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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

HODDER & STOUGHTON'S SPRING LIST.

Crown 8vo., *cloth, price* 5*s.*

COLOSSIAN STUDIES. Lessons in Faith and Holiness from St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and Philemon. By the Rev. HANDLEY C. G. MOULE, D.D., Principal of Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

New Edition. Crown 8vo., *cloth, price* 5*s.*

PHILIPPIAN STUDIES. Lessons in Faith and Love from St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians.

8vo., *cloth, price* 10*s.* 6*d.*

THE PREPARATION AND DELIVERY OF SERMONS. By JOHN A. BROADUS, D.D., LL.D.

Crown 8vo., *cloth, price* 9*s.*

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF SOCIOLOGY. By J. H. W. STUCKENBERG, D.D., Member of the Philosophical Society of Berlin, and Author of "Introduction to the Study of Philosophy."

Fcap. 8vo., *cloth, price* 2*s.* 6*d.*

COMPANIONS OF THE SORROWFUL WAY. By the Rev. JOHN WATSON, D.D. (Ian Maclaren).

Crown 8vo., *cloth, price* 5*s.*

DR. WILLIAM MOON AND HIS WORK FOR THE BLIND. By the Rev. JOHN RUTHERFORD, M.A. With Portraits and Illustrations.

THE

Expositor's Greek Testament.

EDITED BY THE REV. W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A., LL.D.,
Editor of the *Expositor*, "*Expositor's Bible*," etc.

The FIRST VOLUME, of 880 pages, handsomely bound in buckram cloth, consists of

The GOSPELS of ST. MATTHEW, ST. MARK, and **ST. LUKE,** by the Rev. Professor A. B. BRUCE, D.D.; and **The GOSPEL of ST. JOHN,** by the Rev. Professor MARCUS DODS, D.D.

The price of each volume is **28s.,** but for those who **subscribe in advance** the price for Two VOLUMES is **30s.**

"Dr. Bruce's commentary on the Synoptics is a notable piece of work. It is cheering and refreshing to find these books, with which our inner life is so closely bound up, treated frankly and honestly, as well as adequately for English readers, and withal in so believing and reverent a spirit that the treatment need not repel the most orthodox. . . . All is set forth with great frankness and admirable common-sense, and often in racy language, not without an occasional Scottish flavour."—*Athenæum.*

"The first thing that strikes one when he takes up the volume on the *Gospels* is the uncommon handsomeness of the book. It is a joy to handle it and look into its pages. It is the very book to lure a student into reading. The form is so superb, the paper so choice and so light, the margins so delightfully broad, the type so clear and so tasteful. The two scholars to whom this volume has been committed are the very men for the work. Each is a master of his subject, and each has gone into his task *con amore*. . . A work worthy of the most cordial appreciation."—*Critical Review.*

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

To the Clergy and Friends of Pure Literature.

PARISH GIFTS FOR THE SEASONS
EASTER AND WHITSUNTIDE.

SPECIAL BOOKS for PARISH CIRCULATION AT SPECIAL PRICES.

Home Words Office has now for many years been a SELF-SUSTAINING SOCIETY for the circulation of high-class literature. Our Magazines and Books and our National Weekly Journal, *The News*, reach millions of Homes.

But the need for increasing the effort to arrest the corrupt and corrupting flood of irreligious, immoral, and especially *decently* immoral publications, presses on every thoughtful mind. If we were told that poison for the *body* was being sold to millions of purchasers in our shops, we should all be startled to immediate action; yet *mental* poison is surely even a greater evil. In a recent letter to the *Yorkshire Post*, the late Bishop of Wakefield wrote: "Allow me to thank you for your outspoken and admirable leader in your issue of to-day upon the foulness of some of the popular literature of the day. I should like to impress upon *Parents the immense injury they may easily do their children by allowing such books to fall into their hands.* The works you have so righteously condemned are unutterably vile. I read one, having seen a very laudatory review of it, and was so utterly disgusted with it that I *threw it into the fire* in pure indignation. It was the foulest book I ever read, and I am sorry to say it first appeared as a serial story in the ———, to the disgrace of that generally respectable paper."

With the view of promoting still wider PARISH CO-OPERATION in *Home Words* Office efforts to substitute good Reading for bad, the Publisher has decided to make an offer for Easter and Whitsuntide of

SPECIAL BOOKS AT SPECIAL PRICES.

The following are the Books selected for this purpose. Originally they were cheap Half-Crown Volumes, but by printing large Editions the selling price is now only 1s. 6d. It will be seen that, in quantities of 12, they will be supplied *direct* from the London Office at *half-price*—or rather less for larger numbers—barely meeting the absolute cost of production.

It is important that orders should be sent in *at once.* The enormous demand for "*The Queen's Resolve*" and "*The Way Home,*" offered on these terms, leads the Publisher to expect a similar pressure for the other books, and, although every effort will be made to supply, the production of fresh editions of course takes time.

I. **THE WAY HOME.** Seventieth Thousand. By the Rev. CHARLES BULLOCK, B.D.

II. **THE OLD GOSPEL EVER NEW.** By the same Author. Tenth Thousand.

III. **HOLD FAST BY YOUR SUNDAYS.** By the Author of "Deepdale Vicarage." Twenty-second Thousand.

IV. **THE QUEEN'S RESOLVE.** 260th Thousand. With Jubilee Illustrations, etc.

V. **THE FORGOTTEN TRUTH.** New Edition. By the Rev. CHARLES BULLOCK, B.D., Editor of *Home Words.*

VI. **THE DAY OF DAYS and HAND and HEART** new Annuals.

*** As far as the limited supply allows.

Immense good would be done if the Clergy generally would preach a Special Sermon about *Home Reading*, calling the attention of parents to the above offer. The result would not only be the introduction of these particular books into the homes of the people, but a large demand for similar books from the local booksellers would be created.

In villages where there are no booksellers, the Clergy, or leading lay friends, might easily get up a *book-shop* in one of the cottages. A window filled with magazines or other preaching pictures, changed frequently, would always gather a congregation. Or an exhibition of books, good and cheap, in the Schools once a year, would rouse interest, and many would be sold. The late Canon Fergie, Ince, Wigan, wrote: "At one such exhibition in this parish many books were sold. More than 200 'Hold Fast by your Sundays' were at once taken." *Home Words* Office would gladly arrange a supply of books, taking back copies unsold. Parish and School Libraries would also be supplied with new books.

TWO TRACTS FOR EVERY PARISH.

"Millions in England never go to any Church or Pray at Home."

I. **HOW TO GET GOOD BY COMING TO CHURCH.** 170th Thousand.

II. **FAMILY PRAYER: DO I PRAY WITH THEM?** Tenth Thousand.

100 Copies of either of these Tracts sent Post Free for 1s. 6d.

LONDON: "HOME WORDS" OFFICE, 7, PATERNOSTER SQUARE, E.C.

CENTENARY YEAR OF THE

RELIGIOUS TRACT SOCIETY.

Patron: Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen.

THE 99th ANNIVERSARY MEETING

WILL BE HELD

On FRIDAY EVENING, May 6, 1898,

AT

EXETER HALL, STRAND.

The Chair will be taken at 6.30 by **The Venerable the Archdeacon of London.**

Speakers: REV. J. E. C. WELLDON, M.A., Head Master of Harrow; REV. ARNOLD FOSTER, B.A., of Hankow, China; REV. G. H. C. MACGREGOR, M.A., of Notting Hill.

A CHOIR, conducted by Mr. E. MINSHALL, will sing for half an hour prior to the Meeting and during the Evening.

MR. IRA D. SANKEY

Has also kindly promised to sing. Tickets for Reserved Seats may be had free on application to the Secretaries, 56, Paternoster Row, London.

THE MISSIONARY BREAKFAST will be held in the Great Hall, Cannon Street Hotel, on TUESDAY, May 17, at 9 a.m., under the Presidency of EVAN SPICER, Esq., J.P.

Tickets, Half a Crown each, may be had of the Secretaries, 56, Paternoster Row, E.C.

LEWIS BORRETT WHITE, D.D.
SAMUEL G. GREEN, D.D. } *Secretaries.*

JUST PUBLISHED. By Dr. G. A. CHADWICK, Bishop of Derry, Author of the Commentaries on Exodus and St. Mark in the "Expositor's Bible."

PILATE'S GIFT, and Other Sermons. Crown 8vo., 5s., cloth.

CONTENTS: Pilate's Gift—Christian Obligation—The Kingdom of the Son of Man—Fishers of Men—The Light Yoke—The Baptism and Cup of Christ—Christian Veracity—Elevation of Character—Solidarity—Meaning of Life—Pessimism—Forgiveness and Fear—Illumination—Eternity of the Unseen—Vision and Resemblance—Voices of God—The Image of God—Transfer of Penalty—Arrest of Souls—Christ Dealing Prudently—Things Kept in Store—The Brook by the Way—The Impenitent Thief.

JUST PUBLISHED.

THE MASS IN THE GREEK AND ROMAN CHURCHES. By

C. H. H. WRIGHT, D.D., Author of "A Primer of Roman Catholicism," "The Writings of Patrick, the Apostle of Ireland," etc. With Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 1s., limp cloth, or 8d. in paper covers.

Dr. Wright gives in a compact form a full and clear account of the ceremony of the Mass in the Greek and Roman Churches. He shows what the different parts of the service are intended to symbolize. He contrasts it with the simple words of the New Testament, and shows how far both Churches have wandered from the true observance and meaning of the Lord's Supper.

PUBLISHED BY THE RELIGIOUS TRACT SOCIETY, 56, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON.

Visitors to London are invited to call at the

ST. PAUL'S BOOK SALOON

OF THE

RELIGIOUS TRACT SOCIETY, 65, St. Paul's Churchyard, London.

The May Meeting List gratis.

CLARENDON PRESS LIST

Demy 8vo., cloth, 2 vols., £2 2s.

THE COPTIC VERSION of THE NEW TESTAMENT, in the Northern Dialect, otherwise called Memphitic and Bohairic, with Introduction, Critical Apparatus, and Literal English Translation.

Vol. I.—St. Matthew, St. Mark. Vol. II.—St. Luke, St. John.

"This edition is at once the most complete and the most serviceable which has yet appeared. . . . The translation will be a real assistance to scholars of the New Testament who have no knowledge of the Coptic language."—*Times.*

Just Published. 26 pp., 8vo., stiff covers, 1s. 6d.

MENANDER'S ΓΕΩΡΓΟΣ. A Revised Text of the Geneva Fragment. With a Translation and Notes. By BERNARD P. GRENFELL, M.A., Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford; and ARTHUR S. HUNT, M.A., Senior Demy of Magdalen College, Oxford.

Now Ready, with a Facsimile, Popular Edition. Crown 8vo., stiff covers, 2s. 6d.

ECCLESIASTICUS (XXXIX. 15 to XLIX. 11). Translated from the Original Hebrew and arranged in Parallel Columns with the English Revised Version of 1895, by the Editors of the Hebrew Text (A. E. COWLEY, M.A., and AD. NEUBAUER, M.A.).

"This excellent edition deserves to be widely known. It is prepared by Messrs. A. E. Cowley and Ad. Neubauer, who are also responsible for the magnificent edition of the Hebrew text, and our heartiest thanks are due to them for the pains they have bestowed upon it, and to the University Press for issuing it in a form which renders it easily accessible to so many readers."—*Guardian.*

50 pp., 8vo., stiff covers, 1s. 6d. net.

SAYINGS OF JESUS, TWO LECTURES ON THE. Recently discovered at Oxyrhynchus. Delivered at Oxford by the Rev. WALTER LOCK, D.D., and the Rev. WILLIAM SANDAY, D.D., LL.D.

Contents.—I. Bibliography. II. Text, with Emendations and Illustrations. III. Interpretation of the Text. IV. History and Origin of the Sayings.

"We desire to call attention to the admirable form in which the text has been presented, and to the scholarly and careful discussion of Dr. Sanday and Dr. Lock."—*Guardian.*

THE OXFORD ENGLISH DICTIONARY.

New Double Section, stiff covers, 4to., 5s.

H—HAVERSIAN. Edited by Dr. MURRAY. This Section begins Vol. V.

Immediately. 8vo., cloth, 21s.

