse, and help the sick and poor; to conduct Bible classes and mothers' meetings; to assist in speaking and singing at Gospel meetings; and to do all the other (including rescue) work of a parochial mission woman, so far as it is leading up to the real conversion of the careless." This agency is necessarily on a much smaller scale, but where it has been tried it has proved itself to be a valuable auxiliary in parish work. Canon Money writes: "Our mission nurse is working with much encouragement, and we cannot be too thankful for her help. I feel that we have here a gentle, loving, yet powerful agent for good."

From the sketch we have given of the constitution and work of the Church Army, it must, we consider, be regarded as a most valuable adjunct to parochial machinery. Before its establish-

ment there was but little, if any, opening for godly men of the working class to carry on any active work for God in harmony with the Church; now, through the starting of the Army, everything is changed. Working men and women can be taken by the hand, taught, trained, and commissioned to speak to their fellows of the Gospel of the grace of God. They have an immense advantage: they know the habit and turn of mind of those they are called to address; they can speak to them in a homely and telling manner, and as a result prejudice is disarmed, for it is not all "parson's talk." Where the surrounding circumstances are suitable, the Church can come as a friend to do work which hitherto has only been partially done. It has been well said, "If the Red Lion is open every night, why should not the mission-hall be also?"

W. E. RICHARDSON.



ART. II.—A CONVERSATION WITH SUNDAY-SCHOOL TEACHERS ON ST. BARNABAS.

"I WANT to point you to St. Barnabas," said the clergyman to his Sunday-school teachers, "and to some undesigned coincidences found in the Scripture account of him. You have in him a new start in life and several important steps as the result of it. He is named the 'Son of Consolation' (*paraklesios*) or of 'Exhortation,' as the Revised Version has it—the effect wrought in him by the Paraclete, the Blessed Spirit promised by our Lord before He left His disciples. This one order of talent in him is the pearl of great price, as you will show the youthful members of our communion, from this teaching of the Prayer Book, in the Catechism¹ and in the Collect for St. Barnabas the Apostle.

I. "Barnabas was 'a Levite,'² and early brought into the Gospel. If you compare this with the after-statement of St. Luke, 'And a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith,'³ you will see how the two statements dovetail into each other. If a forger had wanted to make the words in the one place fit into the other, he would have stated it more plainly. St. Luke says simply in the most natural way that Barnabas was a 'Levite,' and then, writing of the progress of the Church two years after, he refers to a great company of the Jewish priests coming over. The movement appeared at different times in the different orders of the ministers of the old religion. St. Luke's record shows us, in his undesigned,

¹ Catechist: "My good child, know this, that thou canst not do these things of thyself," etc.

² Acts iv. 36.

³ Acts vi. 7.

natural way, how old things are passing away and all things are becoming new. In a social as well as a religious way, the 'Levite' made a new start; for, having land, he sold it, and brought the price and laid it at the Apostles' feet. In both ways a great change passed over the 'Son of Consolation.' The outcome of the double change led to the most important results."

One of the Sunday-school teachers observed: "He was of the country of Cyprus." "That," said the clergyman, "is interwoven with the record of him. When Saul of Tarsus—after being miraculously converted, after a sojourn of three years in Arabia, and after his preaching Christ in Damascus—had come to Jerusalem, the Apostles were very shy of him, and shrank from him. As Tarsus of Cilicia is not very far from the island of Cyprus, Barnabas in all likelihood knew his former neighbour. From his knowledge of his life and character, he felt his conversion was real and that Saul was a true man. Barnabas of Cyprus introduces Saul of Tarsus to the Apostles and to the leading Christians in Jerusalem. Having heard the story of his wondrous conversion, and comparing it with what he knew before of him, he felt it to be real, and brought Saul 'to the Apostles, and declared unto them how he had seen the Lord in the way, and that He had spoken to him.'¹ The step taken—so very natural—on behalf of his former neighbour is quite in accord with his peculiar gift, and such as we would expect from his new start in life. 'Blessed are the peacemakers.'

II "His being of Cyprus puts a thread into our hand that leads us further. Men of Cyprus were among the first that preached the Gospel at Antioch, the great heathen city of the East. Barnabas, the 'Son of Consolation,' was sent from Jerusalem to inquire what his island countrymen had done there. They had been preaching the Lord Jesus 'among the Greeks;' that is, the Gentiles speaking Greek.² You will observe that the Revised Version reads 'Greeks' in its text, adding, however, a marginal note—'Many ancient authorities read "Grecian Jews."' The 'Son of Consolation' was glad at what he saw, and, true to his peculiar gift, 'exhorted'³ them all that with purpose of heart they would cleave unto the Lord.'

"Forming his judgment, under the Spirit of God, of the work at Antioch, he goes to Tarsus to seek Saul, plainly showing

¹ Acts ix. 27.

² Acts xi. 20.

³ *παρακάλει*. The careful student of the text of Holy Scripture would be interested by looking at the two senses of this word and of the noun *παράκλησις*. (1) *Exhortation*, as in the following texts: 1 Cor. xiv. 3, 2 Cor. viii. 17, 1 Tim. iv. 13, Heb. xii. 5, and xiii. 22. (2) *Consolation*, as in 2 Cor. i. 4-7, Heb. vi. 18, Acts ix. 31. The Vulgate renders the word by "Solatium" in Heb. xiii. 22; but Alford, looking to the spirit of the context, thinks that translation erroneous. In support of my preference of "Consolation," I may shield myself under the high authority of St. Chrysostom.

how fully he believed in the reality of his conversion. If not, why go for him? Looking a little under the surface of the narrative, we observe how undesigned and natural is Luke's statement. Barnabas saw that the great work going on at Antioch was in large measure Gentile, and so he laboured to get the help of Saul, to whom the mission to the Gentiles had been given as a special field. Then the 'Son of Consolation,' specially helped as he was by the Paraclete, and his former acquaintance, Saul, laboured there for 'a whole year and taught much people.' The whole surroundings show a wide, comprehensive spirit. The Gospel is lifted out of anything narrow or provincial. The name borne ever after in every age and place joins man to the Divine Christ. 'The disciples were called Christians first in Antioch.'

III. Some of the lady teachers here said the word "Consolation" and the person specially bearing that name were well suited for their consideration, as the teachers met many things connected with their classes in the way of distress.

The clergyman then pointed them to the mission from Antioch for the relief of the poor saints in Jerusalem, and said: "The great famine which came to pass in the days of Claudius Cæsar' called out large relief from Jews, heathens, and Christians, as we learn from the history of the time. We are told by Josephus that in the fourth year of the reign of Claudius the famine was so severe that the price of food became enormous and great numbers perished.¹ We should know very much about this famine even if we had not the Acts of the Apostles at all. St. Paul laboured very much for the relief of it, joining the rich Churches of Corinth and the poor of Macedonia in the work. No one could be more of a *grata persona* for such a mission than the 'Son of Consolation,' to whom was joined the great Apostle of the Gentiles, who had laboured so much for the object. Thus this famine brought together the great Gentile city of the East and the Jewish capital, breaking down the wall of partition between Jew and Gentile. Even a little knowledge of the contemporary history shows us how St. Luke, quite undesignedly, keeps in full accord with it.

"We remember when children the dreadful famine in Ireland in 1847, and how much help was raised for the distress among our own warm-hearted countrymen in our own land, as well as in England and other countries. Then the clergy of our Church stood by the sufferers from famine and fever, as did the Christians in the early times. Calling to mind the story of that dreadful time as told in 'A Tale of the Irish Famine,'² we can better understand the nature of the work when 'the disciples,

¹ See "The Life and Epistles of St. Paul." Conybeare and Howson.

² By William Carleton, the well-known author of "Traits and Stories of the Irish Peasantry."

every man according to his ability, determined to send relief unto the brethren which dwelt in Judæa, which also they did, and sent it to the elders by the hands of Barnabas and Saul.'"¹

IV. Some of the Sunday-school teachers here asked about Antioch and its share in the early spread of the Gospel, a lady teacher remarking, "We do but little here for missions." "Indeed," said the clergyman, "the step taken there in sending out missionaries is a great example to us. It was the natural outcome of the spiritual life of the Church and of the new start in life of Barnabas. A living Church is a running stream. If a Church become a stagnant lake it is ready to die. Look at the inward qualities of the ministers at Antioch. As they ministered (*leitourgeo*) to the Lord and fasted, the Holy Ghost gave a distinct call to mission work: 'Separate Me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them.' The inward spiritual fitness is followed by the outward appointment of the missionaries; and so, my good teachers," continued the clergyman, "you always pray at the ordination seasons for good clergymen for our parishes."² And so we look on St. Luke's narrative of the success of these missionaries thus sent out as most natural.

"As members of our Church, you cannot but note in passing how the steps taken in the mission work at Antioch entirely bear out our Twenty-third Article,³ and upset the view of the Plymouth Brethren, that there are no office-bearers in the Church. 'When they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away.'

"Setting out on their mission work, they visit Cyprus, where they would meet the neighbours and countrymen of Barnabas, and they convert the Deputy of the country, Sergius Paulus, from whom Saul ever after bears the Latin name of Paul.

"In following the narrative closely, one is quite struck by the consistent way in which St. Luke keeps Paul—the Apostle with all the talents—in the first place, and Barnabas—the Apostle with the one order of talent—in the second. It is well worth while to look into chapters xiii. and xiv. of the Acts to see this.⁴ Stoning Paul, they intended the crown of martyrdom for him. The populace, in their rough-and-ready way, taking generally a pretty correct view of a situation, 'called Barnabas Jupiter, and Paul Mercurius,' because he was the chief speaker.

"The notion is that dignity and goodness belonged specially

¹ Acts xi. 28, 29.

² See the prayer in the Ember Weeks, to be said every day for those that are to be admitted to Holy Orders.

³ Of Ministering in the Congregation.

⁴ Chap. xiii. 9, 13, 16, 43, 46, 50, and chap. xiv. 11, 12.

to the one described as ruler of all. Thus it is the king of gods and men is represented by the great Latin poet :

Jupiter æthere summo
 Despiciens mare velivolum, terrasque jacentes, . . .
 Atque illum tales jactantem pectore curas, . . .
 Alloquitur Venus : O, qui res hominumque, Deumque
 Æternis regis imperiis.¹

“As the poem proceeds, the great deity, whose sway is over sea and land, sends down his command for the Trojan hero to leave Carthage. The message is death to the ill-starred Dido. Mercury is the messenger :

Tunc sic Mercurium alloquitur, ac talia mandat :
 Vade age, nate, voca Zephyros, et labere pennis ;
 Dardaniumque ducem . . .
 Alloquere : et celeres defer mea dicta per auras.²

“In the missionary work the chief speaker, interpreting the will of Heaven to the people of Lystra, with ready wit and able speech, is Mercury, the messenger of the gods. No one can read the account with care and not see the distinct character of each missionary, as it is fully painted out and well maintained. In the undesigned carrying out of this the plain mark of truth is obvious.

“My good teachers,” said the clergyman, “you may also observe that in Jerusalem, where Barnabas was so well known and valued, he is named *before* the great Apostle, as you will find in Acts xi. 30 and in Acts xii. 25, and in other places. In the distant foreign mission-field, the many talents of Paul rather eclipse the dignified ‘Son of Consolation’ and throw him into the background.

V. “The part these two missionaries took at the first council in Jerusalem is entirely such as springs naturally out of their great missionary journey. They are for the admittance of the Gentiles to the Church without their passing under the yoke of the Jewish law. In their journey through Cyprus, and in Asia Minor to Perga, and to Antioch in Pisidia, St. Paul’s first step is—according to his usage—to the synagogue and then to the Gentiles, and with very great success. This puts a thread into their hand leading them to the merciful course as to the terms of reception for the Gentiles. They are the strong advocates of liberty and of spiritual life. St. Luke, without any apparent effort, and in the most natural way, makes their conduct at the council the outcome of their missionary experience. Describing the course of proceeding, he says : ‘Then all the multitude kept silence, and gave audience to Barnabas and Paul, declaring what miracles and wonders God had wrought among the Gentiles by them.’³

¹ Virgil, “Æneid,” lib. i. 227. ² *Ibid.*, lib. iv. 222. ³ Acts xv. 12.

“All nations and ages have blessed them for the merciful course taken, and for the gentle decree framed. The finding of the council was addressed to the brethren which are of the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia, and was conveyed to them by chosen men, ‘with our beloved Barnabas and Paul’ (in Jerusalem Barnabas is always put first), ‘men that have hazarded their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.’¹ Millions in every age have rejoiced at the message the ‘Son of Consolation’ brought, as did the Church at Antioch at the time.”

VI. The senior Sunday-school teacher, a little bit of a classical scholar, here showed that Antioch was much in the highway of the old world, its people being in full communication with Rome in the time of the satirist Juvenal, say about A.D. 70. He referred to the well-known words,

Jam pridem Syrus in Tiberim defluxit Orontes
Et linguam et mores et cum tibicine chordas
Obliquas, nec non gentilia tympana secum
Vexit.”²

and said the situation of Antioch and the bent of its people for travelling showed very plainly its facilities for entering into such missionary work as St. Luke has recorded. They in their own parish would accomplish much, he added, if the torch of mission zeal could be relit among them and held on high as it had been in this great Eastern city by her inspired teachers.

The clergyman then went on to say: “After about another year of ministerial labour at Antioch, the curtain falls over Barnabas (say A.D. 51). After his variance with St. Paul about his nephew Mark, he sailed to Cyprus, doubtless for missionary work among his own countrymen. We cannot raise the curtain which the hand of St. Luke lets fall, but looking into the after-writings of St. Paul, we find him spoken of with respect and affection. In St. Paul’s Epistle to the Colossians,³ written in his first imprisonment, we find Marcus, sister’s son to Barnabas, a fellow-labourer and fellow-prisoner with the Apostle. In his second and more severe imprisonment he longed for the Christian labourer over whom had risen at Cyprus the difference between the two Apostles. Luke is then at his side, in his extreme danger, in sight of the open grave of the martyr. His touching word then is, ‘Only Luke is with me’ (say A.D. 66). Then, as the standard is falling from his dying hand, and as he thinks of the carrying on of the work, he writes to Timothy: ‘Take Mark and bring him with thee; for he is profitable to me for the ministry.’⁴

“The backwardness of youth is forgot and well redeemed, and the dying word of the Apostle about Mark, the nephew of Barnabas, is indeed in undesigned coincidence with St. Luke’s

¹ Acts xv. 25, 26.

³ Chap. iv. 10.

² Juvenal, Sat. iii. 62.

⁴ 2 Tim. iv. 11.

record of seventeen years before. I long and I pray for Sunday-school teachers with the spirit of the 'Son of Consolation,' and for the one order of talent so precious as that of Barnabas."

THOMAS JORDAN.

ART. III.—THE OLD TESTAMENT AND THE CRITICS.

(Concluded from page 533.)

WHOEVER was the author of the first chapter of Genesis, whether Moses or Ezra or some unknown scribe, he must either have had a communication of the subject-matter of his composition made to him from without, or he must have elaborated it from his own heart's inventions. There is no escape from this alternative. So many writers nowadays observe a strange reticence on this point; they insinuate that the cosmogony was a conception of some late Jewish genius, but shrink from saying openly that God had nothing to do with it. Now, which commends itself most to the common-sense of mankind: that a Jew at a late period of the world's history should have invented this theory—that he should have persuaded his contemporaries, without one contradictory voice, to accept his teaching—that the Apostle St. John should frame the opening of his Gospel so as to reflect the literal history in the spiritual, and that all after-generations of the most enlightened nations of the world should have followed in the same course; or that God, the Maker of man, should in some way which we know not reveal to man in the beginning of his being some information concerning his own origin and that of the creatures animate and inanimate that he saw around him? This is intimately connected with another question—How and whence did Moses (assuming his authorship) derive his knowledge? If we choose the alternative that God did make a revelation, and that the account of the genesis of man was not the design of man, but of God, there would be traditions handed down doubtless, from the beginning; and there can be scarcely any question that some kind of notation was invented in the earliest ages to register and record thoughts and facts—of this, perhaps, the old hieroglyphic characters of the ancient Egyptians may preserve some of the earliest examples. Such archives would be, through God's providence, preserved in the families of the faithful. St. Luke tells us that he had traced all things to their true origin; and so, it may well be conceived, Moses collected, arranged, and edited these relics of antiquity. It may be conceded that much, even all, that took place prior to his own day might be derived from such traditional sources; further, that after his time new editions, as we should term them, were made by the schools of the prophets, or by priestly

custodians, or by Ezra and the Great Synagogue; that the earlier portions would be penned at first by some mode of indication now quite unknown; that much might have to pass through translation or transliteration, as we know that the Phœnician characters gave way to the square Chaldee form at a late period of Israel's history. But all these admissions, though they would account for the introduction of many glosses and insertions which in modern books would be found in the editor's marginal and foot-notes—a mode of supplementary information unknown in that day—would not touch the question of ultimate authorship, or the true place of the book in the history of the ages.

Much has been made of the prevalent use of the different names by which the Maker of the universe is notified in Genesis. It is undeniable as a fact that many portions in Genesis present a more frequent and sometimes exclusive use of Elohim (God), and others a similar preponderance of the name Jehovah (LORD). These, say our critics, prove a difference of authorship; but this is not necessarily true. The words may be used according to their special meaning and the requirements of the context in which each is found. Our Lord uttered three prophetic parables, which are given us by St. Matthew (chap. xxv.). In these Christ is set forth as Bridegroom, Lord, and King; but was ever a critic so audacious as to assert that there must have been three Matthews, whose contributions to the Gospel might be disentangled by the diversity of names they assigned to their Master? Again, in the Apocalypse we have the period of the tyranny of the Antichrist stated under three different arithmetical forms; but who has ever ventured to say there were three Johns, whose works were distinguishable by their arithmetical notation? It is probable, as we have said above, that the occurrences of the most primitive times were transmitted through the patriarchal ancestors to Moses, and not, as Neologians tell us, fabricated in after-ages and foisted into the archives of the nation under false pretensions. If so, one line of tradition might preserve—as, it is to be observed, is a fact—the material and, so to speak, the more secular side of the history, and the other the spiritual and religious. Thus the grouping of these paragraphs into these alternating subjects would well account for this arrangement, and the very feature which is now charged upon mere useless repetition and mutually destructive statement would assume at once a profitable and, it may be, necessary mode of setting forth the treasures of the tradition that had been stored by Moses.

There is one omission that strikes one as glaring on the part of these writers, the almost entire ignoring of the genius of Hebrew composition, which is commonly called parallelism.

This arrangement or order does not merely affect clauses and sentences, but paragraphs, and even books. The interlacing of what appear to be separate and independent accounts is at once disentangled by this disclosure, and will render a reason for many of the seeming difficulties and discrepancies that are paraded with so much confidence against the advocates of orthodoxy.

But to return to the use of the Divine names. We find in Genesis three that are specially prominent—Elohim (God), El Shaddai (God Almighty), and Jehovah (the Self-existent). This is not the place to attempt to trace the philological meanings of these names, it will be sufficient to say that “power” is the radical meaning of the first two, and “being” and “unchangeableness” of the last. But what is the Biblical use? It is probable that the Trinity is suggested to us in these titles. Elohim is the maker and preserver of nature, El Shaddai subdues nature and bends it to His will; and Jehovah directs the purposes of grace in the midst of the world; or, as Delitzsch has said: “Elohim is the God who created the soil of nature; El Shaddai is the God who omnipotently ploughs it, and scatters therein the seed of promise; Jehovah is the God who brings this seed of promise to its flower and fruit.” The controversy has gathered more especially round the names of Elohim and Jehovah. If the former conveys to us the idea of Deity in the abstract as the Source and Centre of all power, and the latter of a personal, superintending God, one who is known, though vested in the regalia of mystery and awe, as *our* God—if the one name is generic, the other appellative—if the one is God over all pre-eminent in majesty and might, and the other the Covenant-keeper, the Ruler and Rewarder of His people, are we to be surprised if different paragraphs exhibit one name or the other according to the subject-matter? But though this is not only granted, but admitted as patent, it is not true that these names are very seldom or never mingled in the same period; and as this proximity of the names is a fact beyond controversy, the task of separating the warp from the woof has given rise to some of the greatest extravagances of hypercriticism. Thus in the account of the creation, after Elohim has been used throughout the first chapter, we find Jehovah Elohim combined in the fourth verse of the second chapter. Now, whether this verse belongs to the Elohist or Jehovist, whether it relates to the chapter that precedes or to that which follows it, the difficulty is equally great, as both names are found together; and to attribute the combination to a redactor is only an effort to escape from the testimony of a difficult fact. The fifth chapter is attributed to the Elohist, but Jehovah appears at the end of it in verse 29; and what is the

special pleading of the objector when pressed with this, but that the exceptional name is the interpolation of a later age, and its insertion is charged either on design, or the ignorance or the intermeddling of the compiler? Is this criticism? is this honest? is this common-sense? Could we treat any one of our own histories in this way before the literary public? Again, it is asserted that whole passages are mere repetitions, each containing a full and perfect history without the other, though it is questioned whether they always substantiate each other, the one of such passages being Elohist and the other Jehovistic, and the inference drawn is that they proceed from different sources. Bishop Jebb has shown that the *Benedictus*, by the laws of parallelism, may be separated by the alternate extraction of the component sentences into two perfect psalms; but who would argue on discovering this that there were two Zachariahs, each of whom raised a hymn of praise, and that they afterwards got mixed up together? But let us take as examples two prominent specimens, the history of creation and the history of the flood. It is objected that the Elohist penned the first chapter of Genesis and the first four verses of the second, and at this point the Jehovist inserted his tradition or theory of the cosmogony, because we then first meet with the name Jehovah. But if we examine, we shall discover that in the first chapter we have only a grand outline of creation recorded, with man the culminating point of all; whereas in the following section we have man in his own province, the special features of his introduction into the world, his allotted work and duties, and, above all, the covenant made with him. Then comes the fall, the rupture of the covenant, followed by the embryo of the Gospel conceived in the promise that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head. How natural, how fitting, how consistent with accurate statement and arrangement! In the *fiat* of creation He is Elohim, the mighty one; in the roll of the covenant and the Gospel promise He is Jehovah, the living and faithful; and yet not one separate or diverse from the other, but He that created and He that saves is the same: He is Jehovah Elohim, not two, but one!

In the account of the flood, we may remark that much in this section is a prophecy of the approaching visitation, and it is a well-known feature in Divine predictions that the same things are treated of under various figures and forms in parallel paragraphs, the prophecies starting from the same point and reaching the same goal, though presenting different phases. Thus, it may be, we have a twin prophecy of the deluge, each furnishing its own particulars, and each distinguishable by the selection of a name of the Deity; but what does it matter whether both came through the same traditional channels

or not? In any case, we are bold to say that in the arrangement and grouping of these records the greatest wisdom is manifested; the parts which refer most to the act of executing judgment are marked by the presence of the name Elohim, whereas the grace which Noah found, the door of salvation closed after him, and the sacrifice he offered on his exit from the ark—all these portions of the narrative shine with the presence of the covenant name of Jehovah. And here it may be well to add, as intimately connected with these examples, that if the proposal of these critics be accepted to split up the narratives in Genesis into a medley of contributions made by later authors, the whole continuity of such biographies as those of Noah and Jacob and Joseph would be broken, and the records themselves dissolved in ruins.

These earlier assaults have, however, given way to more modern schemes of critical warfare. The Pentateuch is now displaced from its leadership among the books of the Old Testament. It is no longer "the Law, the Prophets and the Psalms," but the Prophets, the Psalms and the Law, or the two last are held to be almost or chiefly coeval; and the commencement of Genesis, instead of being the preface, is the appendix of the Bible, except in position, as an introduction was wanted for the collection of writings which the post-exilic editors had compiled and arranged. There are many modes of exposing the fallacy of such a theory, but the purpose of this paper is to bring forward only such arguments as are not only conclusive in themselves, but commendable to the common-sense of intelligent readers. On reading the works which advance this theory, the following refutation at once occurred to the writer of this article, as well as to a number of others, as it appeared afterwards. If the earlier portion of the Pentateuch was written by the returned exiles from Babylon, their verbiage would, like Peter's *patois*, bewray them. They had recently come from a long sojourn in Assyria, and consequently the names of the gods of Babylon would have been familiar to them; the words in daily use among the people with whom they were associated would crop up in the description of men and things, and this feature would be all the more prominent since we are given to understand that they had let their own ancient language fall into disuse, and that Chaldee had taken the place of the Hebrew tongue. On the other hand, if the Pentateuch was written by Moses, he had just brought the people out of Egypt; the gods of the Egyptians would be familiar to their eyes; Egyptian ideas, words and religious rites would rise naturally to the surface. There was about a millennium between the Exodus and the return from Babylon, and this length of time, and the difference of the nations, and the diversity of all the

circumstances, must find a corresponding evidence and echo in the writings produced at either period. It is most uncritical, and worse than unfair, to say, with one well-known critic of this school, that the writer did all he could to imitate the characteristics of the Mosaic times, or with another, that more words are claimed to be Egyptian than are really so, and that Isaiah employs Egyptian words in his writings, as though the times of Isaiah and Israel's then relations with Egypt were the same as at the period that was subsequent to the return from the Captivity. These are only evasions of the plain facts, and evasions are not disproofs. We will, however, take a few examples of words about which there is no dispute. The names conferred upon Joseph, Abrech and Zaphnath paaneah, are Egyptian words, not translated, but transliterated; these are as evident to the English reader as to the Oriental scholar, but there are many other words which are not thus easily distinguished by the general reader, such as the word rendered "river," which always means the *Nile*, and "meadow," which signifies the *rush* that grows on the banks of the Nile; "passover" is also an Egyptian word, and so is the "bush" in which the manifestation of God was made to Moses. These are but a few of the most familiar instances traceable in words.

To pass on to other points, the plagues that devastated Egypt were acerbations of well-known and not unfrequent scourges; the calf that Aaron made was a reproduction of Egyptian worship, and is as natural to the circumstances of that day as the calves of Jeroboam were in his case, as he had been a sojourner in Egypt from fear of Solomon before he returned to rend the tribes asunder and make Israel to sin; and further still, we may remark that the ark of the covenant itself had, it is well known, a prototype among the Egyptians. What can be more evident than that the author of the Pentateuch reveals undesignedly, but with perfect consistency, the circumstances of his own knowledge and experience, and so fixes the geography and the chronology—the place and the time—which are described in his works, which could only be written by one who was learned in Egyptian lore, and not one who was trained among the Magi of Babylon.

We may be excused if we make choice of two of the words above mentioned to exhibit in detail a further argument for the date of the Pentateuch. The words are "passover" and "bush." Both these words are, as has been stated above, Egyptian, and not Hebrew, in their origin, and were introduced among the Israelites, and not devised by them. "Passover," in the old hieroglyphic language of Egypt, is represented by, and signifies, a bird sheltering with its wings; the noun and the verb "pass-over" imply not, as often interpreted, the act of omission on the

part of the destroying angel, but the act of Jehovah in protecting and sheltering His people. The sacrifice of the passover lamb was the mother of all sacrifices. The Levitical system derived from this source all the several and distinct sacrifices of the altar. All these sacrifices were concerned with the one great end, the making an atonement for the people. Now, atonement or reconciliation, both in the noun and the verb, is represented in the Law by the ordinary Hebrew word, which signifies "covering," the idea being that the innocent blood was a shield or shelter for the guilty. What has become of the old Egyptian word, which is only retained, except in one or two instances in the verb form, as the name of the yearly memorial feast? Why, the answer is plain: that it was translated into the language of ordinary life among the people. Again, the word "bush" is an Egyptian word, and, strange to say, is found in Egyptian papyri of the nineteenth dynasty; that is, about the same period as Moses. This word is only found in Exod. iii., where the account of the Divine manifestation is recorded, and in Deut. xxxiii. 16, in the blessing pronounced by Moses upon the tribe of Joseph, where the same historical fact is referred to. But what becomes of the word afterwards? The bush, *seneh*, is the well-known thorny acacia so abundant in the East, and must find mention in the sacred records. Again, we reply, this word was translated from Egyptian into Hebrew, where we find it is called the *shittim*-tree, of which, it will be remembered, so large a use was made in the manufacture of things pertaining to the tabernacle and the sanctuary. Now, to apply these words to our argument: Which are the oldest, the original Egyptian words or their translations into Hebrew? Could such strange and almost-forgotten words have been coined or re-introduced in the Assyrian or post-exilic period from a long unused language? Such a thing would be quite impossible: this must have been "imitation" of the most extraordinary character! At the time of the Pentateuch, such words were intelligible, but were fast giving way to others which were more generally so, as the people forgot Egypt, and were more conscious of their own independent nationality and rites. It is allowed that the earlier portion of the LXX. was made about 280 B.C. This would be rather more than a century and a half after the proposed date of completing the Pentateuch, but if anyone will take the trouble of comparing the places where the former verb occurs, he will find that those translators were not quite certain about the meaning of it. How could this be accounted for amongst the most learned members of a nation with whom tradition was as trustworthy as history amongst others?

The Book of Deuteronomy has become a special centre of attack. Modern critics have invented the painful theory that

the Book of the Law of the Lord, which is stated to have been found in the Temple by Hilkiah in the reign of King Josiah (2 Kings xxii. 8), was not the entire Pentateuch, but only the Book of Deuteronomy; and that Hilkiah, the high-priest, did not find it at all, but composed it, either by himself, or with the joint connivance of the king, to suit the present urgent crisis. They thus unblushingly teach that it was a mere forgery to carry out a measure of expediency.