GESENIUS' HEBREW GRAMMAR. As Edited and Enlarged by E. KAUTZSCH. Translated from the Twenty-fifth German Edition by the late Rev. G. W. COLLINS, M.A. The Translation Revised and Adjusted to the Twenty-sixth Edition by A. E. COWLEY, M.A.

Long Primer Type. New Edition, with Marginal References. Fcap. 8vo., 4s. 6d.

THE GREEK TESTAMENT. With the Readings adopted by the Revisers of the Authorized Version.

SACRED BOOKS OF THE EAST. Edited by the Right Hon. F. MAX MÜLLER.

Vol. XLIII. **THE SATAPATHA BRAHMANA.** Part IV. Books VIII.-X. According to the Text of the Mâdhyandina School. Translated by JULIUS EGGELING. *Price 12s. 6d.*

*** *A minute account of the sacrificial ceremonies of the Vedic age.*

Vol. XLVII. **THE MARVELS of ZOROASTRIANISM.** Being Part V. of the PAHLAVI TEXTS. Translated by E. W. WEST. *Price 8s. 6d.*

LONDON: HENRY FROWDE, CLARENDON PRESS WAREHOUSE, AMEN CORNER, E.C.

CHURCH PASTORAL AID SOCIETY

ANNUAL SERMON

WILL BE PREACHED (D.V.) AT

ST. MARTIN'S, CHARING CROSS, on THURSDAY, APRIL 28, at 3.30 p.m.,

By the Very Rev. the DEAN OF ST. DAVID'S.

ANNUAL MEETING of L.H.M.U. at SION COLLEGE, on FRIDAY, APRIL 29, at 3 p.m.

ANNUAL MEETING

IN

EXETER HALL, on THURSDAY, MAY 5th, at 2.30 p.m. The President in the Chair.

SPEAKERS:

THE RIGHT REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF EXETER
THE RIGHT REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF RIPON
THE REV. E. A. STUART
THE REV. W. HODGSON (OF WIDNES)
C. E. TRITTON, ESQ., M.P.

CHURCH OF IRELAND SUSTENTATION FUND.

(LONDON COMMITTEE IN AID.)

Patron—THE DEAN OF NORWICH.
Chairman of Committee—THE LORD CLAUD J. HAMILTON.

This Fund was founded at Disestablishment as a channel for sympathy of friends in England with their brethren of the Church of Ireland.

It is now devoted entirely to enabling the ministry of the Church to be maintained in the South and West of Ireland, in parishes where the Protestants are few and isolated, and UNABLE TO MAINTAIN THEIR CHURCH UNAIDED.

Last year EIGHTY-NINE parishes received grants from this Fund, administered through their own diocesan schemes.

The NEED of this help is unabated, and the Committee earnestly appeal to English Churchmen to give this testimony of fellowship with their isolated brethren bravely holding the outposts. Their help in supplementing the efforts of the Church herself is much appreciated.

Donations may be sent to Messrs. COUTTS and CO., Strand, W.C.; to the Treasurer, Sir C. R. LIGHTON, Bart., 91 Billiter Buildings, Billiter Street, E.C.; or to the Hon. Secretaries, the Misses NUGENT, 29 Eaton Terrace, London, S.W.

CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY.

Instituted by the Huguenots, 1685.

OFFICE.—MEMORIAL HALL, LONDON STREET, BETHNAL GREEN, E.

President.—SIR G. WILLIAMS.

Vice-Presidents.—THE RIGHT HON. THE EARL OF ABERDEEN, A. PEASE, Esq., M.P., S. D. WADDY, Esq., Q.C., and J. H. GLADSTONE, Esq., PH.D., F.R.S., etc.

Treasurer.—F. A. BEVAN, Esq.

Hon. Sec.—REV. JOHN GRITTON, D.D.

This, the oldest of all the Evangelistic Societies in London, is largely engaged in taking the Gospel to two classes, viz., those who cannot, and those who will not, attend ordinary places of worship. The former are met with in workhouses, infirmaries, and such-like places; the latter in the open air, common lodging-houses, etc., besides in rooms and 8 mission-halls, where every sort of religious, social, and benevolent efforts are in daily operation, by 450 volunteer workers and a large contingent of lady helpers, who visit 23 workhouses and infirmaries, with 15,000 inmates.

Free breakfasts, teas, and cocoa suppers are given to the destitute poor and poor gutter children all the year. Nearly 50,000 were given last year.

During the winter an earnest and most successful effort has been made to reach the "Submerged Tenth." Thousands of them have been sheltered all night and fed in the Mission Hall, Spitalfields. Many have been secured work, and assisted in other ways. To sustain this and the general work Funds are urgently needed.

Parcels of Goods for the Free Meals, as well as Old Clothing, Old Periodicals and Tracts, Hospital Letters, etc., will be most acceptable at any time, and can be sent to the Secretary.

Subscriptions and Donations will be most gratefully received by the Treasurer, F. A. BEVAN, Esq., at the Bank; by the Secretary, MR. JAMES ATKINSON, Memorial Hall, London Street, Bethnal Green, London, E.; by the Bankers, MESSRS. BARCLAY AND CO., 54, Lombard Street, E.C.; or the EDITORS of *The Christian*, 12, Paternoster Buildings, E.C.

JAMES ATKINSON, *Secretary.*

The St. Giles' Christian Mission.

Treasurer—F. A. BEVAN, Esq.

VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS ONLY SOURCE OF INCOME.

This Mission assists, amongst other classes, the following :—

THE BETTER CLASS OF DISCHARGED PRISONERS;
THE INNOCENT BUT SUFFERING WIVES AND CHILDREN OF PRISONERS;
THE SICK AND POOR;
HOMELESS AND DESTITUTE WOMEN.

The demands upon the resources of the Mission are very heavy.

Mr. WILLIAM WHEATLEY, *Superintendent*, 4, Ampton Street, Regent Square, W.C.

SOCIETY FOR RELIEF OF PERSECUTED JEWS.

(SYRIAN COLONIZATION FUND.)

FUNDS URGENTLY NEEDED for Employment and Relief at Jerusalem.

Above 50 men and boys daily employed at Abraham's Vineyard on Stone Dressing, Soap Making, constructing Rock-hewn Cisterns for Water, etc. Above 3,000 souls annually given food, drinking-water, and clothing. Numbers live in underground airless places, or in sheds exposed to summer sun and winter storms. No furniture but boards, rags, petroleum tins, and sacks for bedding. No water-supply, and unable to get any work, they starve. Many apply to us daily for work, without which they must starve.

DONATIONS THANKFULLY RECEIVED BY

F. A. BEVAN, Esq., *Hon. Treasurer*, 54, Lombard Street, E.C.

E. A. FINN, *Secretary*, 41, Parliament Street, S.W.

THE LONDON CITY MISSION

EMPLOYS 470 MISSIONARIES,

AND IS IN URGENT NEED OF FUNDS.

It is one of the oldest of the Home Missionary Societies, and has ever held fast to its Evangelical principles.

More than half a million men yearly visited.

If friends are unable to contribute the whole sum necessary to maintain a Missionary, they may be able to offer **£10**, **£5**, or smaller sums. These subscriptions will be grouped for particular districts, and will thus remove the pressing anxiety of the Committee. Gifts will be gratefully acknowledged by the

Treasurer—F. A. BEVAN, Esq., or by the *Secretaries* {Rev. T. S. HUTCHINSON, M.A. / Rev. ROBERT DAWSON, B.A.

Bankers—BARCLAY & Co., LTD. *Offices*—3, Bridewell Place, London, E.C.

THE MISSIONS TO SEAMEN.

Patron:
Admiral of the Fleet
H.R.H. The
DUKE OF SAXE-COBURG AND GOTHA, K.G.

Labours afloat and ashore, at home and abroad, among seamen of all classes and nations, fishermen, bargemen, and emigrants. Sixty-eight harbours are occupied.

Income, £38,291.

Increased Contributions and Offertories, urgently needed, should be forwarded to the Secretary, Commander W. DAWSON, R.N., 11, Buckingham St., Strand, London, W.C.

SPANISH AND PORTUGUESE CHURCH AID SOCIETY.

President: The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Worcester. Vice-President: The Very Rev. the Dean of Norwich.

To aid the Reformed Episcopal Churches in the faithful preaching of the Gospel, and to help and encourage them in the great work of evangelization in which they are engaged. Contributions will be gratefully received by the Right Rev. Lord Bishop of WORCESTER, Hartlebury, Kidderminster; and by the Revs. H. E. NOYES, D.D. (Hon. Fin. Sec.), and E. C. UNMACK, M.A. (Organizing and Deputation Secretary), at the Office, Church House, Dean's Yard, Westminster, from whom all information may be obtained.

THE

CHURCHMAN

MAY, 1898.

ART. I.—THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE PENTATEUCH.

No. XIV.

I HAVE once more to thank a friend for having pointed out that I have overlooked two passages in which the word *Shaddai* occurs in Genesis: the one is chap. xliii. 14, the other xlix. 25. Professor Driver recognises in the first of these a "trace of E." The latter has been "incorporated by J from an independent source."[1] My argument is not much affected by the omission. The majority of passages in which *Shaddai* occurs seem to indicate that it was an early name of God common to various Semitic tribes, or at least not necessarily confined to the Hebrews themselves. P tells us that it was the title by which God described Himself at the solemn moment when He made His covenant with Abraham, and marked the fact by the establishment of the rite of circumcision. I have already observed how P selects for the name of God employed on this important occasion one which does not appear to have been much used in the history of Israel, and that such a selection appears somewhat a strange one if his story is in any sense an invention of his own. On the other hand, little as the name was used, its appearance in J, in E, and in a song incorporated by J into his work from an independent source, is sufficient to prove that the name was at one time pretty widely known. That it should have been more widely known in early days, and have fallen into disuse when the name Jehovah had been specially assumed by God,[2] is not un-

[1] "Introduction," pp. 15, 17.

[2] It is P, remember, in which this substitution of the Covenant Name of God under the Law for His Covenant Name before the Law is recorded in Exod. vi. 3. From this time the occurrence of the disused name is rare, in J, in E, and in *all* the other Old Testament writers. What explanation can be given of this remarkable fact?

likely. Which, then, is the more probable alternative, that in this narrative, ascribed to P, we have an authentic account, couched in the language usual before the time of the Mosaic Law, of God's original covenant with Abraham, or that P, in his narrative of the establishment of this covenant, written a thousand years after the time of Moses, has pitched upon, and laid particular stress on, a name of God which in his time had almost, if not entirely, gone out of use, if, indeed, it had ever been in general use among the Israelites at all after the days of Moses? The point is a fair one to raise. It ought not to be decided by mere assertion. There can be no doubt whatever that on the critical theory this particular choice by P of the name given to God at an important epoch in his history was at least a strange one, and that its selection here demands some explanation. Nor is this all. I omitted to state that P, in Gen. xxxv. 11 (*cf.* chap. xlviii. 3, 4), where he records God's renewal of His covenant with Jacob, *again* introduces God as calling Himself by this almost obsolete name, *Shaddai*. What possible reason could a post-exilic writer have had for disinterring it?

A point which strikes the careful reader of Gen. xv.-xxi. has been already noticed. It is the *unbroken continuity* of the whole narrative. First we have Abraham's lament that he had no heir, then the grant by Sarai of her maid to fill her place, then the birth of Ishmael, and Abraham's hope that the covenant would be fulfilled in him, then the promise to Sarah, and finally its fulfilment. The stories of the supposed various writers have been dovetailed on the critical hypothesis into a continuous and strikingly consistent narrative. Moreover, there are repeated references in both JE and P to God's covenant with Abraham, each reference adding a cumulative force to it by fresh and more solemn sanctions. First we have the promise before Abraham had reached Palestine (xii. 1, 2), then the promise after he had separated from Lot, then the renewal and confirmation of this promise by means of a solemn vision (xv. 5, 18), and then the enactment of an external sign of the covenant (xvii. 9-14). It is, moreover, clear that the cumulative force of these successive ratifications of the original covenant was due to no mere chance, but that it was the obvious intention of the historian to point it out. The fact is remarked by the writer of Ps. cv. (vers. 8-11). The cumulative force of these repetitions is altogether lost sight of if we regard the history as a combination of different accounts. Further, these continued repetitions have an ethical and spiritual significance, to which St. Paul has directed our attention in the Epistle to the Galatians. But this significance is altogether illusory unless the story is true.

In ver. 7 we have a covenant made, not only with Abraham, but with *his seed after him.* This mention of a covenant, we are told, with the chosen people is a distinctive feature of the post-exilic priestly writer. Nevertheless, though this late priestly writer is the first to tell us of it, it was well known long before, as its mention by the "prophetic" writer of the "eighth or ninth century B.C.," in chap. xv. 18, xxvi. 24, and xxviii. 13 clearly shows. Here, once more, we find JE taking for granted centuries previously what modern criticism tells us was first made known by P. In other words, these passages, taken together, go a considerable way in the direction of establishing their unity of authorship. Then we have the expression "land of thy sojournings" here, in xxviii. 4, xxxvi. 7, and xxxvii. 1. In each case it is attributed to P. But, as we shall see when we get to xxxvii. 1, it is extremely problematical whether the division there can be sustained. If xxxvii. 1 does *not* belong to P, then once more the use of this expression indicates a common authorship of P and JE. Again, in vers. 7, 8 we have the expressions, "Be a God unto thee;" "I will be their God." This, as we find in Exod. vi. 7, 8, and xxix. 45, is a characteristic expression of P. But we find the words in Deut. xxix. 13, and the idea in Deut. vii. 6, xiv. 2, xxvi. 18. Now, if there be any conclusion of modern criticism supposed to be more satisfactorily established than any other, it is the fact that the religious teaching of Deuteronomy is *based on JE.* Yet here we find the Deuteronomist emphasizing a *characteristic feature of P!* Is there a mistake here? Is xvii. 7, 8 to be assigned to JE? Or does the Deuteronomist draw his religious conceptions from P as well as JE? In the latter case P is anterior to Deuteronomy after all. In either case the conclusions of the critics will have been shown to need serious revision. We may further briefly advert to the fact that in order to support the theory that the story of the covenant of circumcision is invented by P, the critics are driven to the shifts to which they usually resort when they are in a "tight place." Chap. xxi. 1 to "had said" belong, we are informed, to J; the rest of the verse, *save the word "Jehovah,"*[1] *which is the work of the redactor,* is taken from P. Ver. 2 down to "old age" *is taken from J.* Thence the passage down to the end of ver. 5 is from P. As usual, no proof of these statements is given, at least in Wellhausen's treatise on the composition of the Hexateuch. Some proof, however, is surely necessary. Wellhausen does not even refer to the passage, except to say that in xxi. 1 Jehovah (which "Jehovah?"—the

[1] P, it is to be remembered, is an *Elohist.*

word occurs twice in the verse) betrays the hand of a stranger. Is it not a little too much to ask us to accept such statements as these as the conclusions of modern science without giving some reason why we should do so? Then, again, we have here the word יולד (is born) in the Niphal (ver. 17), though that (see Gen. iv. 17) is a characteristic of JE.[1]

In ver. 12 the word לדורותיכם (in your generations) occurs. In every place where this phrase occurs it is assigned to P. But it is only fair to say that if all the criticism of the Old Testament dealt as fairly and rationally with the facts as that which relates to this particular word, I would never have said a syllable against it. That special chapters where special words and peculiarities of style occur, and when there is no special reason for the introduction of any new words or terms of expression, may have been written by a different author from the rest of the narrative, is, of course, by no means improbable. One of my complaints, however, against those who have accepted the modern criticism is that they have assumed, first, that what I have just mentioned is its *leading* principle, which it is not, and next, that the reasonableness of this leading principle is disputed by traditionalists. Nothing of the sort. Were all the criticism of the kind involved in the treatment of this particular expression, I for one would never have raised a voice against it. The expression in question never occurs except in passages of considerable length and close coherence —passages, moreover, in which not it only, but several of the words supposed to be characteristic of P, occur. No reasonable person would deny that features such as these in a Hebrew narrative might justify a candid observer in concluding that the passage in question might (not *must*) have been by a different hand. It is only when it is found that the theory of authorship suggested can only be established by such violent measures as the treatment of chap. xxi. 1-5, which has just been noticed; by the purely conjectural severance elsewhere of verses and halves of verses in a continuous narrative, as, for instance, where ver. 29 alone is assigned to P in Gen. xix., and where, in the passage xxv. 21—xxvii. 45, xxv. 26*b*, and xxvi. 34, 35 are similarly severed from the rest, with other cases like these, that the arbitrariness and doubtfulness of the conclusions become apparent. And it must once more be repeated that *probability* and *proof*,

[1] Driver, "Introduction," p. 13. This chapter has also the verbal adjective יליד to represent "is born." It also occurs in the supposed independent author of Gen. xiv. 14. This word occurs elsewhere in Lev. xii. 11; Jer. ii. 14; and *in JE*, Numb. xiii. 22, of the children of Anak. The Masorites point ver. 28 as though it were there also. But there is no Yod in the text.

though cognate words, are most assuredly not synonymous. Our next point is ver. 14. The words "break (הפר) My covenant" seem to me here, I confess, to have been the original of such passages as Deut. xxxi. 16, 20. Of course I may be wrong, but if we were to follow the example of the subjective critics, I have only to make the assertion, and any person who approved of my sentiments on the point would be entitled to say that I had "proved" that assertion, and if he could get a dozen or so of writers to support him, might declare that "the critics were agreed." In Wellhausen's work on the composition of the Hexateuch even such a step as this is very frequently regarded as quite unnecessary. The conclusion is quietly assumed. But let us follow the history of the expression. It occurs first, on the modern critical theory, in Judges ii. 2, which Professor Driver[1] tells us contains "fragments of an old account of the conquest of Canaan." Next it occurs in Isa. xxiv. 5. Then we find it in the passage of Deuteronomy mentioned above. Then it occurs with some amount of frequency in Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Last of all, it appears here, in the post-exilic account of the institution of the covenant itself. I am, be it observed, taking the critical, not the traditional, view of the relative dates of these books or parts of books. Of course we know that "the critics are agreed," and that from their verdict there is no appeal. But, were we living in an age of liberty of thought, were a little liberty of conscience permitted in the place of the Vaticanist *régime* the critics have established, perhaps some rebellious Protestants might possibly be found inclined to the belief that it were infinitely more probable that Gen. xvii. is, after all, the older narrative, and that the other writers who use the expression in question were making an allusion to the awful sanction under which the rite of circumcision was originally established. And when we further find that in ver. 13 the covenant is spoken of as "everlasting," and that Isaiah in the passage just cited uses the phrase, "They have broken (הפרו) the everlasting covenant," the inference would seem irresistible, did the strong hand of authority permit us to make it, that Isaiah was well acquainted with, and was referring to, the passage in Gen. xvii., even though criticism claims to have established the fact that it was not written till three hundred years after his death. It may safely be asserted that when criticism has been carried a little farther, when it has recovered from the

[1] "Introduction," p. 153.

[2] Isaiah xxiv. would naturally belong to the *first* Isaiah. But possibly the Polychrome Bible, which I have not seen, may attribute parts of the first Isaiah to the second. Isaiah bids fair to resemble the Pentateuch in its susceptibility to "polychrome" treatment.

present wave of disintegrationism under which all liberty of opinion and a good deal of reason and common-sense is submerged, it will be once more acknowledged that in Gen. xvii. we have the original history of the establishment of circumcision as the sign of the covenant with Abraham, and that the other passages which have just been quoted are subsequent allusions to it.

Our next argument will be one drawn from considerations of style. We have already been made acquainted with the *dictum*, delivered *ex cathedrâ*, that a priest's style is always "formal and wearisome,"[1] and have bowed to the decision, it is to be hoped, with due humility. Yet the old Adam of scepticism, even in this age of touching humility and obedience, will sometimes disquiet us a little. There is a singular likeness in style and tone between Gen. xvii. 17, and Gen. xviii. 12; but, as duty bids us, we resolutely suppress the rising doubt. Gen. xvii. 17, 18, is "formal and wearisome; it is the style of a priest." Gen. xviii. 12 is picturesque and lively, as is natural with a prophet. If there be any similarity between the passages, P has of course (I wonder why he did not do so oftener) borrowed his liveliness from JE; that is, Gen. xvii. 17 is copied from Gen. xviii. 12. There is, it is true, as we have seen, another lively passage in Gen. xvii. 18, which P has not borrowed from JE. We are, of course, forbidden to indulge the heretical thought that Gen. xvii. may after all be by the same author as the rest of the narrative, or at least as Gen. xviii. We must therefore satisfy our conscience with the theory that in the striking and somewhat impassioned and perhaps also somewhat "anthropomorphic" passage, "And Abraham said unto God, O that Ishmael might live before Thee," the priestly writer forgot his priesthood for a moment, and the obligation it imposed on him to be "formal and wearisome," and allowed himself for once in a way to write like other people. There is also another great similarity between the promises that Ishmael shall become a great nation in Gen. xvi. 10, xvii. 20, and xxi. 18, and it may be observed that in the latter passage JE repeats not his own words in chap. xvi. 10, but those of P in xvii. 20. However, as the defenders of the critics have lately boasted, they are very "difficult to refute." It is, indeed, extremely difficult to refute assertions, especially when those assertions, if questioned, are immediately bolstered up by other assertions, and when every fact which seems to look in a contrary direction is promptly set aside. It would be "difficult to refute" the assertion that the sun is a mass of incandescent

[1] CHURCHMAN for March, 1898, p. 293.

green cheese, especially if the evidence of the spectroscope and the solar prominences were set down to ignorant hallucination. And so here. If there be a strong likeness between Gen. xvii. 20 (P), and Gen. xxi. 18 (JE), the presumption in favour of unity of authorship is easily set aside. P is here quoting JE. It is not merely "difficult," it is impossible, "to refute" such an assertion. And so the critic boldly bestrides his patchwork, and challenges the miserable traditionalists to come on. If the latter venture to make a remark with which it is in the least degree difficult to deal, the weapon of lofty and contemptuous silence is unsheathed, and is brandished in his face. What use can there be in answering a person who is impervious to the force of a critical "proof"? It is, of course, impossible to argue with a man who refuses to take any notice of your arguments. So there is nothing for it but to submit. If a "formal and wearisome" passage is found, it belongs to P, and there is an end of it. If P deviates into liveliness sometimes, he is copying JE, as every enlightened critic can plainly see, and if any person fail to see it, words are thrown away upon him. So, again, if there be any resemblances in style between these different authors, JE and P, whose style is so markedly divergent, it is as clear as the sun at noonday that here the later has copied the earlier. And if we stumble across a "formal and wearisome" passage in JE, why, "formal and wearisome" passages occur in all authors, at times, as everybody knows. It is impossible for anyone to avoid it altogether. If we should go so far as to ask why, on this principle, which is indisputably true, the "formal and wearisome" passages in the Pentateuch may not be due to the author but to the subject, and may after all not be so incompatible with unity of authorship as has been supposed, the trained investigator turns aside with disgust from such wretched special pleading, and informs the ignorant quibbler that he is but "beating the air" in attempting to re-open questions which have long ago been settled by competent authority. It is, indeed, *very* "difficult to refute" critics who conduct their inquiries in such a fashion as this.

It may, however, be necessary to observe once more that I do not dispute the statement that the author or compiler of the Pentateuch used documents. Recent archæological research has conclusively proved that, at least in the earlier portion of his history, he has done so, and what he has done in the early chapters of Genesis, he may have done, and probably has done, elsewhere. The genealogies, too, as I shall hope to show further on, whether they are supposed to be extracted from JE or P, betray special features of their own. They, therefore, are almost certainly by another hand or

hands than that of the author, and many of them were probably later insertions. What I dispute is that the asserted division of the four first books of the Pentateuch between JE and P has been established. I contend that the question has in truth never been fairly discussed at all. The history of the present "conclusions of scientific research" is briefly this: Hupfeld was the first to perceive that the old J and E theory could not be sustained. He proved, not in the critical sense of that much-abused word, but by real and rational arguments, that there is far less difference between J and E than between some parts of E and other parts of E. He proceeded to assign the parts which were less like J to an earlier Elohist, and those which were more like J to a later Elohist. As we have already seen, the relation of these two Elohists to each other in the order of time has been inverted since Hupfeld's time. But there has been no real and thorough reopening of the whole question by those who have so inverted it. Where Hupfeld's analysis has been found to involve the critic in difficulty, it has been corrected. Further amendments have been made on the hypothesis that Deuteronomy is based on JE. It is possible that still further adjustments may yet have to be made in order to evade the force of objections such as have been urged in these papers. But the whole critical theory, be it once more remarked, *is based on assumptions which have not been, and cannot be proved*, and its acceptance is due, first of all to the taste of the time, which greedily runs after novelties, and next to the difficulties involved in the Old Testament history, for which it offers a welcome and specious solution. But I repeat that there has *never yet been a fair and impartial investigation* of the critical problem presented by the Pentateuch on the ordinary principles of historical and literary research accepted when dealing with the history and literature of other peoples. Until research is conducted on such principles, and on such principles only, we have a right to persist in rejecting the results supposed to have been attained.