We have said that we give a foremost place to arguments based on common-sense, such as all can understand and appreciate at their value, whatever it may be. What, then, is the purport and object in view of this book? A sensible man takes up Deuteronomy; he reads it through with ordinary care and observation. Now, leave alone who the author is (whether Moses or Hilkiah, or anyone else who lived between them, or even after the latter), what does the book teach?—what is the object in view of the writer? Surely there can be no hesitation in replying: It is a denunciation of idolatry, a protest against the practice, a warning to the people of Israel against the snare that dominated their heathen neighbours. If, therefore, the writer had this purpose at heart, and if he had belonged to the late date assigned him, he would naturally have drawn his arguments from the experiences of the nation hitherto, and would have shown how disastrous idolatry had proved to their forefathers, and exhorted them to hear and fear and not do the like. How, then, could this (supposed) late writer omit all reference to Jeroboam and the calves set up at Dan and Bethel, and the judgment that had fallen on the ten tribes till they had been rooted up out of the land which God had given them? How could such an author pass by in utter silence the introduction of Baal into Israel, and the triumph of Elijah over Ahab and Jezebel? But not a single word touching these events is found. Why? Simply because they had not then taken place; they lay in the then future, not in the past, and consequently the author knew nothing of them. In addition to this common-sense argument, this book, like the rest of the Mosaic writings, makes constant references to Egypt, which are unnatural and inconsistent if the book were written in the days of Josiah, when Egypt had lost her prestige. We have also in Deuteronomy a detailed knowledge of the geography of the Desert and of all its localities. There is frequent mention of Moses as the speaker, and there is a completeness of design and a unity of style throughout which, if a forger had imitated, he must have betrayed himself hopelessly in some matters of detail at so distant a date and with such different surroundings. Moreover, the oft-reiterated declaration, "The Lord spake unto Moses," and similar statements that involve personal communication between the "servant

faithful in all his house" and the Lord of that house—are these all to be set down to mere idealization?—in other plain but profane words, that God did not speak at all, but that Josiah and Hilkiah said He did, and the king and the high-priest, after their concoction was complete, like the Roman augurs, dared not look each other in the face, lest a laugh should put an end to their mummery? We repel such a thought with "Get thee behind me, Satan; thou art an offence unto me!" The argument, to a straightforward, honest mind, is more than conclusive. What man of the high moral tone of Josiah, the ardent reformer and zealous advocate of religion, what high-priest of the character sustained by Hilkiah, would make a forgery and publish it in the name of God? If a man were capable of such an act of lying and deception, he would be found among the idolaters and worshippers of the false gods, and not among the defenders of the faith and witnesses of the God of truth. "By their fruits ye shall know them" is a test in all ages—in those days as in our own. He that is of the truth is of God, and he that is not of the truth is not of God.

Having thus dwelt upon one or two salient features of the recent onslaught on the Law, we may proceed to the next section of the ancient Scriptures, the *Prophets*. As the Rationalists have adopted Hume's objection to miracles—that they are antecedently impossible, and so must be either denied altogether or qualified, or attributed to the interpolation of after-days—so also do they deny the possibility of *predictive* prophecy. Prophecy is only moral teaching; all seeming foresight into the future is only the penetration of a good or clever man into great general truths, the tracing of the convergence of lines that naturally lead to some distant centre, or the picturing of some ideal which will be concreted sooner or later in some great character. We have mentioned the wide range enclosed in this term "prophets." The prophetic schools were the authors, editors, and guardians of this section; hence the application of the term. All the works herein specified, the historical as well as the predictive portion, have been subjected to the scrutiny of the critic; but as it is with the prophets properly so called that the objectors have been most busy at work, we will select a well-known example for our purpose in the prophet Isaiah. It is observed that at the end of the thirty-fifth chapter the prophecy breaks off; then follow five chapters that are simply a reproduction of the parallel history given in the Kings. Probably both came from the same pen, as the Books of Kings were the work of the prophets, and the Books of the Chronicles were of the priests. The prophecy proper is resumed at the fortieth chapter. Now, in this last section there is a definite statement made that Cyrus shall be concerned in the restoration of Judah from Babylon

(xliv. 28). This, to say nothing about the distinct and accurate portraiture of the Messiah in chapter liii., is enough to call forth the animosity of the Rationalist. The Messianic prophecies are solved into the dream of the ideal reflected in that sense, not a vision fulfilled in the orthodox sense, in the person of our blessed Lord; but in the case of Cyrus there is no escape from the actual name of the benefactor, or from the fact that that statement embodied a well-known historical truth. How can it be disposed of so as to preserve their theory intact? There is only one way: we must raise the cry, The prophecy so called is not a prophecy at all; it was written after the fact. What matters it that the LXX. translators knew nothing of this? What matters it that the son of Sirach, about the same date, knew nothing of it? What matters it that Josephus says that the words were written 210 years before, and that Cyrus was moved by them to take steps in behalf of the captives? What matters it that the Baptist, the Evangelists, and St. Paul knew nothing of this novel theory? The theory must be true, because Rationalism has decided that prescience is impossible. Though Isaiah himself claims this test of truth as final, yet it cannot be, because it is contrary to the dogma of infidelity. So there must be two Isaiahs—one in the time chiefly of Hezekiah, and another who wrote after the Captivity—whose works were adroitly fastened on and affiliated to the evangelical prophet; and this prophet of their own creation or dream they adorn with the name of the "Great Unknown." Having started the theory, they search the two sections to discover any words proper to one that are not found in the other, shutting their eyes to the many words and phrases that are common to both, and forgetting, it would seem, that the one was the work of the youthful and the other of the aged prophet. We have heard something of late years advanced by a somewhat similar process to prove that the works of Shakespeare are not his, but Bacon's; but all this is being forgotten and has fallen to the ground, and time and further evidence will show also the futility of these absurd attempts to upset the creed of centuries. Volumes have been written to prove and to disprove the double, or, according to some, the manifold authorship of Isaiah. Space and circumstances alike forbid our proceeding further with the more abstruse argument founded upon language, unity of thought and purpose, balance of ideas, and unbroken tradition among both Jews and Gentiles alike; but one common-sense argument will, we are persuaded, not only appeal to the sound judgment of intelligent men, but also convince them of the identity of authorship in the roll of the prophet Isaiah. If we turn to our Bibles we shall see that throughout the Prophets the name of the prophet is always given in the superscription of his work.

The historical books, such as Judges, Samuel, and Kings, were extracts from public records that were made as the occurrences took place generation after generation, and therefore, as they had no single author, no one name could be affixed to such works, and the last editor would not venture to claim as his the record to which he had only given the finishing stroke. But with a prophecy it was quite different. This was a revelation made to one man, and that man must be authenticated to his people; hence the name of the chosen vessel of communication between God and His creatures invariably stands in the forefront of his writings. To this is frequently added, for the purpose of identification, the name of his father, as "Isaiah the prophet, the son of Amoz." In some cases the chronology is fixed by the name or names of the reigning kings. In some the country only is added to the name; two are simply entitled "the prophet"; and Amos alone, as not being a prophet professionally, merely states his occupation; and in Malachi the bare name is given. But in all the name, and in most some particulars that furnish credentials, are stated. If, therefore, the last twenty-seven chapters of Isaiah are by a different author, what are we asked to accept? That one of the longest of the prophetic rolls, one that contains the most important predictions, one that defines the hope of Israel most distinctly, one that is noted for its transcendent thoughts and composition, the brightest star in the prophetic firmament, has been left like a wanderer without a name—that the author did not substantiate the revelations he had received by his own signature; that the men of his generation, who must have hung upon his golden lips, failed to perpetuate his memory not only by writing, but tradition also; that the Jewish Church, who read his writings in their synagogues, did not investigate the authorship, and, more than that, took occasion, in the most magnificent example of the prophetic gift vouchsafed to their nation, to violate their otherwise unbroken law, and sent forth to the world the pages that are crowded with the faith and hope of future generations pinned to the skirts of another's garment, as if needing the shelter of another's authority, and claiming to be heard under the disguise of falsehood and the disgrace of an anonym. No; we cannot believe this to be the case. This glorious prophecy needed a superscription, and God has given it one—"The vision of Isaiah, the son of Amoz," and "what God hath written, he hath written." This may serve as an example. We might show other instances in which this system of conjecture catches at insufficient, and sometimes trifling, points, and, by magnifying molehills into mountains, would displace others of "the goodly fellowship"; but we must hasten to the last section of the Old Testament writings, the *Psalms*.

The Psalter, the first portion of this section, is one of the grandest strongholds of prophecy. If the antiquity of many of the Psalms in this pentateuch of sacred song can be maintained, revelation and predictive prophecy cannot be denied. "But," argues the Rationalist, "we do deny them; they are in the nature of things impossible." How, then, will they deal with all this wealth of testimony? Again they fall back upon the theory of an ideal, and dissolve the divine Apocalypse into a human dream, or say, "Let us be bold, and deny the testimony altogether. The Psalter is no ancient work; it is a composition as well as a compilation of a late date; it is a product of the period of the scribes, of the latest days of the Jewish nationality." This is the theory that has been in part, and now in whole is being urged upon us by the most advanced representatives of this school; though how they are really advantaged by this it is difficult to see. If some at least of the Psalms were written before the time of our Lord, which none attempt to question, and granting that, according to His word, the Psalms testified of Him, a prediction is as hard to make a hundred years as a thousand before the date of fulfilment. To enter into so wide a controversy would require a volume, not a brief article. We shall again confine our remarks to a common-sense rejoinder. The Psalter, every Hebraist must confess, is written in the best Hebrew, some of it in the most archaic style. After the Captivity the old language, the classical Hebrew, was laid aside and superseded by Chaldee. How could the ancient Hebrew at such a period be produced? The Scriptures had to be interpreted by the Targums or expositions in Aramaic: what use could there be in penning Psalms to be sung in the Temple or for private use in a language that none could understand? The argument is like this: A hymn-book is required for the general use of the National Church for her daily services, and for the devotions of the closet, and Convocation invites contributions, and all the contributions when sent in are found to be written in the style of Wickliffe or Chaucer. The theory has not even the charm of cleverness to recommend it: it is as feeble as it is false.

Then as to the theory of an ideal. Here we have to repeat that these critics commence their study of Scripture with the foregone conclusion that prediction is impossible, though Scripture itself asserts that doctrine and claims it as a proof of its acceptance and authority, but, finding such a remarkable correspondence between the prophetic Psalms and Him that fulfilled them, they say that there was such a longing in the hearts of Israel after an ideal man, that they pictured in their minds what sort such a man should be, and that Jesus of Nazareth satisfied these demands more than any other. One simple word upsets this argument. If the Hebrew race had framed such an ideal, and if the Rational-

istic theory that Jesus of Nazareth realized that ideal more than any other, and so in a sense fulfilled prophecy, be accepted as an explanation, we may well ask, Why did the Hebrew race, as represented by all sorts and conditions of men, their rulers, priests, scribes and rabbis, and the whole crowd of common people, reject their ideal? So far from greeting Him as the consummation of their hopes and the verification of their dreams, they one and all cried out with throats of iron, "Crucify Him! crucify Him!" Why, we repeat, did they give up their ideal to be nailed to a heathen cross? The other theory, named above, which these teachers maintain, that the Psalms are all of very late date, aggravates the case, for, according to this, the conception of the ideal must have been of quite recent date, and so the almost immediate offspring of its authors were totally ignorant of its existence, and abnegated it altogether.

In this section the book called *Ecclesiastes* has a place. It bears the superscription, "The words of the Preacher, the son of David, king in Jerusalem." It does not in these words claim definitely to be the work of Solomon, but the Jewish Church received the book as the writing of Solomon, and taught that the "Song" was written in his youth, "Proverbs" in his maturity, and "Ecclesiastes" in his old age, after his fall, when he had tasted the after-bitterness of the sweets of sin. Notwithstanding the external and internal testimony that furnish a strong probability for this view, it has been held by some since the days of Grotius, and almost universally in our present time, that this book cannot be the work of Solomon. The chief reasons alleged are of a linguistic character. We do not, in our zeal for orthodoxy, for a moment undervalue the force of this objection, and are willing to admit the argument as a fair subject for inquiry, so far as it goes; but it has been much overstated, and the difficulties on the other side have been greatly ignored. In adjusting the balances fairly, there are, to say the least, quite as many difficulties to be got rid of if we accept the modern theory as there are if we cling to the ancient one. It is true that there are many words of foreign extraction and use found in its pages which, perhaps, were not current in Jerusalem amongst the people of that city at that date; but the book was not written by them. These extraneous words, so far from presenting an insurmountable obstacle to the Solomonic authorship, may perhaps provide stepping-stones whereby we may find our way into the explanation of the mystery. Are we not told in the history of that king that he loved many strange women of the Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, Zidonians and Hittites; that of these foreign women his wives were 700 and his concubines 300? Would not such a medley cause a perfect Babel of languages? Would not constant intercourse with

them vitiate his diction? As they turned away his heart from his God, so did they degrade the pure lip of his fathers; and the book which testifies of his penitence bears the very impress of his sinful associations, and so becomes a witness of the authorship. At all events, sufficient weight has never been accorded to this historical explanation of the diction found in Ecclesiastes.

Daniel is another that is classed in the same section. In the LXX. (though Theodotion's version of the second century was adopted in place of the one first executed) this book is reckoned among the Prophets, but in the Hebrew Bible it is reckoned among the Psalms. It is quite possible that the LXX. preserved the original order, and that Jewish prejudice in post-Christian times transferred it to the place which it now occupies. Our Lord distinctly calls Daniel a prophet, and thus He seems to insist upon the arrangement of the LXX., and asserts beyond a doubt his foresight of futurity. The writings of Daniel differ in form from those of the prophets proper, in that they chiefly detail visions and dreams of himself and others and the interpretation of them. The Jews of a later period probably fastened upon this as an excuse for dislodging Daniel from his previous position, and raising the well-known cry, "Daniel is no prophet!" If so, it was bad enough in the Jew, but it is far worse for men calling themselves Christians to assert that the book is a pseudo-graph—that is, in plain language, a forgery, written in 163 B.C., the year after the death of Antiochus Epiphanes. This ground is taken because the contents of this book are supposed to depict with close accuracy the awful events of that tyrant's reign; and if it can be proved that the book was written before that date, predictive prophecy is proved beyond dispute. The critics who advance this theory support it by appeal to the language, and specially to the presence of words of Greek origin and use; but there are difficulties of equal force, if not greater, in the path of their own pursuing. It has recently been urged by Professor Margoliouth that words and usages of words found in the latest books of the Canon (and this has special reference to Ecclesiastes and Daniel) are older than words and usages which must have found place in Ecclesiasticus, which is outside the Canon. This last-named book was certainly written before the date 163 B.C., and hence the books of Ecclesiastes and Daniel must claim priority, and that, probably, by a very considerable interval. But, under all circumstances, how unavailing is this effort; for no opposition of this kind can dispose of the times and seasons, the image of the kingdoms, and the advent of the Messiah and the final triumph of His rule, all of which have been and are being verified in the history of the world.