I cannot conclude without adverting to some recent criticisms in the *Times* and *Standard* which show the conclusions to which English people are likely to arrive on the discoveries of the German school when its methods and results are fairly before the public. At present, all that the public, which has no time to study the matter, knows, is, that sundry German critics are supposed to have demonstrated that the Bible was compiled from documents, and that these documents have been proved to have been of a considerably later age than has been supposed. This is, of course, an extremely reasonable proposition, and were this all for which

the critics in question have been contending, I, for one, as I have already said, should not have troubled myself to put pen to paper to controvert them. But, happily, the invention of the "Polychrome Bible" has let the British public into the secret of the methods by which the critics have arrived at the result that Jewish religious history, as it has come down to us, is Jewish religious history turned upside down. Especially has it let daylight into the "cocksureness" of the modern professor, German or English. And so the average Englishman is beginning to have his doubts, no longer of his Old Testament, but of the infallibility of its critics instead. The *Times*, a little while ago, insinuated that the conclusions of modern criticism required a good deal of faith to support them. And now the *Standard* follows suit. In a recent review of the "Polychrome Bible" it says, "Is such certainty as the method of this edition requires likely ever to be attained?" And then, after indicating the difficulties which would attend on such a method of research if applied to English literature, it significantly adds, "Hence we doubt whether the distribution of the books of the Old Testament to which we have referred will command universal assent, and we shall not be surprised if some of them are superseded even before the series of volumes in the Polychrome Bible is completed."[1] Thus, the "Polychrome Bible" is likely, with its rainbow tints, to be a great public benefit. "I thank thee, Hebrew" critic, "for teaching me that" way of making it clear what you are driving at. The critical school may continue to ignore all critics who do not accept their axioms and postulates. They may, and undoubtedly will, represent the utterances of the reviewers in the *Times* and *Standard* as the utterances of the British Philistine. But those utterances will be found to be the ultimate verdict of English common-sense.[2]

J. J. LIAS.

[1] The *Standard* writer is a little exercised by the substitution of JHVH for the less accurate Jehovah, and after the manner of the British Philistine, asks how this remarkable combination of consonants is to be pronounced if the book be read aloud!

[2] In my last paper I referred to the fact that it is the post-exilic P which relates the change of name of Abram and Sarai, and gave evidence to show that this change was already known in the "eighth or ninth century B.C." I might have adduced Josh. xxiv., assigned by Professor Driver to E, and 1 Kings xviii. 36, supposed to be by a North Israelitish hand, and "in the best style of Hebrew historical narrative." Both these are supposed anterior to P, and both "know nothing" of the name Abram. Is P, then, romancing in Gen. xvii., or is he following some authentic narrative? It is to be hoped that some day criticism will be able to give us some account of this authentic document.

ART. II.—THE SPANISH REFORMED CHURCH.

IN a previous paper we have shown how and why evangelical religion disappeared from Spain in the sixteenth century.[1] It was burnt out of the land. In the year 1559 there were a thousand Protestants in Valladolid, a thousand in Seville, and a proportionate number in the other cities of Spain, and the wave of Protestantism was rising higher and higher. Cazalla, one of the victims of the *auto da fé* at Valladolid, is reported to have said that four more months would have been enough to have made the Protestants a match for the Roman Catholics; and a Romanist writer (Gonzala de Ilescas, "Historia Pontifical," vol. ii.) states that "if two or three months more had been suffered to elapse before applying a remedy to this mischief (Lutheranism), the conflagration would have spread itself all over Spain and brought upon her the most dire misfortunes she had ever seen." At the beginning of the year 1559 there was an undercurrent of Protestantism throughout Spain which, if not repressed, would have risen to the surface and sustained itself. And then in ten years' time there was not a Protestant in the Peninsula! Why? Because they had all been either burnt, or exiled, or imprisoned, or driven into outward conformity with the dominant Church by Philip II., the Pope, and the Inquisition. From 1559 till 1868, that is, for more than 300 years, no one in Spain dared to profess himself a Protestant. A necessary consequence of this was that the Established Church concealed within itself a vast amount of infidelity and immorality, and that it was an object of abhorrence to some of those who served at its altars or scrupulously obeyed its injunctions in public. That this was the state of things at the beginning of this century we have ample testimony in the autobiography and other writings of Blanco White.[2] The present writer can testify that it was the same in the middle of the century.[3] Already at that time the eyes of religious

---

[1] CHURCHMAN, March, 1893.

[2] Doblado's "Letters from Spain," Letter III., p. 126, etc.

[3] "Practical Waking of the Church of Spain," pp. 110, 278, etc. The following is an instance. On Good Friday, 1851, the writer went into a church with a Spaniard. "Before going into the church, he said to me, 'Señor, you will not object to going through the superstitious ceremony of crossing yourself? Do as I do.' He went in; he knelt down; he crossed himself; he appeared sunk in devotion; he rose and seated himself. After waiting three-quarters of an hour, we went out, as there was no service, owing to one of the priests required being not forthcoming. As he passed the altar he made a low genuflection, again went down on his knees, crossed himself devoutly, and retired. Immediately that we

men in Spain were turning to the Church of England for help in their distress. Here is the case of a religiously-minded layman who had been educated abroad:

"He came home to find empty, heartless forms and ceremonies, beautiful in their original intention, but now sometimes almost ridiculous from their want of life. Monks with large families of children, priests the same, openly known to all. Confession and communion once a year compulsory (no man was eligible to any employment who could not produce a certificate), the certificates of having confessed, commonly sold at the price of tenpence a piece, or less. He became thoroughly disgusted, and advocated all liberal measures, the destruction of convents, abolition of the law about confession, etc. These measures were carried. The result is, that instead of rich clergy there are poor; that instead of confessing under compulsion or bringing a ticket, he never confesses, but he is more miserable than before. He says that the Church orders confession, but he cannot, and will not, confess to such priests. He has become acquainted with some good English people and studied the Prayer-Book and New Testament. Finding no rest in his own Church, he longs to try ours. He wishes to come to the English Chapel. Of course it will not be allowed. I greatly fear that he has embarked on the downward course that leads to infidelity, and yet he is a man of a religious disposition. He sees his children growing up. His wife is a good woman who is contented to believe as she was taught, but he fears that the children are not religious, and how to make them so he does not know. If there were a priest whom he could trust, a man of intelligence and holiness, all might yet be right; but he knows of none such. He says of himself that he is profane, for he cannot believe the miracles of the saints. Of course there is self-will in this, but what first stirred him up to set himself against priests and monks but their own corruption?" (p. 111).

And here is a bitter cry raised by a priest, canon of a

---

were outside, 'Did you go through the foolish, superstitious ceremony, señor?' he asked, with a look on his face that showed that his heart had been nearer cursing than praying. On my indignantly asking him how he could go through such a mockery, 'Ah, señor,' he answered, shrugging his shoulders, 'what would you have? Everybody in Spain must be a *puro Cristiano*, i.e., *Catolico Romano*, so many keep their thoughts to themselves, and lay their fingers on their lips. Spaniards dare not express themselves freely. Formerly, had they done so, they would have been thrown into the dungeons of the Inquisition, and now no one knows for what he may find himself in the prisons of the State. I was myself brought up before the Bishop because two Englishmen with me did not kneel at the Elevation of the Host,'" etc.

Spanish cathedral, in the year 1851, contained in the same book:

"My most dear brethren in Christ,—If I must begin by a profession of faith in order that the conformity of our ideas and unity of religion may be the more plain and clear, that which I can offer you will find to the letter in the Apostles' and the Constantinopolitan Creed, and it is expounded in the same sense in which I make it by John Jewell, formerly Bishop of Salisbury, in his excellent 'Defence of the Anglican Church'. . . .

"This was ever in my thought from the time that I once recognised the true faith of Christ, to place it under the powerful shadow and protection of the Anglican Church, that, strengthened by so great a support, and led by so great a light, it might be propagated through the Spanish territory, and bring forth fruit most abundantly. As you well know, the true and genuine Gospel of Christ cannot be preached in Spain, but the gospel of the Pope, which is a very different thing indeed. The Spaniards, having these things before them, laugh at the mission of the Christian priesthood, are losing their faith and morals and sinking into atheism. Will you, then, keep them in the way of perdition in the very mouth of the pit? There is no other way but preaching the true Gospel. Here, then, is a difficult work, to which all my efforts are directed, and I implore your aid. . . . It cannot be denied that Spaniards of the present day are generally opposed to Roman practices, and rather agree with you and me in thinking and doing than with them—such is the force of reason and truth. While, however, they are giving up the errors of Romanism, they have no rule of faith and morals to embrace. . . . For unity, then, and stability of the faith to be established among us, for the restoration of Christian morals, and specially for delivering them from atheism, into which they are running headlong, the light of the Gospel must, as in old times, shine upon them. But how shall they believe without a preacher? and how shall we preach unless we be sent? . . . Will you, then, associate yourselves together for the work of the Gospel in these regions? Will you, in your charity, lead these people to the true faith of Christ? Will you recall them from atheism and indifferentism to the Church of God? Establish evangelical missions, and support them with your pious alms. Romanists labour night and day to propagate their errors, sending their fanatical missionaries round the world, and all sorts of sectaries run eagerly to the work. But ye, who profess the true faith of Christ, will ye leave a thirsty people to perish, and give them nought out of your abundance when they ask?" (p. 370).

The canon then petitions for the works of Jewell and

Cranmer to be sent to him for translation, "that so the light of the Gospel may be spread through these regions, and prepare the soil for receiving the seed of truth and life;" and ends his letter with the expression, "Your brethren in captivity salute you and the holy Anglican Church of God."

A pathetic appeal! But what could be done? A missionary or colporteur would at once have been lodged in prison, and watch and ward was kept all round the borders of the Peninsula that no book which did not have the Papal approbation should be admitted. The Anglo-Continental Society sent a box of books to Gibraltar, but they could get no further. It was as difficult for them to pass the watchful eyes of custom-house officers and monks in the middle of the nineteenth century as it was in the fifteenth century when Julian Hernandez ingeniously introduced Bibles and tracts in a small barrel fastened into the centre of a larger barrel, which appeared to be filled with wine. Gibraltar was the only corner of the Peninsula where men could freely breathe and speak; and where the lives of Spanish reformers were safe. Here they gathered, biding their time. Among them came Señor J. B. Cabrera, and helped to earn his livelihood by translating into Spanish Bishop Harold Browne's "Exposition of the Articles," for future use among his countrymen. The position which Bishop Cabrera now holds serves to give a double interest to the following letter which he wrote when in exile in Gibraltar more than thirty years ago:

"I think that you are aware that I am a presbyter of the Church of Rome, obliged to exile myself from Spain for having protested against the said Church. This is, in fact, the reason of my being in Gibraltar, having abandoned relatives, friends, and country, to follow the inspirations of my conscience, and to serve Christ in a purer Church than that in which I was a priest. It is true that I have to suffer a life of privation and distress, and earn my bread by the sweat of my brow; but I am able to do all in Him that strengtheneth me. I am here alone, unprotected by any society, and left to my own resources; my faith is firm, and I hope that if it be God's will that the doors of Spain be soon opened to the Gospel, I may be a useful servant of Christ, to make known among my countrymen the false doctrines of Rome, and the truth of the law of grace in its purity. Meantime, I carry on some correspondence with Spanish priests which, I think, may bring forth good fruit. I know my country and its needs, and I think that I know the best way of meeting them. The two great enemies that we have in Spain are fanaticism on one side, and indifferentism on the other. Fanaticism, the

child of ignorance, we must combat by teaching; indifferentism, which springs from want of faith, we must banish by the Word of God, set forth in all its purity and freed from the tawdry coverings with which it has been disfigured. We must give the Spaniards good books on which to feed. Little tracts go for nothing. There is a proverb in Spain, 'The cloth is known by the pattern,' and in accordance with this, Spaniards judge of the Reformed Church by the insignificant and uninteresting little tracts which have been circulated in Spain. It is my opinion that our exertions ought to be specially directed to enlightening the clergy, for if they are turned to the Lord, they will be the instrument for enlightening the masses. You are well aware that reformation ought to come from the clergy and not from the people; let us, therefore, address the clergy. For this reason I have the greatest pleasure in being engaged on the present translation, because I think that the 'Exposition of the XXXIX. Articles' will be a book to spread much light in Spain, though, at the same time, I do not hide from myself the difficulties there will be in the way of its introduction into this unhappy Peninsula.

'JUAN B. CABRERA, Presbyter.

"Gibraltar, August 5, 1866."

To meet the needs, so far as was possible, of the little colony of Spanish exiles at Gibraltar, the Anglo-Continental Society sent the Rev. Antonio Vallespinosa to hold service, in Spanish, according to the forms of the English Prayer-Book, his stipend being found by the excellent William Gibbs, of the great Spanish-American mercantile house of Antony Gibbs. Señor Vallespinosa had some years before left his home in Catalonia as a young man, and thrown himself on the charity of the English chaplains at Malaga and Gibraltar, saying that he wanted to be educated and taught as a Protestant, in order to teach his countrymen. From Gibraltar he came to England, and was sent for his education by the Anglo-Continental Society for two years to St. Aidans, after which he was placed under the care of Mr. Alexander Dallas for another year. He was then ordained Deacon by the Bishop of Gibraltar in Frant Church, near Tunbridge Wells, on October 25, 1865, and he began his ministrations at Gibraltar in November in the same year. These ministrations he continued till "the doors of Spain were opened" in 1868.

Even before that date some efforts were made, but they were at once crushed. There was one Spaniard who dared to protest against the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. Fray Braulio Morgaez, Divinity Professor in the University of Alcalà, ventured to question it—with bated breath indeed, but

yet he questioned it; for he was a Dominican friar, and the Dominicans had always been opposed to the doctrine. The result was that he was seized by the ecclesiastical authorities and thrown into prison, and there kept till the secular magistrates interposed to deliver him. Then every effort was made to shut him up in a madhouse, but here again the law, even though it was Spanish law, stood his friend, in spite of the clamours of the Ultramontane party and of "the prelates who in hostility to my doctrine have tried to kill me either by throwing me into prison, or by burying me for ever in a madhouse, or in some other way." The honest friar held out for a time and published his protest,[1] not, of course, in Madrid, where such a profanity would not have been allowed, but in Paris—a protest full of sound argument mixed with cries of indignation. But what could one man do against the enthusiastic Mariolatry of populace, priests, and bishops, among whom the Immaculate Conception had been made a party war-cry? Down to 1855 one Father Pascual had been respected as the most learned theologian of Salamanca, but though he made no protest, as he would not acknowledge the new dogma, the bishops and clergy refused him the last sacraments, on the ground of "his error and heresy." What became of Fray Morgaez we know not. Perhaps he too died excommunicate; perhaps he was forced back into a compulsory conformity. If so, he would be no worse than Hefele and the other German bishops who "accepted" the dogma of Papal Infallibility, which they did not believe.

Another effort previous to 1868 was made by Señor Aguayo. He wrote a "Letter to the Spanish Presbyters" of a Liberal-Catholic tendency, which caused some stir. Holding a benefice at Motril, in the diocese of Granada, he was brought before the Archbishop and imprisoned. He was kept in prison until he consented to sign a retractation. Being released, he withdrew his retractation and escaped to Lisbon, keeping himself well out of reach till the era of comparative liberty arrived, when he returned and took a leading part in the reform movement.

How little security a native of Spain could find who dared to whisper the word "Reform" may be judged from an incident which happened to two Englishmen in 1866. They had contrived to smuggle some Bibles across the frontier, and found them eagerly sought after by the common people. On their

[1] "Examen Bullæ Ineffabilis institutum et concinnatum juxta regulas sanioris Theologiæ, a Fratre Braulio Morgaez, Professore Sacræ Theologiæ in Ordine Prædicatorun et in Universitate Complutensi." Paris; Huet, 1858.

way from Bayonne they were met by gendarmes, who stopped them and confiscated all the books they had with them. Providing themselves with more, they zealously continued their work, but it was soon interrupted by a summons from the Alcalde of Vittoria, served upon them and published in the *Gaceta*, to appear before him and answer to the charge of "having distributed prohibited books published by the English Protestant Bible Society" before the 30th of January next. They thought it best to leave the country before the day of trial came. The present writer made himself liable to deportation from Spain or imprisonment in the year 1850 for saying the English Church service with the English visitors who happened to be in the hotel with him at Granada.

The year 1868 came, and with it General Prim's long-hoped-for revolution. "The doors of Spain were opened," and the little band of exiles at Gibraltar burst over the Peninsula like the contents of an explosive ball. Protestantism was preached to willing ears in Madrid, Seville, Barcelona, Cordova, Malaga, Granada, and other cities and towns of Spain. Six places of Protestant worship were opened in Madrid, six in Seville, two in Barcelona, one in Cadiz, Xeres, Granada, Malaga, Cordova, Huelva, Carthagena, Alicante, and so on. Señor Cabrera betook himself to Seville, and began with a congregation of 400. Scottish Presbyterians showed the greatest sympathy and liberality towards the reformers, and obtained a proportionate influence over them. The first hint at the creation of a Reformed National Church is found in a programme issued June 29, 1869, which begins as follows:

"We proclaim and establish in Spain a free Christian and National Church, which shall be ruled till the meeting of a general Assembly by the articles of the following constitution:

"1. This Church holds, believes and confesses the Apostles' Creed, the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed, and that of St. Athanasius, with all doctrines contained in the sacred Scriptures, and in the first four General Councils of the Church.

"2. This Church, holding the faith which is common to all true Christian Churches, shall have its own discipline, which may be altered according to the conditions of time and place."

The document then goes on to appoint "for the present" a Presbyterian form of discipline.

We do not see what else could have been done for the moment, when the chief idea entertained of a Bishop was that he was a State officer for the enforcement of conformity to the dominant Church by imprisonments which he could arbitrarily

inflict, and when Christian love was mainly shown to the brethren by Presbyterian agencies. The determination from the beginning to hold by the Catholic faith, as expressed in Holy Scripture, the creeds and earliest Councils, is very satisfactory. We believe that the first article was due in a great degree to the influence of Señor Cabrera, who had but a little before been engaged in the translation of Bishop Cosin's "Religion, Discipline and Rites of the English Church," which commences with a similar declaration.

In 1871 a second manifesto was issued at Madrid, signed by seven priests, at the head of whom was Señor Aguayo, who had now returned to Spain, and had been for the last year publishing a weekly journal, in which he dealt with such questions as the Infallibility of the Pope, Indulgences, the Celibacy of the Clergy, etc. The new manifesto laid down as a basis of union and reform—

1. Purity of doctrine as it is in the New Testament, excluding all additions made by Councils, Bulls, Decretals, and Encyclics.
2. Separation and independence of Church and State.
3. Election of Church officers by universal suffrage.
4. Abolition of the Latin tongue in public worship, of the compulsory celibacy of the clergy, and of payment for the ministration of the Sacraments and Church services.
5. Self-government of the Church by means of synods.

A committee of seven priests was formed to carry out this programme, and an organ entitled *La Iglesia Española* was started.

At first there could be no thought among reformers except of a combined effort for reform and Christian liberty. As time went on, a difference naturally developed itself as to the basis on which the desired reform should be carried out. Some of the reformers had all along been Episcopalian in their principles, some Presbyterian, Wesleyan, or Congregationalist. Out of about ten thousand Protestants some two thousand declared themselves Episcopalians, and in 1878 they appealed to the Lambeth Conference to consecrate a Bishop for them, nominated by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London; or if the Conference, as such, should feel themselves precluded from taking such a step, to refer the question to the Irish Church, and "enable them to procure the Episcopate from the Church of Ireland," in which case they "desired to leave the nomination of their first Bishop in the hands of the Irish Primate, the Lord Bishop of Armagh." In response, the Lambeth Conference appointed a committee to take the matter into consideration, and the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"That your Committee, having carefully considered a memorial addressed to the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church of England by four priests and certain other members of the Spanish and Portuguese Reformed Episcopal Church, praying for the consecration of a Bishop, cannot but express their hearty sympathy with the memorialists in the difficulties of their position, and having heard a statement on the subject of the proposed extension of the episcopate to Mexico by the American Church, they venture to suggest that when a Bishop shall have been consecrated by the American Church for Mexico, he might be induced to visit Spain and Portugal, and render such assistance at this stage of the movement as may seem to him practicable and advisable."

Accordingly, the Archbishop of Canterbury (Tait), acting for the Lambeth Conference, requested Bishop Riley, in a formal letter "under our hand and Archiepiscopal seal," to visit Spain and Portugal for the purpose of advising and otherwise assisting the members of the Spanish and Portuguese Reformed Episcopal Church," and "commended him to the sympathy and goodwill of the faithful in Christ Jesus."

Having received his Grace's letter of commendation, Bishop Riley visited the Peninsula in the spring of 1880, and in March the first synod of the Reformed Church was held at Seville, attended by delegates from Madrid, Seville and Malaga, Bishop Riley presiding. At this synod a constitution of the Church was formally adopted, and the Rev. J. B. Cabrera was chosen as Bishop Elect. Bishop Riley ordained a deacon for Malaga.

The relations between the young Church and the Lambeth Conference were warm and cordial. The following month the synod wrote to the Standing Committee of the Lambeth Conference: "The Spanish Church declares herself to be the faithful guardian and teacher of the Holy Scriptures, the only rule of faith and life, and to maintain and teach the faith once delivered to the saints. She preserves and administers the two Sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion, maintains the Orders of Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons of the Primitive Church, and recognises as her Governor and Head the Lord and Redeemer Jesus Christ. . . . The Spanish Church in its national character is now forming a liturgy based on the ancient Mozarabic rite. . . . We believe in the Communion of Saints, and are convinced that this fellowship is formed by the bonds of faith made fast by those of love. In this assurance we apply to you, asking your fellowship, friendship and sympathies. Pray for us, enlighten us with your mature counsel, and strengthen our hands with a little out of the abundance of those good things wherewith the Lord in

His loving-kindness has blessed you. It is a great privilege to have brethren unto whom we may turn, and surely it is no less a privilege to be able to succour and defend the feeble and those who are in want. The Spanish Church writes to you for assistance, and asks you to receive her friendship, love, and profound gratitude."

All this, be it noted, before Lord Plunket had taken any special interest in the Peninsula, showing how false was the idea, industriously propagated, that the movement "originated with the Archbishop of Dublin," whereas it was about this time that he "for the first time felt that a duty had been cast in his path" by a communication made to him by Dr. Noyes, "and that as one of the Irish Episcopate," to which appeal had been made, "he could not shrink from the responsibility of considering the claim upon which it was based" (Preface to Dr. Noyes' "Church Reform in Spain and Portugal"). In 1881 Lord Plunket paid his first visit to Spain—a hurried visit which he was enabled to make while passing the winter with some of his family at Pau. While in Madrid he was taken by Señor Cabrera to the spot where, in a cutting made for the new Calle Carranza, the ashes of the martyrs of the sixteenth century were laid bare. An effort was made to secure the site for a Protestant church, but that not being possible, a piece of ground in the Calle Beneficencia was selected, and there, as soon as sufficient funds were collected, the present church in which Bishop Cabrera officiates was built. Lord Plunket's second and third visits were paid in 1884 and 1888, when he ordained clergy for the two episcopal communities of Spain and Portugal, which had not yet a Bishop of their own, just as Bishop Riley had done for Spain, and as Bishop Kendrick has subsequently done for Mexico.