Again, may we not ask, as a matter of common-sense, For

what purpose was this book penned and preserved? Was it not to fortify faith in the hour of trial, and could that be achieved by a modern fable or by a falsehood contrived only yesterday? The book was certainly written before the birth of our Lord, yet it predicted the date of that event, and did it fail? The dissolution of Israel's polity and temple was foretold, and has not this come to pass before our own eyes? and surely these undoubted examples of prophecy and fulfilment should confirm our faith and embolden us to believe that the residue only awaits its proper season when all the visions shall be verified.

We have given but a brief and very meagre sketch of the assaults that have been made upon the Old Testament Scriptures, and have selected a few prominent examples to show how the adversary may be repulsed—not by subtle disquisitions, but by mere common-sense and ordinary intelligence. And what is the result in looking back over the path we have trodden? On the one side we have seen the ancient Scriptures supported by the age-long history and traditions of the Jews, and by the tender care bestowed upon the text by the nation who are emphatically the witnesses of God. We have heard these Scriptures quoted by our Blessed Lord in the very passages under dispute, for He quoted from the Jehovistic portions of Genesis in His teaching, He repelled Satan by texts from Deuteronomy, He cited the second Isaiah as a prophecy of Himself, and Daniel before the High Priest and the Sanhedrim; He pointed to the Psalms as bearing witness to Himself, and echoed the prayers of the Psalter on the cross. The Apostles made these same Scriptures the basis of their preaching. They have been accepted by the universal Church; they have been brought forward as proof positive of their tenets both by the orthodox and heretics, by Christian teachers and Jewish rabbis, who, by their very antagonisms, have furnished testimony that refutes the possibility of collusion; and not a hint worth listening to, not a breath of suspicion of any weight, was uttered for, say, two thousand years. On the other side, if we omit such names as Celsus and Porphyry and Julian the Apostate in the earliest days, we reach the Middle Ages before we find an unbelieving Jew uttering a whisper which was probably meant to be as harmless as it was indefinite. Others followed at intervals, till of recent years theories have been started and called discoveries, difficulties magnified in quality and multiplied in quantity, and conjectures taught as facts; and now it has almost come to pass that if any scholar lifts his voice against the prevalent delusion, he is quietly set down as not having posted the last results. And what are the last results? They oftentimes remind one of a student who has wearied his

brain with investigation and invention, and gone to sleep with his cerebral organs excited and overwrought by his efforts. His studies flit before his dreaming mind like the mobile brilliants in a revolving kaleidoscope. On awaking he remembers something of this medley and farrago of critical phantasies, and from this nightmare of confused and contradictory thoughts and theories he elaborates a new phase in the science of theology, and this he propounds the next day to his class and to the world as the "last results" of criticism.

This is no overdrawn figure, though it may have the ring of satire; but what would be thought of the historian who, because he read in the first Prayer-book of Edward VI. evidences of a return to primitive Christianity, would pronounce the ancient Liturgies—such as that in the "Apostolical Constitutions" and the Mosarabic—to be the work of the early Reformation period? or, because the Greek text of the New Testament was almost unknown in the Western Church till the days of the Renaissance, would teach that the Greek Gospels and Epistles had their origin at that date, and were fabricated to meet the necessities of a religious crisis? Yet, if we had not independent history to controvert such propositions, the argument would be equally valid. In the Old Testament this appeal to contemporaneous history is barely possible; still, the discoveries made in Egyptian, Accadian and Assyrian relics go far to show that the historical grouping of events, as handed down in their traditions, bears a striking similarity to the Biblical documents; and the day may yet dawn, and that soon, when some conclusive evidence will be unearthed.

F. TILNEY BASSETT.

Dulverton Vicarage, May 14, 1890.



ART. IV.—SIGNIFICANT CHANGES IN ENGLISH JUDAISM.

THE prevalent idea amongst Christians concerning Judaism is that it is a kind of changeless system which has existed from age to age without any perceptible alteration; in the midst of change it has resisted change, like one of those curious organisms, the existence of which is prolonged simply because all the exhausting movements of life have been reduced to a minimum. And there can be no doubt that this has to a very great extent been the condition of Judaism for centuries. But for some time past this fossilized state of Oriental changelessness has been passing away, a new life has been stirring, and with it there has been a growing sense of restlessness. The influence of

the Rabbis has been on the wane, and modern education has suggested grave difficulties in regard to the Old Testament. The scepticism also which has been such a marked feature in Germany, in France, and in our own country has been making sad inroads. Many are drifting from the old landmarks. Rabbinitism is being discarded, old customs are being given up, and a widespread desire exists amongst the Jews to assimilate themselves, as far as possible, to their Christian surroundings. Some have even gone further than this; they have given up their Bible; and this is scarcely to be wondered at, for the Old Testament, taken by itself, is clearly incomplete; it inspires hopes which have never been realized, and it tells of a Messiah which, according to Jewish belief, has never come.

But while this has for some years past been the existing condition of things, many will read with astonishment the statements made in the "Jewish Quarterly" of last year. This review is conducted with very considerable ability by Mr. J. Abrahams and Mr. C. G. Montefiore, and the larger number of contributors to its pages are Jews. According to the prospectus in the first number, every section of Jewish opinion is invited to co-operate, and the promise is made that all contributions will be treated with perfect impartiality. The editors deplore the fact that Judaism in England has but a feeble interest in its own history and literature, and the best sources of instruction on the Hebrew Bible are to be found, not amongst Jews, but amongst Christian scholars. From the pen of Professor Graetz we have two articles upon the significance of Judaism, for the present and for the future, and in the former of these the significant question is asked, "How can Judaism maintain itself if its most distinguished sons, the cultured classes, turn their backs upon it?" "Even the fidelity of the poor," he adds, "is not secured, for they urge their children to adopt the culture of the time, and to strive to obtain equality and social position by means of scientific ability. This is the case in Germany, Austria, Russia, and the Danubian Principalities; it has spread even to the Turkish Orient, and has crossed over into Africa. How, then, shall the existence of Judaism be continued? or will it have no further existence? Has it already fulfilled its mission? And is it no longer anything but an unsubstantial ghost, fitting from place to place, and longing only for the rest of the grave?" This inquiry he answers by telling us in substance that it can only exist by sweeping away the whole ceremonial system, and all those observances and customs which have hitherto made the Jews a distinct people, by the adoption of what has been called a "minimum of religion;" and by the proclamation of humanity, and a rational Monotheism—for it is only by so doing that it can adopt a universal and cosmopolitan

character, and compete with Unitarianism and Christianity." The ritual observances of the law, he informs us, were given to wean the people from the idolatry of polytheistic worship, and are not of any permanent significance. To touch a corpse, or to come into contact with death, was a protest against the mummy worship of Egypt. The prohibition to eat the flesh of certain quadrupeds, birds, fishes, and reptiles, was a protest against the Egyptian worship of animals; the ceremony of the red heifer was the destruction from amongst them of the red bull, which was worshipped in certain districts of Egypt; and the rite of the scapegoat was a warning against the lascivious goat-worship, mentioned by Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus; and in the ceremonial connected with it we are to see simply the symbol of unchastity driven out of the camp of Israel. These, he insists, must all be set aside, retaining only what he calls "the essence of Judaism," that is, an "ethical idealism," which means "humanity in the highest sense of the word, and a pure rational Monotheism freed from all mysticism and disfigurement."

The Reform Movement has (as is well known) been slowly spreading amongst the Jews, and reform, speaking generally, means some kind of rationalism; but the actual position at which the movement has arrived will come upon many with feelings of surprise. Mr. Montefiore, commenting upon Dr. Ritter's "Text Book of Reformed Judaism," published last year in Berlin, tells us that according to the teaching of this book there must be an "abandonment of every national and political element, such as the dietary laws, the Tifillin, and the Tzitzith; the Sabbath must be transferred to Sunday, so that the sanctifying objects and results may be enjoyed by the whole community; the worshipper, when entering the Synagogue, should bare his head, and the service should be conducted, not in the sacred Hebrew, but in the vernacular; we may not ask God in prayer for any particular boon, for no special interposition on the part of God is possible; and miracles are to be regarded as allegoric, poetic veils through which the higher ethical meaning is to be elicited; orthodoxy may believe in a personal Messiah and the renewal of the national life in Palestine, but reform has abandoned both these articles of faith, and clings only to the slow progress of mankind in knowledge, goodness, and pure religion; and to this Judaism is to contribute its share, but there is nothing said respecting the hope which religion offers of a life beyond the grave."

These statements are sufficiently startling, but they are comparatively weak when compared with those which appear in an article upon English Judaism, by Mr. Israel Zangwill. At p. 379 he says: "If Israel is to bring light to the nations, it must first have light within itself, but to say that Anglo-Israel has this light is to utter an empty compliment. We are not

irradiated with the light of the new knowledge, and we seem to have lost the light of the old. English Judaism is an immense chaos of opinions. We do not know where we are. We have endless disputes in the press when the real issue is obscured; endless arguments when neither party is convinced." Again, he says (p. 389): "Converts from alien races may be regarded as a *quantité négligéable*, while deserters from Judaism are daily becoming more numerous, and the orthodox East End itself contains a very nest of Atheistic Socialists." With regard to this last sentence it may be mentioned that the two principal text books on Socialism—Marx's "Critique on Capital," and Lassalles' "System of Acquired Rights," in which the attempt is made to show that capital is robbery—are written by Jews; and last year, in the columns of the *Worker's Friend*, a paper which apparently emanates from a London Socialistic Club, a banquet was advertised by the Jews to take place upon the day of atonement, the one fast day of the Jewish year—thus, in the most emphatic sense pouring contempt upon the most sacred rites of Judaism.

We are told again (p. 398) that :

All over the world the old Judaism is breaking down. In Germany the reactionary work of a Hirsch has no seed of life within itself; the constructive work of Mendelssohn has failed; the plutocracy is ennobled, and goes over to Christianity—most frequently to the Catholic form of it. The educated are chiefly agnostics, and are not even inspired by that hollow ghost of racial unity which is born of interest in one another's births, marriages, and deaths. In Austria the Jewish teachers have openly broken with Judaism; in Australia Judaism is an anæmic invalid; in America the most liberal doctrines of natural religion are preached by salaried Jewish ministers. American Judaism reflects the very form and pressure of the age. Rabbi Krauskopf, of Philadelphia, expounded before a vast audience at a Sunday-sabbath service, at which a new ritual compiled by him was used, the method by which we advance from the old to the new. We refuse, he says, to look upon Judaism as the absolutely perfect and God-given religion. We discard the belief that the Bible was written by God, or by man under the dictation of God; and therefore, infallible, and binding upon all men and ages. We discard the belief in the coming of a personal Messiah who will lead us back to Palestine, and then establish a theocracy to which all nations of the earth shall be tributary. We reject the belief in a bodily resurrection, in the torments of hell, the rewards of Paradise, prophecy, and all Biblical and Rabbinical beliefs, rites, ceremonies, and institutions which neither elevate nor sanctify our lives. However comforting and useful they may have been in their day, they are now obsolete, misleading, and frequently injurious.

And yet this is the creed, if creed it can be called, which is put forward as Judaism. In England "the idolatry of blind Bible worship has died out among the cultured; both orthodox and reformed Judaism seem to suffer from that defect, which Oriental thought regarded as so serious—sterility.

Both Biblical and Rabbinical Judaism seem to have had their day, and the cloak which could not be torn off by the tempest of Christianity and persecution bids fair to be thrown off under the sunshine of rationalism and tolerance." Again, he asks the question of Professor Graetz,—Has Judaism a future? And his answer seems to be that "Judaism will have a future if the future has no Judaism!" The real struggle of the future, he adds, will be "between the essence of Judaism and the essence of Christism, the scientific morality of Moses and the emotional morality of Christ; and a compromise between the religious provisions for moral geniuses and those for moral dullards will perhaps form the religion of the future!"

Here, then, we have a sketch of modern Judaism, and specially of Judaism in England, drawn by the pen of intelligent Jews themselves, and appearing in a review which pledges itself to unreserved truthfulness and impartiality, and which certainly, in many respects, exhibits very considerable ability; but it may be said that the picture here presented is only applicable to that section of the Jews which is in sympathy with the Reform movement. This may be partially true, but with the exception of Dr. Ritter's book, these writers make no such limitation. The condition of things described is in many respects a dark and melancholy one, and shows us how terribly the philosophic speculations of our time have told upon the Jewish faith; and yet, if we reflect for a moment, we can scarcely wonder, for the Old Testament cannot stand alone, and the puerilities of Rabbinic literature will not bear the light of modern criticism.

We have been accustomed to think that it was the religion of the Jew which kept him continuously distinct, but now a process of disintegration seems swiftly to be going forward in almost every direction. The late Professor Deutsch, a few years ago, said in a German paper that "Judaism was rapidly losing ground by ceaseless disintegration," and it is not a little remarkable that the official statistics that very year in Vienna showed that 232 had been admitted by baptism into the Church. And this is exactly what is taking place at the present time; with this difference, that each year brings with it an accelerated movement. The religion which has stood the lapse of ages seems at last to be giving way, and a unique opportunity is presented to the Church of Christ, an opportunity for which she has prayed and waited in vain for centuries. Nothing can be clearer than that man cannot live long upon mere negatives; the human mind will search for positive truth. Dissolution must be followed by reconstruction in some form, and whether that form will be materialism or Christianity depends upon the energy and effectiveness of the missionary efforts which are put forth.

With these facts before us, let us turn to the results of Christian endeavour. We have read in past years many reports of the work of the London Society, and we have watched for years with deep interest the progress of Jewish evangelization; but never before have we read a report more full of hope and encouragement than that which has been presented for the present year. Never before have we felt the call to action so imperative, and never before have we heard the voice of God speaking so plainly. Already the movement from the negative to the positive has commenced, and a distinct approximation of the Jews towards Christianity is traceable in many directions. At Harrow, for a long time, an effort had been made to obtain a house where the many Jews who attend the school could be located. For eight years such a house has been provided, but instead of the Jewish boys going there, more than half of them are to be found in the Christian houses, attending chapel, and some of them actually helping in the choir; and what is true of Harrow is true in a lesser degree of some of the other great schools of the kingdom. Nor is this drawing towards Christianity confined to the upper classes; it extends to all ranks in society. A clergyman, who has large parish schools, mentions the fact that one-third of the scholars are Jews, and that they are never withdrawn from religious instruction. And in the first report of the Education Commission, Mr. Waller, the secretary of the Wesleyan Education Committee, states that though there are many Jewish children attending their schools, they are very rarely withdrawn from the usual Christian instruction. Two years since the secretary of a branch of the Young Men's Christian Association stated that sixty Jewish young men had recently applied to be admitted as members, and it is well known that many, in different parts of the country, who are not baptized regularly attend the services of the Church. Last year Mr. Barnett Saul, B.A., of the Jews' College, took a first class prize at the London University, for proficiency in the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, the Greek text of the New, in the evidences of the Christian religion, and in Scripture History. The Rev. T. M. Eppstein, Principal of the Home Mission, speaks of two hundred inquirers, of forty receiving baptism, and of eighty more making application for the sacred rite. And the Rev. M. Wolkenberg, from the Midlands, tells of "a work extensive, progressing, and penetrating all classes of Jews. There are no startling incidents, no sensational episodes, but a quiet leavening process is everywhere discernible." And the Rev. T. C. S. Kroenig, of Hull, says: "The Jews all over the world are in a state of anticipation, and never before did they admit as a body that mission work had made an inroad upon them." We might multiply testimonies of this kind almost without limit. We might tell of cases of conversion which are happening every day, but we refrain; we have said

enough to show that the present is an exceptional period. Judaism seems like some ancient fortress, before which the armies of the Church of God have assembled; but age after age has passed, and little impression has been made. During the last fifty years more energetic efforts have been put forth, and as the smoke and dust of the conflict partially clear away, here and there we may have seen a tower which has toppled over, or a bastion which has been demolished or overturned; still the defences have retained much of their former strength. But now a strange phenomenon is taking place: the ground beneath the fortress seems to be heaving and parting asunder, and the walls are being shaken as by an invisible hand. Those old ramparts which have withstood the assaults of centuries are giving way, and the whole is rapidly become a mass of irrecoverable ruin and disorder. The defenders have lost faith in their defences; some are deserting the fortress, and others are in communication with the enemy, and are actually asking us to enter in and take possession. Is this a time for us (when God seems specially to have intervened) to fold our arms and do nothing? Shall we not rather listen to the whisper of the Divine Spirit, and take up the battle cry of Israel's ancient leader, blow the trumpet of deliverance, and each man endeavour to "ascend up straight before him"? If we would only unitedly do this in the strength of 'he Lord, all difficulties would be speedily overcome, and the city would be taken; but to do it we want more enthusiasm, more of the spirit of the Master. Let us ask Him to pour out upon His Church a deeper interest in this great and blessed work! During the next five-and-twenty years the question of English Judaism will be to a great extent settled; and that question is nothing less than this, whether the masses shall be allowed to drift over to materialism, and so be lost to the Church of God; or whether they shall be enrolled beneath the banner of the cross of Christ. We are passing through a seminal period, a crisis in the history of Israel, and the use we make of the present will most assuredly determine the conditions of the problem for many years to come. May God give us grace to be faithful, to respond to the call, and to make some personal sacrifice to bring the Jews to the feet of our blessed Master and Lord.

J. EUSTACE BRENNAN.



ART. V.—COVENANT *VERSUS* TESTAMENT.

WITH ESPECIAL REFERENCE TO HEB. IX. 15-18.

WE have not come to a satisfactory conclusion as to whether the book, which contains the records of our Lord and His disciples, ought to be called the Scriptures of the "New Testa-

ment," or of the "New Covenant." In the Authorized Version we read, not of the blood of a "New Covenant," but of that of a "New Testament," while in the Revised Version the word "covenant" is admitted into the text, and "Testament" is relegated to the margin, in translating our Lord's words at the institution of the Eucharist.

It is easy enough to argue that the expression "blood of a testament" is a simple absurdity, while the phrase "blood of a covenant" refers us at once to the ratification of a covenant by sacrifice; and that the very idea of a will or testament is unknown throughout the Hebrew Scriptures, and was probably unknown in ordinary life to the Jews, as such, during our Lord's earthly lifetime, although the semi-Roman "regulus," Herod the Great, left both a will and codicils attached to it. Nay, the best authorities speak still more strongly as to the non-existence of wills or testaments in early society. The late Sir H. S. Maine, in his admirable work on "Ancient Law" (chap. vi., p. 177), "ventures to affirm generally that, in all indigenous societies, a condition of jurisprudence in which testamentary privileges are *not* allowed, or rather not contemplated, has preceded that later stage of legal development in which the mere will of the proprietor is permitted under more or less of restriction to override the claims of his kindred in blood." And, again, at the end of chap. vii. : "The blessing mentioned in the Scriptural history of Isaac and his sons has sometimes been spoken of as a will, but it seems rather to have been a mode of naming an eldest son." Viewed thus in the light of ancient history rather than in the twilight of modern exegesis, the absurdity of the terms "Old and New Testament" becomes still more manifest.

But the advocates of "testament," though unable to refute the arguments brought against them, yet turn with triumph to another passage in the Scriptures, which is plainly more or less of a commentary on the words of our Lord, and challenge their opponents to produce a satisfactory explanation of it, which shall involve the word "covenant" instead of "testament." It is true that "testament" comes out of the contest, as regards the passage itself, and still more as regards the context of the passage, no better than "covenant." Indeed, each party is able to prove its opponents to be more or less in the wrong, but neither can make out its own case to the satisfaction of a reasonable bystander. Of this passage (Heb. ix. 15-18), which is referred to in the heading of the present article, neither party can make sense, and, therefore, neither party can properly extract doctrine from it; it does not, however, therefore follow that there is nothing in it, as some people would have us believe, but rather that the proper key to it has not yet been discovered.

If we look at the Authorized Version of the passage we find it running as follows :

Ver. 15 : And for this cause He is the mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance. Ver. 16 : For where a testament is there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. Ver. 17 : For a testament is of force after men are dead, otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth. Ver. 18 : Whereupon (wherefore) neither the first testament was dedicated without blood.

Here the word *διαθήκη* is uniformly translated by "testament," neither—over and above the objections already stated to that word—can we find much serious fault with the rendering of the Greek into the English idiom, except (1) that in ver. 15 "by means of death" ought to have been literally translated "a death having taken place," and the article "the" ought to have been inserted before "eternal inheritance." (2) That the word *φέρουσιν* in ver. 16 is translated by "be," or, in other words, that it is reduced to a simple copula, which is unexampled. In the margin an alternative reading "be brought in" is given, which, as will hereafter appear, is infinitely better. (3) That *ἐπι νεκροῖς* in ver. 17 does not and cannot mean "after men are dead," and that *βεβαία* does not mean "of force," but "certain," "firm," "fixed," "stable," or "to be relied on."

Let us now see how the Revisers have dealt with the passage :

Ver. 15 : And for this cause He is the mediator of a new covenant, that a death having taken place for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant, they that have been called may receive the promise of the eternal inheritance. Ver. 16 : For where a testament is, there must of necessity be the death of him that made it. Ver. 17 : For a testament is of force where there hath been death, for doth it ever avail while he that made it liveth? Ver. 18 : Wherefore even the first covenant hath not been dedicated without blood.

Here, too, we find a note attached to the words "covenant" and "testament," that "the Greek word here used signifies both 'covenant' and 'testament.'" The statement is true with regard to classical Greek, but is misleading as regards the Scriptures. For the word *διαθήκη* never occurs in the Septuagint version in the sense of "testament," but only in that of "covenant." And what an extraordinary course of proceeding do we find here foisted upon so careful and logical a writer as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. He is made in ver. 15 to use *διαθήκη* twice in the sense of "covenant," in verses 16 and 17, without notice or apology, to jump to using it twice in the sense of "testament," and that as the ground (introduced by "for") of the statements in ver. 15; and, finally, another jump is made in ver. 18 back

to the original sense of "covenant," in a logical inference introduced by "wherefore" from the statements made in 16 and 17 with regard to the word used in the sense of "testament." I, for my part, refuse to condemn such a writer as guilty of so hopeless and incongruous a jumble.

I would further remark on the work of the Revisers, that in ver. 16 the substitution of "him that made it" for "the testator" is a very questionable alteration, destroying, as it does, the undoubted play of words in *διαθήκη* and *τοῦ διαθεμένου*. And that in ver. 17, "where there hath been death," is even further from the original than "after men are dead," and that even the note professing to give the exact representation of the Greek is incorrect. It runs thus "Gr. *over the dead*." But there is no article in the original *ἐπὶ νεκροῖς*, which is literally "over dead bodies," whatever that may mean. I have already stated the objection to the translation of *βεβαία* by "of force" in ver. 17, and I must add the remark that *ἰσχύει* does not mean "avail," but corresponds to the Latin "valet," signifying "is valid" in a technical legal sense. Whether we write, "for is it ever valid while the testator liveth?" or "for it is never valid, while the testator liveth," is a matter of no importance to the argument.

Now, there is no pretence whatever for calling the Mosaic dispensation a "testament" at all; and, moreover, a will or testament has no connection with sacrifice, the idea of which is unmistakably brought in in ver. 18, "Wherefore even the first covenant is represented in the Scriptures as not having been inaugurated without blood." Nor is anything gained by those who make the sacred writers call the new dispensation a *διαθήκη*—De Wette goes so far as to use in his translation the German word "Stiftung," an "institution"—in one sense, while they suppose them to call the old dispensation a *διαθήκη* in a totally different sense. Surely the meaning of *διαθήκη* intended by our Lord and His disciples must be common to both expressions. The translation of *διαθήκη* by "testament," which would have been good in classical Greek, must therefore be entirely rejected, and reliance be placed upon the LXX. Version, which uniformly uses *διαθήκη* as the Greek equivalent for *בְּרִית*, a covenant or engagement between two parties. Nay, the late Dr. Hatch has informed us in his "Essays on Biblical Greek," that "in ignorance of the philology of later and vulgar Latin, it was formerly supposed that 'testamentum,' by which the word [*διαθήκη*] is rendered in the early Latin versions as well as in the Vulgate, meant 'testament' or 'will,' whereas, in fact, it meant also, if not exclusively, 'covenant.'" Du Cange, under "Testamentum," quotes the definition: "Quævis charta testium subscriptionibus firmata." From notes to a diploma of King

Veremund (Pharamond, whose floruit was contemporary with the death of St. Jerome) he gives: "It was customary in these and many subsequent times to call any donation made by a king or high nobles (and even by private persons) an actual testamentum, as if by this name it was consolidated with greater legal force." A law of the Ripuarian Franks gives us "Testamentum venditionis," "a contract of sale." Possibly this vulgar use of "testamentum" may have long preceded its appearance in official documents.

Let me now translate, as literally and exactly as possible, the whole passage under consideration. Writing "covenant" for "testament," and "covenantor" for "testator," and observing the critical remarks above made as to other defects in the translation, we have:

Ver. 15: And for this cause He is mediator of a new covenant, that a death having taken place for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant, the called may receive the promise of the eternal inheritance. Ver. 16: For where there is a covenant, there must of necessity be brought in a death of the covenantor. Ver. 17: For a covenant over dead bodies is to be relied on, since is it ever valid, when the covenantor is living? Ver. 18: Whence neither is the first covenant represented as inaugurated without blood.

A most extraordinary attempt has been made to extract a sense out of the passage literally translated with the word "covenant" throughout, but with the substitution of "mediating victim" for "covenantor." This brings it into connection with sacrifice, and might have been accepted in default of anything better, could any authority be produced for the translation of *ὁ διαθέμενος* by "mediating victim." But grammar, lexicon and usage are alike against this, and it can only be looked upon as an extremely ingenious conjecture made to overleap the difficulties of the passage. It also meets with a serious obstacle in ver. 17, where the writer either inquires whether a covenant is ever valid, or insists that it is never valid, "when the mediating victim is alive." This looks as if a covenant could be prevented from taking effect by keeping alive a certain victim, called the "mediating victim." And nowhere is any trace of such a victim to be found. Nor would such a victim be *ὁ διαθέμενος*; it would rather have been *τὸ διατιθέμενον*, if *διατίθεσθαι* could have any such signification, which, in default of any actual instance, we may affirm to be impossible. Although, therefore, it can boast many respectable names in its favour, it must be rejected by everyone who has regard for the Greek grammar, the Greek lexicon, and the principles of the Greek language, according to which *ὁ διαθέμενος* can, in such a connection, mean nothing but the "testator" or the "covenantor," *ὁ τὴν διαθήκην ποιησάμενος*.

But let us return for a moment and consider what the argu-

ment of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews really is. He has described the Son of God as a mediating priest between God and man, and he now proceeds to describe Him as a sacrificial victim. And, first of all, as a sin-offering on the part of man, in whom man suffered a symbolical death for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant, that the called might receive the promise of the eternal inheritance. Let us assume that God is the *διαθέμενος* or covenantor, who wishes by a covenant made with sacrifice to guarantee in a manner in which 'it is impossible that He should lie,' the permanency of the New Covenant. For where there is a covenant there needs must be brought in [or brought to bear] (*φέρεισθαι*) a death of the covenantor. For a covenant over dead bodies is sure, since is it ever valid when the covenantor is living?

Here we have a general statement, that the death in some sense or other of the covenantor is necessary to the validity, permanency and reliable nature of his covenant. And the expression *ἐπὶ νεκροῖς*, "over dead bodies," to which we may supply either *ἱεροῖς*, "victims," or *τοῖς διατιθεμένοις*, "the covenanting parties," leads us at once to the idea of a covenant made "with" or, literally, "upon sacrifice," *על-י-זבח* (Ps. l. 5), the victims representing the parties to the covenant, and the deaths of the parties being "brought in" by the deaths of the victims. Thus every word in the passage has its force, and those which are slurred over or loosely paraphrased in former translations are shown to have their especial significance in the connection. Furthermore, the LXX. version of Ps. l. 5 corresponds still more closely with *ἐπὶ νεκροῖς* in Heb. ix. 17. It runs: *τοὺς διατιθεμένους τὴν διαθήκην αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ θυσίαις*. As the sacrifice of Christ was a human sacrifice, the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews probably made the change of *ἐπὶ νεκροῖς* for *ἐπὶ θυσίαις*, with special reference to that great and final sacrifice.

Now, what primary idea or principle of sacrifice is involved in these details? Evidently that the death of a representative victim or victims is taken as that of the offerer, who suffers a symbolical death in it or them, thus retaining no power of altering the so-made covenant than if he had actually ceased to exist. God, then, in giving His son to die for man, did not merely give Him to stand for man in His death as a sin-offering, but also to stand for Himself as a federal or covenantal offering.

The passage is thus quite clear. Christ, both God and man, stands for both God and man in His death. He dies for man, that man, suffering a symbolical death in Him, may be clean to approach God; He dies for God also, as a federal or covenantal

victim, that God may give the human race the solemn guarantee of a sacrificial covenant, "in which it is impossible that God should lie," to certify the immutability of His counsel to establish a permanent and unchangeable covenant with it.

We have thus, from the words of the Epistle to the Hebrews, arrived at a primary idea of sacrifice, which we must now *try* upon the various phenomena that present themselves in the Scriptures, in connection with sacrifice, to see whether it is or is not in harmony with and explanatory of them. Let us apply it to the explanation of the first sacrifices on record, those of Cain and Abel, in which we shall not find ourselves diverging much from the received opinion.