It was plain that the time was now drawing near for the consecration of Cabrera as Bishop of the community over which he was presiding. It was the opinion of all the friends of the movement that the most suitable prelates to perform the act of consecration would be the Old Catholic Bishops of Germany and Switzerland, as this would bind together the reforming bodies and prevent a schism between Teutons and Latins. Lord Plunket, therefore, who never spared himself, took a journey into Germany and Switzerland and made application to the Old Catholic Bishops. He found them very willing to act, and all seemed to be satisfactorily arranged. But soon afterwards a close union was made between the Old Catholics of Germany and Switzerland and the remains of the Jansenist Church of Holland, represented by three prelates. A joint Declaration of Faith was issued at Utrecht, and at the

same time an Agreement was entered into that neither party to the pact should enter into relations with any Christian communities without the consent of the other. The Dutch are as yet but little reformed in their doctrine. They use the unreformed Missal and Breviary, and hold all Roman tenets, except the Supremacy of the Pope and those Roman dogmas, such as the Immaculate Conception and Papal Infallibility, which have been added to the Papal faith since their rupture with the Pope two centuries ago. It is reasonable to expect that, not being constrained by Papal authority, and having begun to co-operate with the Old Catholics of Germany and Switzerland, they may advance to a more tenable position than that which they now occupy; but as yet they have not done so. Consequently, on seeing that the Spanish Reformers had adopted articles analogous to our XXXIX. Articles, and substantially the same with them in doctrine, they interposed their veto, and the German and Swiss prelates were therefore precluded from carrying out their provisional engagement, though Señor Cabrera was invited to the Old Catholic Congress of Lucerne in 1892, and took part in its proceedings.

It was evident now that if the Episcopate was to be conveyed to the Spanish reformed community, there was only one course left open by which it could be done with propriety. Señor Cabrera was known in England and Ireland, having attended and spoken at the Anglo-Continental Society's Conference at Farnham Castle in 1888, and having been the guest of Lord Plunket at Old Connaught House in Ireland. The Spanish Synod had appealed to the prelates of the Irish Church for the gift of the Episcopate. The Irish Bishops had been willing to stand aside in favour of the Old Catholic Bishops, but seeing that the latter were so hampered as to be obliged to put it from them, the responsibility of the Irish Bishops revived, and they felt themselves called upon to act. In 1892 the Archbishop of Dublin and the Bishop of Clogher, accompanied by the present writer and Dr. Robertson, of Venice, visited Spain, not for the purpose of consecrating a Bishop, but for Confirmations in Spain and Portugal and the consecration of the church in Madrid, which was now completed. At Valladolid the Archbishop confirmed 14 persons, and the same number at Salamanca, at Villaescusa 40, the congregations in each place being 120, 125 and 400, and the communicants at Salamanca 25. On December 1 he reached Madrid, being joined by M. Hyacinthe Loyson, Count Enrico di Campello, Rev. Ugo Janni, Mr. and Mrs. W. McCall, and the Archbishop's acting chaplain, Dr. Noyes, from Paris. In the afternoon of that day a meeting of the Synod of the Church

took place, which consisted of Señor Cabrera, who presided, the Archbishop of Dublin, the Bishop of Clogher, and Señores Palomares (Seville), Baquero (Seville), Garcia (Madrid), Regaliza (Villaescusa), Vila (Malaga), Martinez (Valladolid), Jimenez (Salamanca), Rial (Monistrol), and it was attended (by invitation) by Dr. Noyes, M. Loyson, Count E. di Campello, Signor Janni, Mr. McCall, Mr. Forest, Dr. Robertson, and Canon Meyrick. At this synod the Archbishop recounted the steps that had been taken in applying to the Old Catholic Bishops for the consecration of a Bishop, and the failure of the application. The Bishop of Clogher said that after what he had seen in Spain, he should be willing to act as one of the consecrators. M. Loyson and Count E. di Campello, invited to speak, declared their belief that to be a true primitive Christian in these days, it was necessary to be both Protestant and Catholic, and to be separated from the Pope. On Señor Cabrera's proposal, the Archbishop was authorized by the Synod to use either the Spanish or the Irish form for the consecration of the church on the following Sunday.

But the consecration did not take place on the following Sunday. On Saturday night notice was received that the Governor of Madrid would not allow the opening of the church, and on Sunday morning two policemen appeared and peremptorily forbade the entrance of the congregation, which had assembled from all parts of Madrid. Not only so, but as the same entrance led to the church and to the clergy-house, the Archbishop, the Bishop, and Canon Meyrick, who were staying with Señor Cabrera, were not allowed, if they left the house, to re-enter it. Thus, the Archbishop was made a prisoner in his own house. It was astonishing to see his patience and serenity under this insult. He quietly remained, communicating with his friends only through the window, until the afternoon, when he left the house for an ordination in another building, after which, unable to re-enter, he went with his companions to a hotel.

The ordination was one of singular interest. The candidate was Señor Regaliza, already a deacon serving at Villaescusa. On his head were laid the hands of the Archbishop, and Bishop Stack from Ireland, Dr. Noyes and Canon Meyrick from England, M. Loyson from France, Count E. di Campello from Italy, Señor Cabrera from Spain, in the presence of a congregation of some 200 Spaniards. Seldom has the laying on of hands of the presbytery been performed by representatives of so many nationalities and Churches.

Throwing an obstacle in the way of the consecration of the church in Madrid was one of the last acts of the then Canovas Ministry. A few days afterwards a Sagasta Ministry

succeeded, and at the first meeting of the Cabinet it was determined that the Protestants were within their rights, and were not to be interfered with. Still, however, difficulties were raised. There was a foliated cross carved on the outside wall of the building; that must be removed, for what had Protestants to do with the Cross? The west door opened on the street; that must be closed and a little side door used. The approval of the Mayor of Madrid must be obtained, and the new mayor had not yet been appointed. The consecration had therefore still to be deferred, and the Archbishop returned to Ireland, having given a formal license for the use of the edifice as a church.

In the autumn of the year 1894, after some fifteen years of waiting, the time came for the consecration of Bishop Cabrera. On Thursday, September 20, the Archbishop of Dublin, the Bishop of Clogher, and the Bishop of Down, to whose action the Irish Church had given provisional sanction, arrived in Madrid. On the Friday a Synod was held at which the Church bound itself by the following conditions: "1. That until these Churches (of Spain and Portugal) shall have in each case three Bishops of their own, there shall be associated with their own Bishop or Bishops a Provisional Council consisting of two or three Bishops of the Church of Ireland or of some Church in communion therewith. 2. That during the same interval the Synod of each Church shall be pledged (*a*) not to permit the election or consecration of any Bishop for the said Church without the written consent of the Provisional Council of Bishops; (*b*) not to alter or add to the doctrines, formularies or discipline of the said Church without the previous approval of the Provisional Council; (*c*) to submit for the examination and sanction of the Provisional Council every resolution of a fundamental character that may be proposed for adoption by a future Synod. 3. That no Bishop consecrated shall have power to consecrate for another Church without the consent of the other Bishops forming the Council."

Provision having thus been made for the future, the consecration, first of the church, then of the Bishop, took place in solemn form, after which the newly consecrated Bishop proceeded with the Communion Service, "standing behind the holy table and facing the congregation according to the ancient Mozarabic use." The communicants were 134, all deeply impressed by the solemnity of the occasion. No objection was made by the Spanish authorities, and nothing but goodwill was shown by the mass of the Spanish people; but an ultramontane storm was raised by the Papal Nuncio, the Carlist newspapers, and the Court ladies of Madrid,

creating an unreal excitement, which communicated itself to some few persons in England.

Thus was completed the organization of a Reformed Church in Spain, which would have taken shape and been established in the sixteenth century—perhaps under Archbishop Carranza—had it not been for the Inquisition as wielded by the Pope of Rome, Philip II., and the Inquisitor-General, Valdès. Since his consecration Bishop Cabrera has held visitations and fulfilled the functions of a Bishop in confirming and ordaining candidates for his own congregations where necessary; and none of the evils which timid men prophesied have occurred. The question now arises, Are we to stop here? Bishop Cabrera is not a young man, and there is but one Bishop of the Reformed Church in the Peninsula. There is another Church, the Reformed Church of Portugal, of which we have here said nothing. It has six congregations connected with it, and is governed by a Synod. More than once the Synod has expressed its earnest desire that the Rev. Godfrey P. Pope, British Chaplain at Lisbon, would accept the office of Bishop, and that he may be consecrated by the same agency as that by which Señor Cabrera was consecrated. This question therefore lies with Mr. Pope himself and with the prelates of the Irish Church. These prelates have shown so much prudence and courage in their relation to the Spanish Church, that we may confidently leave the question of a reformed Portuguese Bishop to their judgment and wisdom.

F. MEYRICK.

ART. III.—THE BAPTISTS.

THE Baptists are so called in contradistinction to all other Christians who practise Infant Baptism, their leading principle being that Baptism should only be administered to adults, who are capable of exercising repentance and faith as a visible sign, or token, that they have fulfilled these conditions, and as a consequent act of consecration to God. Those who held the same tenets in this respect were formerly called Anabaptists, because they were in the habit of rebaptizing (*ἀναβαπτίζω*) those previously baptized who joined their communion. They also maintain immersion to be the only correct method of baptizing. They regard themselves as the truest representatives of the Primitive Church, alleging that Infant Baptism was seldom, if at all, practised in the Church for some

centuries; that it crept in, along with other corruptions, mainly owing to the baneful influence of the North African Church; and that there have always been those who have held their opinions, often falsely classed as heretics, *e.g.*, the Paulicians, the Cathari, the Albigenses, the Waldenses, the Lollards, and other Churches, or sects, of primitive or mediæval times.

The Anabaptists of the Reformation Period held, in some points, the same doctrines and the same views of Church government as the Baptists of later date, though they differed from them in many respects. In 1523 they were to be found in considerable numbers in Switzerland, where they were persecuted by Zwinglians and Romanists alike. In 1529 the Senate of Zurich—unmindful of the fact that they had only just secured liberty of conscience for themselves, and were exposed to persecution at any time from the adherents of Rome—actually decreed that Anabaptists, or those who harboured them, should be punished with death by drowning. In 1530 they had several churches fully organized in Middle and South Germany and the Tyrol. In 1534 they were found in large numbers in North Germany, Holland, and Belgium, increasing even under Alva's cruel and tyrannous rule, and displaying no little missionary zeal. In Poland, Hungary, and subsequently in Bohemia and Piedmont, they were persecuted with terrific violence, but, notwithstanding, rapidly grew and multiplied.

In England there is said to have been a Baptist congregation at Chesterton as early as 1457. In the middle of the sixteenth century books were written against them, indicating the prevalence of the sect; and good Bishop Latimer tells us that there were as many as five hundred of them in one town. Fox, the martyrologist, states that ten Dutch Anabaptists were put to death in different places in 1535. In 1536 a convocation of the clergy published several articles condemning Baptist opinions, and Henry VIII. issued proclamations against them. We read of a commission being issued in 1538 to Archbishop Cranmer and the other Bishops of the province of Canterbury to search after Anabaptists, and to punish them with all possible vigour; and as the result two of them were burnt in Smithfield, and fourteen altogether were put to death. In 1539 thirty-one Anabaptists who had fled from England were slain at Delft, in Holland, the men being beheaded and the women drowned. As early as 1548 whole congregations of the sect and their ministers were apprehended by legal authority; and less than ten years afterwards inquiries were ordered to be made after them in Articles of Visitation issued by Bishops Bonner and Gardiner. In 1575 Elizabeth issued a

proclamation against them; and in consequence twenty-seven of their body were cast into prison, and two burnt at the stake in Smithfield. These proclamations against Anabaptists, the persecutions to which they were exposed, and the martyrdom of not a few of them, show the prevalence in England of those who held such views in the times of the Tudors, as early as the sixteenth century.