Man appears, from the preceding history in the book of Genesis, to have lain under sentence of immediate death, which seems, on his repentance, to have been commuted for a life of toil and sorrow. Coeval with this appears the institution of sacrifice. Applying my primary idea of sacrifice, I see that man in his then state could only approach God through death, but that he was mercifully allowed to approach him through a representative victim, the death whereof was *pro hac vice* mercifully taken as his own. After such a death, and before he had polluted himself by fresh sin, he was enabled to approach his Maker acceptably. Abel approached God with, Cain without, a victim. Abel thus suffered a symbolical death, as a sinful being under sentence of death, before he ventured to approach his Creator; Cain approached God as one who had a right to approach Him, expecting his gifts to be received as of right, and was consequently rejected. Not a word is said in the Scriptural account of the moral or religious frame of mind of either of them, and the acceptance of the one and the rejection of the other would seem purely arbitrary, were it not for the appearance of sacrifice in the matter.

Next comes the sacrifice of Noah after leaving the ark. By sacrifice Noah acknowledged the preservation of himself and his family, suffering a symbolical death in the victims in acknowledgment of having been preserved from a real death, and thus entering into a new state of life.

Thirdly, we have the remarkable sacrifice offered by Abraham, and the consequent covenant made with him by God, which are recorded in Gen. xv. 7-18. Here, apparently, Abraham approached God after suffering a symbolical death in his sin-offerings. God then took to Himself the death of the same victims in respect of His covenant with Abraham, and guaranteed its immutable nature, by passing between the pieces of the victims under the symbols of a smoking furnace and a burning lamp.

The sacrifice of the ram instead of Isaac in Gen. xxii. is

manifestly treated in Heb. xi. 19 as a symbolical death on the part of Isaac. It is there said that Abraham received him from the dead (*ἐκ νεκρῶν*), *ἐν παραβολῇ*, "in a figure," i.e., after suffering a symbolical death in his representative, the substituted ram. *Ἐκ νεκρῶν* being here used with regard to a merely symbolical death and resurrection, an additional probability is given to the very similar interpretation which I have proposed for *ἐπὶ νεκροῖς* in Heb. ix. 17, viz., *ἐπὶ νεκροῖς τοῖς διατιθεμένοις*.

We now come to the Passover. Here the explanation is obvious and easy. A lamb was taken for every family, representing the first-born of that family. The first-born of the Egyptians suffered a real death in their own proper persons, those of the Israelites a symbolical death in the lambs that represented them.

Again we have the dedication of the first covenant (Exod. xxiv. 3-8) "not without blood" (Heb. ix. 13). Moses here acted as a *μεσίτης*, or mediator in the ordinary sense, between God and the people. The altar, probably with the Book of the Law upon it (Heb. ix. 19), stood on God's part, the people stood for themselves. Moses sprinkled both parties to the covenant with the blood of the victims, indicating that both suffered a symbolical death in them, and that the covenant was thenceforth unchangeable.

The sacrifices at consecrating the priests (Exod. xxix.) evidently betokened a symbolical death on the part of Aaron and his sons, who suffered in their representative victims before they could be admitted to approach God on behalf of the people.

Lastly, the grand sacrifice of expiation on the great day of atonement involved a symbolical death on the part of the high priest before he was allowed to act as such for the people, and a symbolical death on the part of the people collectively, after which the whole nation began a new life, to have a similar symbolical end the next year. The sins with respect to which they had suffered this symbolical death were put upon the head of the scapegoat, and with him removed to a distant region.

It is also necessary to remark that our Lord was not only the *μεσίτης*, or mediator, the agent acting between the parties, but also the *ἔγγυος*, or "surety," of the new and better covenant (Heb. vii. 22). *Μεσίτης* is used in the sense of *ἔγγυος* by Josephus, *Ant.*, 4, 6, 7, and would have been an ambiguous term in Heb. vii. 22, whereas there can be no misapprehension as to the meaning of *ἔγγυος*. And how can we find a more deep and solemn explanation of our Lord's "suretyship of the new and better covenant," than in His actual death, and His Father's symbolical death in Him, as the ratifying victim of the grand and immutable covenant made between God and man upon the cross?

No other theory of sacrifice, especially as connected with covenants, has been found which offers a solution of the difficulties of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Is there not, therefore, a fair probability, at any rate, that what I have advanced is either the right theory or a close approximation to it? No question arises here about God's justice in punishing the innocent instead of the guilty; no difficulties arise on the subject of satisfaction. All is mercy, but mercy worked out according to a plan laid down from the beginning, showing itself in the first institution of sacrifice, appearing from time to time under the patriarchal and Mosaic dispensations, and finally assuming transcendent greatness in the culminating sacrifice of the death of Christ; a golden thread running through the records of generations and ages till it is time for it to be gathered up into a ladder to reach from earth to heaven.

Several other passages of Scripture which had not previously yielded to any commentator fly open at once at the touch of this magic wand. Gal. ii. 19: *διὰ νόμον νόμφ ἀπέθανον*, "By the law I died to the law," is explained in an instant. By the regular rule of death in a representative victim, acknowledged by the Mosaic law, I died to that very law: "I have been crucified with Christ." So, too, Rom. vi. 7, where *ὁ ἀποθανὼν δεδικαίωται ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας*, "He that has died stands justified from his sin," is put as the basis upon which St. Paul raises the superstructure of our baptismal death in Christ and consequently altered condition. He who has suffered a death in a representative victim stands justified from the sin with respect to which he has suffered such a symbolical death. We have suffered such a death in baptism to our former sinful state; how can we any more live in sin with which we have thus formally broken our connection?

I must not omit to notice that in Heb. ix. 20 the expression used is *τῆς διαθήκης ἧς ἐνετείλατο*, not *διέθετο, πρὸς ὑμᾶς ὁ Θεός*, which might possibly be supposed to militate somewhat against my theory. But a simple explanation is that the writer, quoting from memory, took *ἐνετείλατο* from Ps. cxi. 9, instead of *διέθετο* from Ex. xxiv. 8.

Finally, let me return to the passage principally under discussion and paraphrase it at length, showing how simple and how clear it is when taken to pieces and put together again with the missing element supplied.

And therefore it is that Christ is the Mediator, both as mediating priest (*μεσίτης*) and ratifying victim or surety (*ἔγγυος*) of a new covenant between God and man, in order that, His death having taken place as a sin-offering on the part of man, for the redemption and release of the transgressions committed under the old covenant, thus clearing away any obstacle in the way of the transition from the old to the new, those called

to live under the new covenant may receive the promise now of the eternal inheritance hereafter. And this death of Christ is not merely a sin-offering on the part of man, but also a federal sacrifice in addition to the oath of God, as a pledge and security, that God, by symbolically dying in Him, His representative victim, as well as that of man, has guaranteed that He will not alter the terms of salvation freely offered under the new or gospel covenant. For, where there is a treaty or covenant, which is to be rendered certain and unchangeable, a death on the part of the covenantor or maker of the covenant must be brought in or brought to bear symbolically in that of his representative victim or victims. For a covenant made over the corpses of sacrificed victims representing the contracting parties is certain and sure, since, unless such a symbolical death has been suffered, it is never valid, stable, and unchangeable, when the covenantor, who has otherwise not given full security against a change of mind, is living.

A. H. WRATISLAW.

90, Manor Road, Stoke Newington, N.

P.S.—It will be observed that the above explanation of Heb. ix. 15-18 is identical with that which, after writing the above, I rejoiced to find given by Professor Westcott in his recent learned and exhaustive edition of the Epistle to the Hebrews. The two solutions have, however, no connection whatever with each other. In 1859 I published a little volume, "Barabbas the Scapegoat, and other Sermons and Dissertations," in which the dissertation intitled "God's Death in Christ" occupies pages 151-167. This contained the whole matter as addressed to a reader unacquainted with Greek. In April, 1860, I printed a letter in the "Journal of Sacred Literature" on the "Primary Idea of Sacrifice," and in 1863 combined the dissertation and the letter in a volume of "Notes and Dissertations principally on Difficulties in the Scriptures of the New Covenant." But I was but crying in the wilderness, and no one took any notice of the important matters which I brought forward. For thirty-one years I thus continued to cry in vain. But now Professor Westcott has arrived independently at the selfsame conclusion as to Heb. ix. 15-18, and now I presume the matter will be taken up and properly discussed and considered. Of the eventual result I have no doubt.—A. H. W.

Reviews.

The Epistle to the Hebrews: The Greek Text, with Notes and Essays. By BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT, D.D., D.C.L. Macmillan, 1889. Pp. lxxxiv., 504.

THIS work appeared shortly before the author of it was chosen, with wide-spread approbation and deep thankfulness, to follow his brother professor and friend as Bishop of Durham. Its fulness, ripeness, and weightiness will make all who can appreciate such work anxious lest the heavy burden of other duties which has been laid upon him should prevent him from enriching Christian literature with anything more of the kind. Not that one regrets the heavy price which Christendom of necessity pays when a great theologian and scholar consents to dedicate his powers

to an office which must greatly curtail his literary activity, but that one hopes that the contemplation of such a volume as this will lead all who have influence in the matter to reduce the unavoidable invasion of the scholar's time to a minimum. If others will endeavour to minimize their claims upon his attention by applying to chaplains and archdeacons rather than to the bishop himself, and if he will allow merely mechanical work to be done by others, time may still be found for another volume or two equal in excellence and instructiveness to the one which now lies before us. When the "Speaker's Commentary" was in preparation, it was stated that 2 Peter was to have been undertaken by Dr. Lightfoot. An adequate treatment of the difficult problems connected with that most perplexing epistle is still a great desideratum; and among living scholars there is no one more competent to deal with them than the author of the present commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews. To supplement his friend's uncompleted work is the sacred task to which he has now devoted himself, and a volume like this one, dealing in a similar manner with 2 Peter and Jude, would be a welcome closing of a gap which Bishop Lightfoot left, and which very few can fill.

The commentary on Hebrews gives to the world the main results of the immense amount of study which has already produced "Christus Consummator." It is emphatically a book for students, and a great deal of it can be properly appreciated by none but fairly advanced students. Although there is a great deal that may be read with pleasure by any intelligent person, yet there is also a great deal that is by no means easy reading for anyone; and, as in most of the author's works, there are some passages in which even those who are well acquainted with the subject will find it difficult to extract the precise meaning. This is no doubt a defect, and to the eager student it is rather a serious one. It would be rash to dogmatize as to the cause of it; but the impression is left on the reader that this want of clearness is not the result of indecision. The writer has made up his own mind, and has a decided opinion; but he is not successful in conveying clear ideas as to the contents of this opinion to others. Language which adequately expresses a complex product of thought to the person who has gone through the whole process of reaching it may not be the best form of words by which to place others in possession of what has thus been reached.

To the ordinary reader one of the most interesting questions respecting the Epistle to the Hebrews is, Who wrote it? On this point Dr. Westcott leaves us very much where Origen did. God alone knows. He gives us an admirable summary of the history of the problem; but he does not attempt to solve it, for he does not believe that materials for a solution are extant. He is decidedly of opinion that neither St. Paul nor Clement is the author, and that St. Luke, St. Barnabas and Apollos are only persons who, equally with others (*e.g.*, Silas), *might* have written it. Among the names of those who are inclined to follow Tertullian in assigning the Epistle to the Hebrews to St. Barnabas, Dr. Salmon is omitted. (See his "Introduction to the N.T.," 4th ed., pp. 465-471.)

Some of the ways in which Dr. Westcott indicates that St. Paul cannot be the author are worth noting. Without arguing the question of a

second Roman imprisonment, he places the death of St. Paul A.D. 65. "The fire at Rome, which first brought the Christians into popular notice, took place in A.D. 64, and St. Paul was martyred in the next year." But the Epistle was most probably written just before the commencement of the Jewish War in 67, for "the writer speaks of the visible signs of the approach of 'the day' (x. 25; comp. viii. 13, *ἔγγυς ἀφανισμοῦ*), and indicates the likelihood of severer trials for the Church (xii. 4, *οὐπω*, xiii. 13 f.)." The persecution under Nero is one terminus, the destruction of Jerusalem is another, before and after which the letter cannot have been written. Theories which assign it to the reigns of Domitian or of Trajan "seem to be utterly irreconcilable with the conditions and scope of the writing" (pp. xlii., xliii.).

The *style* is on the same side as the probable date. "The calculated force of the periods is sharply distinguished from the impetuous eloquence of St. Paul. The author is never carried away by his thoughts. He has seen and measured all that he desires to convey to his readers before he begins to write. . . . No book represents with equal clearness the mature conclusions of human reflection" (pp. xlvi., xlvii.).

The *characteristics* of the treatise point in the same direction. It is "a final development of the teaching of 'the three,' and not of a special application of the teaching of St. Paul. . . . For St. Paul the Law is a code of moral ordinances; for the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews it is a scheme of typical provisions for atonement. For the one it is a crushing burden; for the other it is a welcome if imperfect source of consolation. . . . For St. Paul the Law was an episode, intercalated, as it were, in the course of revelation (Rom. v. 20, *παρεσιθῆεν*): for the writer of the Epistle it was a shadow of the realities to which, the promise pointed. It is closely connected with this fundamental distinctness of the point of vision of the two teachers that St. Paul dwells with dominant interest on the individual aspect of the Gospel, the writer of the Epistle on its social aspect; for the one the supreme contrast is between flesh and spirit, for the other between the image and the reality, the imperfect and the perfect" (pp. li.-liii.).

With somewhat less certainty, but on the whole quite decidedly, Dr. Westcott concludes that the Hebrews who are addressed in the treatise are to be looked for neither in Egypt nor in Rome (the latter is a conjecture which "need not detain us"), but in Palestine. "Our choice is limited to Egypt, with the Temple at Leontopolis, and to Palestine, with the Temple at Jerusalem. Nowhere else would the images of sacrifice and intercession be constantly before the eye of a Jew. There is very little evidence to show that the Temple at Leontopolis exercised the same power over the Alexandrian Jews as that at Jerusalem exercised over the Palestinian Jews and the Jews generally. Even in Egypt the Temple at Jerusalem was recognised as the true centre of worship." Then why does the writer never mention the Temple, but give us the ritual of the Tabernacle instead? Because "the ritual of the Tabernacle was the Divine type of which the ritual of the Temple was the authoritative representation," and because "the Temple, like the kingdom with which it was co-ordinate, was spiritually a sign of retrogression. It was an

endeavour to give fixity to that which was essentially provisional." This fact respecting the Temple is not sufficiently kept in view by students of the Old Testament.

When we turn from the Introduction to the notes, we find a storehouse of closely-packed material, expounding the writer's language clause by clause, and sometimes word by word, with a fulness which sometimes makes the student almost independent of such helps as dictionaries, grammars and concordances. Citations from the Fathers and from Philo are frequent, and are given in the original, illuminating the text in a degree that no translations, however accurate, could reach. Besides all this, Dr. Westcott from time to time pauses and sums up results in a little condensed essay, as pp. 17, 18 on i. 1-4, pp. 47, 48 on ii. 10-18, and p. 142 on vi. 1-8, and at the end of each chapter adds detached notes on special passages in the chapter. Many of these represent a very large amount of reading and thought, and will be most instructive to students, not merely for understanding the Epistle to the Hebrews, but for obtaining a grasp of the language and import of the New Testament generally. It is not easy to pick and choose out of such material, but the following may be mentioned as fairly representative: pp. 63-67, on *the idea of τελείωσις* and on *the τελείωσις of Christ* (ii. 10); pp. 67-70 on *quotations from the Old Testament in cc. i., ii.*, which "offer a representative study of the interpretation of Scripture;" pp. 114-116 on *the origin and constitution of man* (iv. 12), discussing Traducianism and Creationism; pp. 137-151 on *the præ-Christian priesthood* (v. 1), a substitute for an essay which the commentator had hoped to write on the subject; pp. 203-210 on *the Biblical idea of blessing* (vii. 1); pp. 233-240 on *the general significance of the Tabernacle* (viii. 5); pp. 281-292 on *the præ-Christian idea of sacrifice* (ix. 9), which is, again, a substitute for a projected essay. As a specimen of an elaborate grammatical note, that on *the expression of an end or purpose* (x. 7) may be noticed, in which an analysis is given of the various forms of construction which are found in the New Testament to express these ideas, together with illustrative passages taken from the Epistle.

In Heb. ix. 14-20 the Authorized Version uniformly renders *διαθήκη* by "testament." The Revisers have "covenant" in *v.* 15, "testament" in *vv.* 16, 17, and "covenant" again in *vv.* 18, 20. Dr. Westcott would have "covenant" throughout, and his rendering of *vv.* 16, 17 is remarkable: "For where there is a covenant the death of him that made it must needs be presented (*φέρεσθαι*). For a covenant is sure where there hath been death, since it doth not ever have force when he that made it liveth"; or (if the *μή* be taken interrogatively), "for is it ever of force when he that made it liveth?"

Of the three methods of dealing with *διαθήκη* in this passage, the one selected by the Revisers will not readily command assent. It is *prima facie* rather improbable that the writer of the treatise would in the compass of one short paragraph use the same word first in the sense of "covenant," then in that of "testament," and finally in that of "covenant" once more. If, as some assert, and as the Revisers appear to concede, "testament" *must* be the meaning in the middle of the passage, then

"testament" is the right rendering throughout. Yet this would be a somewhat surprising result, for (with the *possible* exception of Gal. iii. 15) everywhere else in the New Testament *διαθήκη* means a "covenant or contract," and not a "testament or will."

Dr. Westcott contends that in these central verses (16, 17) the meaning "testament" is by no means necessary. The death spoken of is not the death of the person who framed the *διαθήκη*; such language as *φέρεσθαι* and *ἐπι νεκροῖς* would be most extraordinary if that were the writer's meaning. The death which is "presented" is that of the victim, which, according to ancient ritual, was slain in order to give a solemn ratification to a covenant; hence the classical phrases *ὄρκια τέμνειν*, *icere fœdus*, implying that a deadly blow was struck in striking the treaty. Perhaps the idea which lay at the root of this ceremony was that the death of the victims symbolized the death of the contracting parties; so far as this compact was concerned, they were regarded as defunct and incapable of revoking what had been agreed. The new covenant between God and man was after this manner made sure and irrevocable by the death of Christ.

"It will cause no surprise," says Dr. Westcott in his additional note (p. 302), "that the patristic interpretations rest on the sense of 'will.'" But the authority of the Greek Fathers as to the interpretation of their own language is great; and if the familiar sense of *διαθήκη* in classical Greek would influence them in the direction of "testament," their knowledge of the universal sense of the term in the Septuagint and in the New Testament would incline them towards "covenant." The Latin Fathers might be unduly influenced by the traditional translation *testamentum*. Bishop Lightfoot thinks that in "Heb. ix. 15-17 the sacred writer starts from the sense of a 'covenant' and glides into that of a 'testament,' to which he is led by two points of analogy—(1) the *inheritance* conferred by the covenant, and (2) the *death* of the person making it" (note on Gal. iii. 15). But in a writer who has so carefully thought over every word that he is going to write, is it not possible that the two points of analogy have influenced him from the beginning of the passage, and that without any gliding into it he has the meaning "testament" in his mind throughout?

On the "cloud of witnesses" (xii. 1), which is an important text as to the condition of the blessed dead, Dr. Westcott remarks: "There is apparently no evidence that *μάρτυς* is ever used simply in the sense of a 'spectator' . . . At the same time it is impossible to exclude the thought of the spectators in the amphitheatre. The passage would not lose in vividness, though it would lose in power, if *θεατῶν* were substituted for *μαρτύρων*. These champions of old time occupy the place of spectators, but they are more than spectators. They are spectators who interpret to us the meaning of our struggle, and who bear testimony to the certainty of our success if we strive lawfully (2 Tim. ii. 5)." Of the various meanings suggested for the unique word *ἐνπερίστατος* (which occurs nowhere else in Greek literature, excepting in passages which are influenced by this text), Dr. Westcott is very decided for "readily besetting" as against either "easy to be avoided" or "much admired."

Neither of these suits the context, and the form of the word is fatal to the derivation on which "easy to be avoided" rests. Yet this latter has the sanction of Chrysostom.

The volume concludes with an essay "On the Use of the Old Testament in the Epistle," which ought to be carefully considered by all those who have been perplexed or distressed by the controversy which has been raging for some time past respecting recent criticism of the Old Testament, and which has reached an acute stage in England since the appearance of "Lux Mundi."

This inadequate notice of a great work shall close with a few extracts from the author's own weighty conclusion :

"Fresh materials, fresh methods of inquiry, bring fresh problems and fresh trials. Difficulties of criticism press upon us now. It is well, then, to be reminded that there have been times of trial at least as sharp as our own. When the Epistle to the Hebrews was written, it might have seemed that there was nothing for the Christian to do but either to cling to the letter of the Jewish Bible or to reject it altogether. But the Church was more truly instructed by the voice of the Spirit; and the answer to the anxious questionings of the first age which the Epistle contains has become part of our inheritance. We know now, with an assurance which cannot be shaken, that the Old Testament is an essential part of our Christian Bible. . . . We know this through the trials of other men.

"For that new 'voice,' on which the Apostle dwells in the Letter, was not heard without distressing doubts and fears and sad expectations of loss. Such, indeed, is the method of the discipline of God at all times. Many must feel the truth by their own experience in the present day, when, as it seems, He is leading His people towards a fuller apprehension of the character of the written Word than has hitherto been gained. New voices of God are heard 'to-day' as in old time, and there is still the same danger of neglecting to hear them. . . .

"It is likely that study will be concentrated on the Old Testament in the coming generation. The subject is one of great obscurity and difficulty where the sources of information are scanty. Perhaps the result of the most careful inquiry will be to bring the conviction that many problems of the highest interest as to the origin and relation of the constituent books are insoluble. But the student, in any case, *must not approach the inquiry with the assumption*—sanctioned though it may have been by traditional use—*that God must have taught His people, and us through His people, in one particular way. He must not presumptuously stake the inspiration and the Divine authority of the Testament on any foregone conclusion as to the method and shape in which the records have come down to us.* We have made many grievous mistakes in the past as to the character and the teaching of the Bible. The experience may stand us in good stead now. The Bible is the record, the inspired, authoritative record, of the Divine education of the world. . . . How the record was brought together, out of what materials, at what times, under what conditions, are questions of secondary importance. . . . We must remember that, here as elsewhere, His ways in the fulfilment of His counsel are, for the most part, not as our ways, but infinitely wider, larger, and more varied. And when we strive to realize them on the field of life, we must bear ourselves with infinite patience and reverence as scholars in Christ's school, scholars of a Holy Spirit Who is speaking to us as He spoke in old time" (pp. 492-494).

ALFRED PLUMMER.

Reminiscences of a Boyhood. A New Story by an Old Hand. Pp. 360.
Sampson Low, Marston, Searle, and Rivington.

DURING the past year or two a wave of autobiography seems to have been surging over the land. People of more or less fame have been giving the public their impressions of it, and certainly the public has encouraged the proceeding. Whether we can or not, we all like to try and "see ourselves as others see us"; and so we have all been eagerly reading to discover in what light the world is looked upon by those who have succeeded in it—whether they be peer or commoner, Academician or opera manager, traveller or statesman. The volume before us would possibly not claim so pretentious a classification as "autobiography," and yet, at all events, if it lets the heavy three-volumed tomes thunder over the shingle of the reading public, it may well aspire to the part of the refreshing spray that caps the wave.

Perhaps the "Old Hand" will be recognised by some of his readers; but whether or not, all will feel the freshness and unaffected cheeriness of his reminiscences. The book is strictly what it professes to be, an account of a boyhood; but it is an account so lucid and interesting as to be a pleasure to follow. Much of that homely moralizing which appeals to all our hearts is mixed with quiet humour, with keen description of persons, and with a strong appreciation of the beauties of nature.

The main scene principally lies in the North of Ireland and in Edinburgh. The author is evidently an admirer of the fine race of Scoto-Irishmen who form such an important part of her Majesty's subjects, and most will agree with him. He tells how a servant-maid, faithful enough, but a Roman Catholic, would, in her religious zeal, when they were alone in the garden, pull an orange lily from its stalk, throw it on the ground, and bid him trample on it, giving him a lump of barley-sugar as a bribe. And this, of course, because it was a symbol of Protestantism. He also gives us an insight into the faction fights that then raged, and are still unhappily frequent. And though he is never unfair, we can see well that in his opinion the prosperity of the North and the distress of the rest of Ireland are due to the different forms of Christianity professed. No wonder, then, that he can sum up Home Rule as "certain injury and loss" to Ireland.

From Ulster the scene changes to Auld Reekie. The author's school-days were passed in the famous Edinburgh Academy, and we learn that a strong impulse towards this move was given by the fact that Sir Walter Scott was a director and on the council. Edinburgh is lovingly described—Holyrood, the Castle, the Academy, and all—in fact, it is pronounced the most picturesque and romantic town of the author's knowledge. "At all times of the day and night," he says, "Edinburgh is beautiful; and if in the glare of noonday she is somewhat colourless and gray, yet at night what a bright picture she presents when a myriad of lights burn from the low-lying land of her streets in the new town, to the lofty heights of the Castle that is the crown of the old!" His school-days are

evidently truthfully and openly described, and many will sympathize in the holidays, the ups and downs in class, the classics and the fisticuffs that go to make a schoolboy's variegated life. The holidays, by the way, were mainly spent in Westmoreland, so that we get some pleasant peeps into the Lake District. Here is a specimen: "Kirkby Avondale, which may be called the gate of the Lake Country, is a lovely spot, surrounded by hills—the Shap Fells seen in the purple distance, and the Avon, one of England's most beautiful rivers, flowing under a picturesque bridge, and through flowery meadows and fields of green. Standing in the churchyard, made famous since by Turner's pencil and Ruskin's pen, you have as charming a scene as any that England presents to the eye. You have wood and water down below you, verdant pastures, and red sandstone rocks, with many a glimpse of blue sky seen gleaming through the thick-foliaged trees—oak and elm and birch. Close at hand, and on the level, you have the old church, with its low tower, and, near, the pretty parsonage overgrown with creepers, from which the pink roses peep out and the honeysuckle sheds its perfume; a few quaint houses border one side of the churchyard, and round you, at your feet, are the quiet graves rising amid the smooth and velvet grass."

We take leave of the author with regret. His book is the best of its kind; and as it will be read by many who do not care for books which are labelled distinctly religious, we are glad to think its influence will be great. A poet, a lover of human kind, an able writer, the author is in religion sound and strong. He ends by adverting to the "spirit of the age," but looks on that much-discussed subject with optimistic eyes. He believes that the truest remedy for social and other evils is not so much legislation as the Gospel.

The Country Clergyman and his Work. Six Lectures on Pastoral Theology delivered in the Divinity School, Cambridge, May Term, 1889. By the Rev. HERBERT JAMES, M.A., Rector of Livermere, Suffolk, late Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. Pp. 192. Macmillan and Co. 1890.

THERE has been a good deal of suggestion, or rather of criticism, this last year or two touching the practice and prospects of the country parson. No small proportion of it, however, has failed in tone and treatment, we think, with regard to the really spiritual aspects of the question. We heartily welcome, therefore, these Cambridge lectures, delivered by one who is in every way well qualified, in which the highest points are clearly placed and ably dealt with. A book like Mr. James's was really needed.

Mr. James begins by reminding his readers that our country parishes are just now in a state of flux. The old order is decidedly changing, and perhaps we have not yet arrived at the end of the changes. The country squire is but the shadow of his former self. Occupiers as well as farmers have fallen on hard times; small tradesmen are giving up business; the labourer is practically master of the situation. And with the change of proprietors and the dying out of the old class relations, and so forth, parson and peasant will be brought into much closer contact.

What is the present social state of the labourer? Mr. James replies: "For one thing there is a general levelling-up in the matters of position, of taste, of feeling. I don't say that this applies to every country parish. It would be hard to find any two alike in this or other respects. But whilst making all abatements the fact remains. The English labourer is a better paid, better housed, better dressed, better mannered man than he was thirty years ago. He has moved on and up with the rest of the world. Railways, village clubs and weekly newspapers are doing their work. There may be an 'outer barbarism' still in some places, but 'humanism' is largely asserting itself in others. Landlords, with the exception of that face-grinding class the small proprietors, are turning their attention to the vital question of cottage accommodation, and we shall not hear, I hope, in days to come, that which is asserted now, viz, that 50 per cent. of English cottages have only two bedrooms, 20 per cent. only one. The house is now less of a hovel and more of a home. Its arrangements are more decent; a little more pride is taken about the look of the things by the tenant; the ornaments are less scanty and tawdry; there are more books for reading, even if they are not always read; 'the soul of music no longer slumbers in its shell'—the concertina or its equivalent claims a chief place in many tidy front rooms, and gives both employment and polish to the inmates. Nay, amongst other tokens of advancing civilization, I can proudly point to a Christmas-tree which has been a family joy in one of my cottages for many a Christmas-tide." These things, it may be thought, are but so many social straws. They are so. But they mark the rising of a tide of which the clergy must take notice.

On the moral and spiritual state of country parishes Mr. James speaks with caution and ripe judgment: "Speaking generally, and in view of observed facts, of trustworthy experience, and of competent testimony, I think it may be said that the wave of moral and spiritual progress has reached a higher mark in our day than ever before." "Perhaps to some," he adds, "this will not be saying much, as the mark is not very high." "It cannot be denied that the tone of moral feeling in some of our pit-villages, nail-making districts, and out-of-the-way agricultural places, is low indeed;" and, "speaking generally, the moral sense greatly needs elevation all along the line of the Ten Commandments." In regard to the more distinctly spiritual state of country parishes, "there is too little outward religious observance." God's Day, God's House, God's worship, God's Sacraments, do not hold the place they ought.

Having described the Country Clergyman's Field, Mr. James treats of his Preaching, his Visiting, his Educational Work, his Parochial Organization, his Influence.