The connection, however, of our modern Baptists with these Anabaptists is by no means clear; they seem to have sprung rather from the Brownists, or early Independents. Indeed, their early history is somewhat obscure, and does not properly commence till the seventeenth century. From the "Baptist Handbook" we learn that "the earliest General Baptist churches of which any history is known were founded about 1611-14 by Thomas Helwisse in London, Tiverton, Coventry, etc., and the earliest Particular Baptist church by John Spilsbury, at Wapping, in 1633." Many of the Brownist, or Independent, congregations held Baptist views, repudiating the practice of Infant Baptism, and these founded a separate congregation in London on September 12, 1633; and we read of another Baptist church being founded in 1639. Their opinions rapidly spread; so much so, that in 1643 they held an assembly in London, at which a Confession of Faith was drawn up, which was generally accepted as a standard for about seventeen years. In 1646 they had as many as forty congregations in London alone; and in Cromwell's time their tenets were held by many members of Parliament, and by large numbers in the army and in civil employments. Under James I. and Charles I., and again after the Restoration of the monarchy in 1660, they were cruelly persecuted; indeed, the last man executed by burning for alleged heresy in England was Edward Wightman, a Baptist, on April 11, 1612. Under Charles II. the celebrated John Bunyan was put into prison in 1660, and kept there for twelve years; and in 1683 a pastor at Bristol named Fownes was apprehended while preaching in a wood, and conveyed to Gloucester gaol, where, after two years and nine months' imprisonment, he died. After the glorious Revolution under William III., and with the passing of the Toleration Act in 1689, all persecution of the Baptists as well as of other dissenters ceased. All remaining disabilities imposed by the Test and Corporation Acts were finally removed by the repeal of those Acts in 1828.

The first Association of Baptist churches was organized in 1653, in Somersetshire; this was followed two years later by one in the Midland counties. Others were formed from time to time in different places; and at present there appear to be in England and Wales thirty-four of these in connection with

the Baptist Union, which was founded in 1863, and now has a regular constitution, and is duly registered as a corporation capable of holding property under a common seal.

Baptist opinions were carried to America by Roger Williams, who emigrated to Boston, Massachusetts, in 1630. Driven thence because he refused to recognise the power of the civil magistrate in religion, he formed a settlement in Rhode Island, and in 1639 founded the first Baptist church on the American continent. The views of the denomination rapidly spread there. At the beginning of the eighteenth century there were only sixteen Baptist congregations in America, at the close there were about nine hundred—a fifty-six-fold increase; and at the present time one-fourth of the Protestant population of the United States is said to belong to their communion. The "Baptist Handbook" for this current year gives the following statistics for the United States: Number of members, 3,980,088; of churches, 44,037; of ministers, 28,820; of scholars in Sunday-schools, 1,500,832; and of baptisms, 205,157.

In the British Isles we gather from the same authority the number of members of the denomination is 353,967, or less than one-tenth of those in the United States; of churches, 2,917; of ministers, 1,935; of scholars in Sunday-schools, 513,638; and of baptisms, 15,795.

For the last eighty years the Baptists have paid great attention to the preparation of candidates for their ministry. As early as 1685 a member of the community in Bristol left a portion of his estate for the education of young men for the ministry under the pastor of the chapel in Broadmead, Bristol. By the help of this bequest, subsequently supplemented by others, an academy was started in 1720. This developed into the Bristol Baptist College in 1811. Similar institutions have been founded elsewhere, and there are now eleven colleges—including one in Scotland, one in Ireland, and three in Wales—educating about 250 students for their ministry.

The Baptists have been conspicuous for their zeal for Foreign Missions. Next to the Moravians, they were the first of British Christians to take up missionary work amongst the heathen; for our own Society for the Propagation of the Gospel had for its primary object only our own colonies. In 1784 the Northampton Association of Baptist Churches set apart the first Monday of every month for prayer for the spread of the Gospel amongst the heathen. In 1792, or seven years before the inauguration of our own great Church Missionary Society, the Baptist Missionary Society was founded at Kettering, in Northamptonshire, the sermon on the occasion being preached by the celebrated William Carey, who uttered

then the memorable, oft-quoted sentence, "Expect great things from God; attempt great things for God." In the following year he sailed for India, and shortly after was followed by Marshman and Ward. Being prevented by the authorities from commencing work in British India, they started a mission in the Danish settlement of Serampore. The Society is now engaged in active operations in the East, in Africa, and in the West Indies, and its ordinary income for the year ended March 31, 1897, was £64,792, and expenditure £69,874, exclusive of amounts raised and expended at the mission stations and some special funds.

Indeed, not only in this, but also in other respects, it would be alike unjust and ungenerous to refuse frankly to recognise "the works of faith and labours of love" which the Baptist community has so largely exhibited; especially we may not forget the conspicuous part they played in the emancipation of the slaves in the West Indies. They have had their fair share of saints—men who, by the holiness of their characters and the devotion of their lives, have "adorned the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things"; while amongst their ministers there have been many whose lips have been touched with fire from heaven. A religious community, which numbers amongst its ministers Robert Hall and Charles H. Spurgeon, two of the greatest preachers of any country or age, and amongst its missionaries Carey and Marshman of Serampore, and Judson of Burmah, and which includes in its ranks John Bunyan and Andrew Fuller, John Forster, and Dr. Gill the Commentator, cannot but occupy a conspicuous place amongst the Churches of Christendom.

There are a great many sects of those who hold Baptist opinions, *e.g.*, the Free-Will Baptists, the Seventh-day Baptists, the Campbellites, etc. Without attempting to describe the differences which separate these respectively one from the other, we may refer to the following main subdivisions:

1. The General, or Arminian, Baptists, who hold that Christ died for all men; but that those only who by faith appropriate His salvation will be saved.

2. The Particular, or Calvinistic, Baptists, who hold that Christ died only for the elect.

These in 1891 amalgamated; and the leading subdivisions now are:

1. The Baptists, including General and Particular.

2. The Strict, or hyper-Calvinistic Baptists.

There is a further classification of members of the Baptist denomination into:

(1) The Open, who admit Pædobaptists and all without distinction to the Holy Communion.

(2) The Close, who admit only those who have undergone the rite of Adult Baptism to the other Sacrament.

This latter ground of difference caused, at the beginning of this century, much discussion, in which the celebrated Robert Hall took a leading part. Since then the principle of Open Communion has largely spread; and it is said now to be the usage of nearly half the Baptists of the British Isles and of the majority of those in North America.

The first Confession of Faith amongst the Baptists in England was published in 1644, and several editions of it, with alterations and additions, were published in subsequent years. In 1655 another code, in sixteen articles, laying down with much precision the principal articles of their belief, was put forth by the Association of Baptist Churches in the Midland counties. In 1677, a General Assembly of Baptists adopted the Westminster Confession, which was completed in 1646, *i.e.*, subsequently to the first Baptist Confession, with some changes and omissions; and this is still the standard of doctrine most largely accepted, at all events, in the United States. In 1689, a general meeting, attended by delegates from more than one hundred congregations, was held in London; and at this gathering a Confession of Faith in thirty-two articles was drawn up, containing a tolerably complete compendium of theoretical theology and practical Christian duty. This was ordered to be disseminated amongst all the Baptist churches of the United Kingdom, and remained for about one hundred and fifty years their recognised standard of doctrine and communion. It seems, however, to have fallen into disuse now for many years; and there does not appear to be any generally accepted standard of faith for the ministers and members of the Baptist denomination at the present day.

As regards the principal doctrines of the Christian Creed, the Baptists are in general accord with our own and the other Protestant and Evangelical Churches. Thus they hold (1) Holy Scripture to be given by the inspiration of God, and its supreme authority as the one sole rule of faith. (2) The doctrine of the Trinity—the Three Persons in the One Godhead. (3) The doctrine of the Incarnation—that the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity became man. (4) The doctrine of the Atonement—the one offering of Christ for the sins of the world, offered once for all on the Cross. (5) Regeneration, as the sovereign work of the Holy Spirit—that all who are to be saved must have the "new birth unto righteousness" effected by Him. (6) Justification by faith only; but that that justification must be followed by good works as "the fruits of faith," for without holiness "no man shall see the Lord." (7) The two Sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper. In

their exposition of these doctrines, they are in very general accord with the statements of our own Articles and other formularies, except as regards Baptism, with respect to which they differ in the following particulars:

1. Baptism should only be administered to those who are capable of understanding Christian doctrine, of exercising repentance and intelligent faith, and of making an open profession of their belief in Jesus Christ—in short, only to true believers; the outward rite being the seal of the faith that is in them.

In support of this view they allege:

(1) That from our Lord's discourse with Nicodemus it would appear that spiritual regeneration must precede Baptism, which is the outward visible token of the inward spiritual change.

(2) That our Lord, when He instituted Baptism, associated teaching with it.

(3) That, so far as we can gather from the Acts of the Apostles, none but those fully conscious of what they were doing were admitted to Baptism.

(4) That whenever Baptism is spoken of in the New Testament, it is implied that the recipient has undergone the spiritual change first; and that otherwise the rite has no significance.

2. The only correct mode of Baptism is by immersion, or dipping in the water.

In support of this view they assert:

(1) That this was undoubtedly the practice of the Church, as far as we can gather from what is recorded in the New Testament; as, indeed, is plain from St. Paul's reference to it in Rom. vi. 4, 5, and Col. ii. 12, where the going down into the water represents death and burial, and the coming up out of it again resurrection—the illustration being meaningless if Baptism were by sprinkling.

(2) That this was the method used by all Christians for thirteen centuries, until the Roman Church introduced the practice of sprinkling.

(3) That the Greek, Armenian, and other Oriental Churches baptize by immersion still.

They also differ from us in another important particular, viz.:

3. That of Church Government.

Of the three leading systems,

(1) The Episcopal, or government by Bishops;

(2) The Presbyterian, or government by councils of Presbyters;

(3) The Congregational, each congregation being inde-

pendent, and having along with its pastor or pastors the right of self-government, subject only to the Headship of Christ;—
this last is the system which they have adopted, believing it to be most in accordance with New Testament teaching and precedent.

They hold further in this connection that the only order of the ministry is that of pastors—known in the New Testament as presbyters or overseers; and that government and discipline can only be exercised by these in conjunction with the whole body of baptized believers gathered together in the particular congregation. True, they join together in associations for the purpose of Christian fellowship and work; but these associations are merely consultative, and can only give counsel or advice, without the right of exercising any control over the associated congregations.

It will be thus seen that, except in these three particulars, they do not differ from us materially. Indeed, the points in which we agree are so much more important and numerous than those in which we differ, that reunion in course of time ought not to be regarded as quite an impossibility.

Dealing with the points of difference, we observe—

1. With regard to Infant Baptism we could not relax our rule. For, without insisting too much on the probable arguments based on (1) the three cases of Baptism of whole families recorded in the New Testament, in some one or more of which, presumably, there were young children; (2) the analogy of Circumcision in the Jewish Church; (3) the fact that our Saviour allowed the young children to be brought to Him, and said that "of such is the kingdom of heaven"—we have (4) the Apostle distinctly stating that the children of believing parents are "holy," and if "holy," then *ipso facto* they are consecrated to God, and have a right to receive the seal of Baptism. We should not think of baptizing the infants of any but professing Christian parents, as it is on this principle alone we baptize infants at all. In the case of Adult Baptism, we are quite in accord with the Baptist view that faith and repentance are indispensable preliminary conditions for the reception of the outward rite; while we hold that in the case of infants the promise to fulfil these conditions is made for them beforehand, "which promise," subsequently, "when they come to age, themselves are bound to perform." As it is, there are not a few nominal members of our own Church who unhappily neglect to have their children baptized in infancy, and we make no difficulty about baptizing these in riper years on the fulfilment of the requisite conditions; and, indeed, our Church has a special service appointed for such

cases. Though, then, the non-use of the practice of Infant Baptism could not possibly be sanctioned by our Church as a principle, may not the deferring of the rite, perhaps, be tolerated in the case of the children of parents who have conscientious prejudices against it, as, indeed, practically, it is tolerated now in the case of the children of the negligent and indifferent?