His remarks upon Preaching are excellent. It has been truly said that the leading principles of all ministry are to be found in these three things, *διδάσκειν, ποιμαίνειν, διακονεῖν*; that the greatest of these is the *διδάσκειν*, and that the leading form of the *διδάσκειν* is the living voice of the Preacher. "You will probably hear this contradicted," says Mr. James. "It is not only the people who like 'short religion,' who clamour for short sermons or none. There are those of a more

“devout spirit, whose heart is toward service and ceremony, who say “that the day for preaching is past—that on the ‘*segnius irritant*’ principle the clergy must speak more to the eye than to the ear. And “there may come times when you yourselves will be tempted to think “that they are right, when sermon work is heavy, because sermon-“thoughts are few, or sermon-hearers drowsy and difficult to interest, to “quicken, to influence. But you will not let these ideas and feelings “have lasting place. You will remember that you are ordained to be the “successors of the prophets; that you will solemnly vow to be dispensers “of God’s Word—yea, that preaching is God’s great ordinance for “saving souls; that ‘woe will be unto you if you preach not the Gospel.’ “You will remember, also, that *the majority of our people look for it*, and “especially our villagers. Preaching is, in their eyes, an integral part of “the worship in which they come to join. A service without a sermon “is hardly a service at all to them. You are wronging them, if you are “not wronging yourselves, by the omission.”

As to eloquence Mr. James gives the best advice. Aim at that eloquence which is found in *earnest simplicity*. “It is almost every-thing (I was going to say) with our country people. Others may insist on boldness, fervency, wisdom and love; but all these avail little without simplicity.” Rustics attend where they can understand. Some few may like a highly-charged rhetorical sermon; some, again, may like a little science or a little controversy. But these are not the most numerous or the most hopeful in our flocks. You are charged to preach the Gospel to the poor. Be simple. Try to *think* simply. “The highest compliment I ever heard paid to a preacher was the comment of a Kentish parishioner on the sermon of a friend and curate of my own. He was about to leave the parish, and the man said, ‘We are very sorry to lose Mr. P., sir; we like his preaching so much. You see, sir, he talks just as if he was inside of us!’”

In the chapter on Parochial Organization—not the least valuable portion of the book—Mr. James refers, but briefly, to the administration of the Holy Communion. The hours chosen, he says, “should be such as to suit the majority of your communicants. Early Communion is not an impossibility. Labourers and their wives will turn out in the country as well as in the town” for an eight o’clock celebration—particularly, we may add, in the *summer* months. “I will not discuss,” says Mr. James, “the moot question of evening Communion. I will only say that I adopted the practice before the present opposition was raised, and am prepared to defend it on Scriptural and Ecclesiastical grounds.”

We had marked other passages in this volume, but must forbear. A second edition we hope will soon appear. Meantime, we tender hearty thanks to the pious and learned author.

It should be added that the book is beautifully printed.



Short Notices.

Memorials of the Hon. Ion Keith-Falconer, M.A. By the Rev. ROBERT SINKER, D.D. With portrait and map. Sixth edition. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, and Co.

THIS admirable book was commended, by the Rev. W. E. Richardson, in the *CHURCHMAN* of July, 1888. We are pleased to see that in so short a time it has reached a sixth edition. In a brief note to the present edition, Dr. Sinker observes that the welcome accorded to the book is a symptom of the remarkable growth of interest in the cause of Foreign Missions, and marks a wide-spread appreciation of the noble character which he sought to portray. This is very true; but Dr. Sinker's work is remarkably well done. Not a page is dry; not a point is badly put; the presentment of a charming character is graphic and very pleasing. Taken as a whole, we know no memoir so likely to win its way and do a good work among cultured people at the present moment as this, with its masculine common-sense and deep spirituality. The new portrait, we may add, is an improvement.

Sweet Home. By the Rev. J. B. FIGGIS, M.A., Minister of the Countess of Huntingdon's Church, Brighton, Author of "Emmanuel," "Homely Homilies," etc. Pp. 158. London: Nisbet and Co.; Brighton: D. B. Friend. 1890.

This is a welcome little work—simple, suggestive, and spiritual—likely to do much good. The esteemed author treats, first, home—its foundation; then home's duties, its dangers, its joys, its sorrows, and so on. He points out the way from home to heaven. There is freshness and force about the whole, and some valuable quotations, prose and poetry, are well placed.

Our Lord's Miracles of Healing Considered in Relation to Some Modern Objections and to Medical Science. By T. W. BELCHER, D.D., D.M., and M.S. With preface by the Right Hon. and Most Rev. R. C. TRENCH, D.D., Lord Archbishop of Dublin. Second edition, revised, enlarged and annotated. Pp. 257. Griffith, Farran, Okeden and Welsh.

Of the first edition of this very able work we have no knowledge, but we gladly welcome and heartily recommend the work as it is now before us. It seems to us of singular value, particularly as regards a certain class of readers. Readable throughout, it bears everywhere marks of most patient inquiry, and also of a judicial temper. We first of all turned to the chapter on Leprosy. Dr. Belcher argues that the "leprosy" which Father Damien so much alleviated in others, and of which he himself died in 1889, was *Elephantiasis Græcorum*, and not the leprosy of the ancients and of Holy Scripture.

Nunnery Life in the Church of England. Seventeen Years with Father Ignatius. By Sister MARY AGNES, O.S.B. Edited, with preface, by the Rev. W. LANCELOT HOLLAND, M.A., Vicar of All Saints, Hatcham. Pp. 200. Hodder and Stoughton.

This is a very curious book. The Editor tells his readers, in a preface, how he became acquainted with ex-Sister Mary Agnes, or Miss J. M. Povey, and how he came to edit and publish her experiences. Mr. Hol-

land also mentions that he had taken "great pains to find out the thorough trustworthiness of her antecedents and statements."

At the age of fifteen, we read, Miss Povey was much impressed at one of Father Ignatius' Missions, and after a time she entered his convent at Feltham. In the tenth year of her life at this convent, a change took place. Father Ignatius, we read, demanded unconditional obedience from the Lady Superior, and she refused to give it. Miss Povey's account runs thus :

Sometimes before breakfast he would order that no one, not even the Reverend Mother, should speak for a whole day, thus causing the utmost confusion, especially among the servants in the kitchen, who were included in the eccentric command, and yet if his own dinner were not properly cooked and served in time he would show great displeasure. Another time, I recollect how he ordered a young and delicate sister, who was very ill and consumptive, to walk barefooted in the snow up and down the garden. . . . Once he intended to bring a young monk, ill from his monastery, to be nursed by a young novice nun, and she was to devote the whole of her time to looking after him. This might have been well enough if we had been Sisters of Charity; but we were enclosed nuns, and were not allowed to see the face of a man, except, of course, our Superior. The Mother would not hear of such a thing, or allow the sick monk to come to the house, as she was sure it would prove an occasion of scandal. She thus set up her will and judgment to oppose Father Ignatius, and she did this on more than one occasion. But at last Father Ignatius boldly asserted that he was quite determined to have nothing but *unconditional obedience*. The Mother and the majority of the nuns in the Feltham Convent refused to accept such an unconditional obedience, and the result was that a split took place.

Father Ignatius dissolved all connection with the rebel nuns, but took the three who were willing to sign his paper to Slapton Convent, in Devonshire. Sister Mary Agnes was one of these three. We read :

It is astonishing to contemplate how absolutely Father Ignatius required us to yield our wills to his will. Whatever he demanded was, he said, distinctly God's will for us, and whatever we did for him was God's will. To use his own oft-repeated words, "It must be so sweet for you to wait upon your Superior, because in so doing you are really waiting upon God; in fact, in waiting upon your Superior, like Martha of old, you are waiting upon the Lord Himself." I can assure my readers that we poor deluded nuns believed in all this.

Some of the statements in this book, we should think, will call forth statements in reply; and we may return to it. Meantime, we repeat, it has, even in these days, an interest of its own. †

We have received from Mr. Murray the new *Quarterly Review*. It is just the volume to put in the portmanteau for a holiday run. There is enough, and the supply is judiciously varied. Amid the many changes in the reading world of this changing time, we are always pleased to see the *Quarterly*, thoroughly up to date, and undeniably of the highest ability, yet free from developments in the way of morality or religion which startle and shock so many who are by no means bigoted or narrow, and do no living creature any good whatever. This summer number is a very good one. "The Emperor Frederick," based on Gustav Freytag's Reminiscences, is interesting throughout, and so is "Sir Robert Walpole," reviewing Mr. John Morley's new book. "Eton College," "Shakspeare's Ghosts, Witches and Fairies," and "The Acropolis of Athens," are ably written. A very timely article, headed "Penny Fiction," is sure to be well read, and the *Quarterly* has done good service in taking up so important a subject. "Mesmerism and Hypnotism," and "Twenty Years of Irish Home Rule in New York," are very readable. "Realism and

Decadence in French Fiction," remarkably clever, ought to be duly considered by critics who repeat the cant phrase about English prudery. We quote the conclusion: "Balzac, Stendhal, Flaubert, Zola, Bourget, Pierre Loti, Daudet, greatly as they differ in character and style, do yet agree in the general resemblance. Negatively, they are not controlled by that reason which discerns the laws of life, morality, and the Divine Presence in the world. Positively, they write under the pressure of passion and instinct. The man they delineate is not a being of large discourse looking before and after; he is *la bête humaine*. . . . Lord Chesterfield, on Christmas Day, 1753, when the Revolution was only murmuring like distant thunder, wrote: 'All the symptoms which I have ever met with in history, previous to great changes and revolutions in government, now exist and daily increase in France.' But 'revolution' is not the word which falls from French lips in our time. There is something beyond revolution; and the Renaus, Bourgets, and Dandets are not slow to pronounce it—the word 'decadence.' A putrescent civilization, a corruption of high and low, a cynical shamelessness meets us at every turn, from the photographs which insult modesty in the shop windows on the Boulevards, and the pornographic literature on the bookstalls, to the multiplication of divorces and the 'drama of adultery' accepted as a social ordinance. What difference of view is there between 'Jacques' and 'Un Disciple,' save that George Sand was a sentimental artist and M. Bourget is a student of psychology? What between 'Sapho' and 'Les Parents Pauvres,' or between 'La Terre' and 'Les Paysans'? And is not Flaubert's disdain of Emma Bovary surpassed by his still deeper disdain of himself? The civilizing bond of the moral law has burst asunder in France; and the whole beast-nature it kept in check is stripping itself of the last shreds of decency that it may go about naked and not ashamed. 'All has ended in the mire, in the abyss of the eternal nothingness,' cries the hero of 'Le Mariage de Loti.' The literature of a nation possessed with that belief has become either a Psalm of Death, or, as M. Renan proves in 'L'Abbesse de Jouarre,' a wild outburst of Epicurean sensuality. With Leopardi it exclaims, 'Omai per l'ultima volta dispera,' or with Baudelaire,

"Resigne-toi, mon cœur; dors ton sommeil de brute.

"The question is whether we are witnessing, not the 'tragedy of a will which thinks,' exemplified in the rejuvenescence of a great nation struggling against adversity, but something at once hideous and beyond all description pitiable, the comedy of *delirium tremens*, of foul dreams and spasmodic efforts, with which M. Zola makes his hero die in 'L'Assommoir.' These are not merely symptoms of revolution; they are prognostics of an intellectual and moral suicide. To find a parallel to modern French literature we must go back to Martial and Petronius. But when Martial and Petronius wrote, society was sinking down into its ashes like a spent fire, suffocating in the stench of its own abominations."

From Mr. Henry Frowde (Oxford University Press) we have received two copies of the Bible with the lessons marked for Church service. Both are useful volumes. The cheaper one, prepared for the S.P.C.K., will doubtless have a very large circulation; the other is tastefully got up and printed on thin paper.

What Cheer, O? is a well-told "Story of the Mission to Deep Sea Fishermen," by Mr. Alexander Gordon (Nisbet and Co.). It has an introductory note by Mr. T. B. Miller, Chairman of the Mission. There are several good illustrations.

THE MONTH.

THE Tithe Bill and the Land Purchase Bill, after all, have both been withdrawn. An autumn session is to be held. The *Record* says :

The abandonment of the Tithes Bill was a necessary sequel to the breakdown of the Ministerial programme. Some pressure was, it is true, put upon the Government to make an effort to proceed with the Bill, or at least those of its proposals which relate to the collection of tithe. But the Government whips, it is not a little instructive to know, would not undertake to guarantee a sufficient attendance of Ministerial supporters to ensure the passing of even this part of the measure. When the melancholy history of the present Session comes to be written, its most significant chapter will be the failure to secure the attention of Parliament upon many questions of paramount importance to the Church of England. With an unscrupulous and indefatigable Opposition against them, many of the friends of the Church show an apathy which is nothing short of a scandal. The present Government have proved themselves quite incapable of securing the necessary precedence for a measure which, divided as opinions are as to its merits, promised to deal with a growing source of danger to the Church. There is, in short, an urgent need for community of purpose and concerted action on the part of Churchmen in Parliament. No branch of legislation is more seriously mismanaged than that affecting the Church.

The Archbishop's Clergy Discipline Bill has been withdrawn, and the meeting of Convocation countermanded. At the Canterbury Diocesan Conference his Grace said it was impossible to proceed with the Bill this year.

The criticisms on *Lux Mundi* are growing more severe.

The obituary contains the names of two distinguished laymen, the Earl of Carnarvon and Lord Magheramorne.

The Archbishop of Dublin has sent to the *Times* an interesting letter from the Bishop of Salisbury to his Grace with regard to Count Campello. The Archbishop says :

I am permitted by the Bishop of Salisbury to make public the following letter. Your readers will, I am sure, gladly welcome the vindication of Count Campello's character which it supplies, as also the testimony borne by the Bishop to the general fitness of this noble-hearted reformer for the work in which he is engaged. . . . As to the latest calumny, namely, that the Count had returned to the Church of Rome, it speaks for itself, and furnishes so palpable a type of the unscrupulous methods adopted by his enemies, that, in conjunction with the exposure of these tactics referred to in the Bishop's letter, it will, I hope, lead Campello's friends to estimate, for the future, at its true value any similar rumour that may reach their ears. For my own part, I confidently expect that such exposures as these will do more. They will, I trust, induce many to rally round this brave and faithful man, witnessing for the truth in the midst of many enemies and many discouragements. Even already the hearts of some generous friends have been thereby stirred up to help the Count in completing, without delay, the church which he is erecting at Arrone, in the centre of his Umbrian Mission.

Mr. Stanley's long-expected volume, "In Darkest Africa," has been remarkably well received. The committee of the C.M.S. welcomed the great traveller at Salisbury Square.

The Rev. T. Teignmouth Shore has published in the *Guardian* a paper explaining the aim of "Churchmen in Council."

Canon Maclure has been appointed Dean of Manchester.

At the annual meeting of the Home Reunion Society, the Chairman, Lord Nelson, made an encouraging speech.