2. In the matter of the mode of administering Baptism the difference between us and them is only an apparent one in practice, and not a real one in principle at all. For our Church, as is clearly stated in her rubrics, requires in the first instance Baptism to be by immersion, allowing only of Baptism by affusion, when it is certified that "the child may not well endure" to be dipped in the water. If the second, or merely tolerated, method has become practically universal, it is because, in a climate like ours, to immerse a child in water and then take it out into the cold air, would always be a more or less hazardous proceeding, and not unfrequently attended with fatal results. Whitby, in his commentary on Rom. vi. 4, observes: "This immersion being religiously observed by all Christians for thirteen centuries, and approved by our Church, and the change of it unto sprinkling, even without any allowance from the Author of this institution, or any license from any council of the Church, being that which the Romanist still urgeth to justify his refusal of the cup to the laity, it were to be wished that this custom might be again of general use, and aspersion only permitted, as of old, in case of the *clinici*, or in present danger of death." There is no real antagonism, then, between us on this point, and nothing to prevent immediate reunion should it be found on other grounds practicable.

3. The diversity of view, however, with respect to Church government seems to create a crucial difficulty in the way of anything of the kind; and it is not easy to see how it could be got over. Those who hold Congregationalism as the best form of Church government would be hardly likely to accept the condition requiring them to acquiesce in what is called "the Historic Episcopate," or the rule of Bishops in any form. In this connection, however, it is important to note Hooker's memorable dictum that, while episcopacy is of the *bene esse* of the Church, it is not of its *esse;* nor must it be forgotten, that prior to the Act of Uniformity in 1662 numbers of the ministers of the Church of England held Presbyterian views, as is shown by the fact that two thousand of them, including the celebrated Richard Baxter, resigned their preferments on that occasion. The definition of the Church in our Article XIX. certainly opposes no barrier to reunion. If other obstacles were

removed, the thing need not, perhaps, be regarded as quite impossible, if only negotiations were carried on with tact and in a spirit of prayer; at all events, we may venture to indulge in some hope, if we cannot have much assurance, of success in this direction.

It will always, however, be open to question whether it is worth while to aim at actual uniformity of government and forms of worship in the Christian Church; for it is, to say the least, doubtful whether it may not be more influential by being presented in these respects to different minds in different aspects, just as in the case of the Gospel itself one truth comes out into prominence at one time or place, another at another, to suit the particular exigencies of the age or people. To get the various denominations in our own country to reunite on one common basis of doctrine, and to submit to one common authority, seems at present almost Utopian, and outside the sphere of the practicable; but union in the oneness of the Spirit in the one Lord is attainable, and, indeed, is largely realized to-day by many from all the Churches who are members of "the mystical body," "which is the blessed company of all faithful people," and of which Christ is the living Head. Whether any other union than this is possible until the Lord Himself comes to rectify the wrongs, adjust the disorders, and allay the controversies of earth, is a matter of very grave doubt. Meanwhile, we may join in earnest and frequent intercession to Almighty God that He would be pleased to purify those corrupt Churches, reunion with which now is an absolute impossibility for those very many who, like ourselves, take the Holy Scripture, and it only, as our rule of faith; and that He would, in His good time, hasten the visible fulfilment of the Redeemer's prayer for the unity of all who believe in Him—"That they all may be one; as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us."

J. HUGHES-GAMES.

ART. IV.—"THIS DO," OR "OFFER THIS"?

IN the manual entitled *The Congregation in Church*, on page 49 we read:—"Our Lord's command was, 'Offer THIS in remembrance of Me.' In the Greek version of the Old Testament (commonly called the 'Septuagint') which was in use in our Lord's time and read in the Synagogues, and which was then, and is now by the Greek Church, looked upon as of

equal authority with the Hebrew text itself, the same word (ποιεῖν) which is translated 'do' in St. Luke xxii. 19, is used about eighty times in the sense of to *offer up* or to *sacrifice*."

This passage falls naturally into three divisions, which it will be convenient to put in the following order:—

(1) The assertion that the verb ποιεῖν is used about eighty times in the Septuagint "in the sense of to *offer up* or to *sacrifice*."

(2) The implication[1] that this alleged use of the word influenced our Lord's language because the Septuagint "was in use in our Lord's time and read in the Synagogues."

(3) The conclusion that ποιεῖν does therefore positively mean 'offer' in Luke xxii. 19.

I.

First, then, it is asserted that ποιεῖν is used about eighty times in the Septuagint "in the sense of to *offer up* or to *sacrifice*."

Now it might reasonably have been expected that a writer making an assertion of this character would support it by mentioning at any rate some of the most conspicuous passages in which the verb is so used. A foot-note of one or two lines would have sufficed for this; and his not doing it both weakens the credibility of the statement, and lays upon an opponent or an inquirer a very unreasonable burden. Upon an opponent, indeed, it puts the responsibility of proving a negative; and he would be quite justified, if victory and not truth were his object, in refusing either to admit the truth of the assertion, or to enter into argument upon it, until references had been given, which might be used as a test of its accuracy. My own object, however, being not so much to controvert another's opinion as to exhibit the truth, I must, if possible, get over the difficulty which the omission interposes. Now ποιεῖν is one of the commonest of Greek verbs, and occurs about three thousand three hundred times in the Septuagint. Am I to go through the whole of the volume, and examine every place in which it is found, in order to ascertain whether it bears the meaning of 'offer'? This is out of the question: nor would it be satisfactory to the reader, since he would have to take my word for the result of the investigation, it being clearly impossible to present each case to him without utterly wearying both his patience and my own. There is, however, another course, which, though it has involved very great labour, I have

[1] If any objection is felt to the assertion that this is implied, the reader will find the matter treated below more fully than would here be convenient.

adopted; which, moreover, will admit of my giving the reader not only the conclusion at which I have myself arrived, but also a considerable proportion of the passages on which that conclusion is based; and which I feel sure every reasonable man will allow to be satisfactory. I have gone through the Pentateuch in the English Authorized Version, carefully noting every place in which I found the verb 'offer'; and for the rest of the Old Testament (in which, from the nature of the subject-matter, the word is much less frequent) I have used *Cruden's Concordance* with the same object. I have taken great care to make the list complete, and hope that no passage, either through my own or through Cruden's inadvertence, has escaped me. I have found the verb 'offer' in 275 places, and in every instance have examined the passage in the Septuagint. The result is that in forty-nine places ποιεῖν is used, while (as was to be expected) in a far larger number are compounds of the Greek verb φέρειν, from the Latin form of which 'offer' itself is derived. Of the forty-nine places, thirty-three are in the two books Leviticus and Numbers, five in a passage of only six verses in Exodus (xxix. 36-41), and only eleven others in all the rest of the Old Testament.

Now at first sight the fact that ποιεῖν is found in so many places in the Septuagint where 'offer' is used in the English Version would appear to justify to a considerable extent the assertion of the writer of *The Congregation in Church*. But he has omitted to qualify his assertion by an additional fact, which, as will presently appear, would have robbed it of all value in his argument. To explain this, I must first observe that the general verb ποιεῖν, like its English equivalents 'do' and 'make,' may be used instead of many other specific verbs, provided that the subject-matter allows it to be substituted without risk of misconception. Let me illustrate this by examples, first of the use of 'do' and 'make' in English, and then of that of ποιεῖν in the Septuagint. Suppose a number of persons to have met together to execute some work in concert —say, the decoration of a church for a festival. One says, "I should like to *do* the font"; another is asked to *do* the pulpit; and so on. 'Do' is here used for 'decorate,' the general word being less formal and more idiomatic than the special. Now suppose that two of the decorators are conversing during their work about some matter not connected with it, and that one says to the other, "He *did* what I told him": these words would not be understood by the listener to mean "He *decorated* what I told him," simply because the word 'do' had just been used in that sense; but would be interpreted in connexion with the subject about which they were talking. In the same way 'do' may be used for very many verbs denoting

action. Again, in the phrases "*make* an offering," "*make*[1] a covenant," 'make' may be said to stand respectively for the verbs 'offer' and 'covenant'; but no one would suppose it to mean 'covenant' when followed by the noun 'offering,' nor 'offer' when followed by 'covenant. The grammatical object determines its meaning, and precludes misconception in both cases. Now ποιεῖν is used in a similar manner in those places in the Septuagint which we have under consideration. On carefully examining the forty-nine passages I find that in all of them, without exception, the subject-matter, and particularly the grammatical object of the verb, makes it clear that offering is intended. In Exodus xxix. 36-39, for example, we have the following:—"And thou shalt offer every day a bullock for a sin-offering for atonement. Now this is that which thou shalt offer upon the altar; two lambs . . . the one lamb thou shalt offer in the morning, and the other lamb thou shalt offer at even." In Lev. xiv. 19, 30: "And the priest shall offer the sin-offering . . . he shall offer one of the turtle-doves." Lev. xv. 15, 30: "And the priest shall offer them, the one for a sin-offering, and the other for a burnt-offering." Lev. xvii. 4, 8: "to offer an offering unto the Lord" —"that offereth a burnt-offering or sacrifice." Numb. vi. 11, 14, 16, 17: "And the priest shall offer the one for a sin-offering, and the other for a burnt offering"—"he shall offer his offering unto the Lord, one he lamb, etc."—"the priest . . . shall offer his sin-offering and his burnt-offering"—"he shall offer the ram for a sacrifice of peace offerings unto the Lord . . . the priest shall offer also his meat-offering and his drink-offering." These examples, which are, indeed, about a third of all that are to be found in the Old Testament, are amply sufficient for my purpose. Let the reader substitute 'do' (or 'make' in some cases) for 'offer' in them, and he will see that, though these words are generally not so appropriate in English as in the Greek, they still convey the right meaning.

The result, then, of our investigation of the Septuagint usage is the following:—When the translators had to express the idea of offering, they employed, more than four times out of five, a word bearing that specific meaning; but, when the context allowed it to be done without risk of misinterpretation, they sometimes used the general word ποιεῖν. It must be added that for every example of ποιεῖν used instead of 'offer' in the Septuagint nearly seventy could be adduced where it bears another meaning.

[1] This is actually the English rendering (both Auth. and Rev.) in Heb. viii. 10, though the original Greek is "the covenant that I will *covenant*."

Let me now show by a few examples that the limitation, which I have explained, in the use of this verb is of cardinal importance to the subject under consideration. Ποιεῖν occurs twelve times in the 1st chapter of Genesis, and is represented in the English Version five times by 'create,' five times by 'make,' and twice by 'yield' (fruit), *i.e.*, of course, 'make' fruit. (We also can speak of a tree's 'making' wood, though we do not apply the word to fruit.) Now this use of the verb for 'yield' might fairly be adduced to justify (if justification were needed in a matter which is sufficiently clear to common-sense) the translation of it five times by 'bring forth' (fruit) in Matt. vii. 17-19; but it would be absurd to adduce it in support of translating, in the verses immediately succeeding, 'bringeth forth the will,' 'brought forth many wonderful works.' Again, in Gen. xviii. ποιεῖν is used eight times, and in the English we find in five of these places 'do,' in one 'make,' and in two 'dress' (food). But shall I for this reason maintain that in Matt. viii. 9 the true translation is "And to my servant dress this, and he dresseth it"? Once more, in the eighteen verses of Gen. xx. the verb occurs no less than seven times, the English Version having six times 'do,' and once 'show' (kindness), *i.e.*, do kindness. But how absurd it would be on this ground arbitrarily to render in Mark iii. 14 "He shewed twelve," instead of "He appointed twelve"! Yet neither of these would be a whit less reasonable than to insist on rendering 'offer' in any passage in which the context does not require it. Let me give one other example—a striking one—of the variety of meanings ποιεῖν bears. In Num. xv. it is found twenty times, and is represented in the English by no fewer than six different words, viz., three times 'make,' nine times 'do,' four times 'prepare,' twice 'offer' (vv. 14, 24), once 'observe' (commandments), and once 'sinneth' (margin, 'doeth').

I must not pass over the fact (although it is not pretended that τοῦτο ποιεῖτε means "*sacrifice* this") that the alleged "about eighty" passages include those, if any, in which the verb means 'sacrifice.' I have therefore, with Cruden's help, examined the verb 'sacrifice' throughout the Old Testament, and have found it in seventy-eight places. In fifty of these θύειν is used in the Septuagint; in nearly all the rest, θυσιάζειν; in only two, ποιεῖν. In the former of these two, as in the passages in which ποιεῖν is represented by 'offer,' the context settles the meaning. It runs thus in the English Version (Exod. x. 25):—"Thou must give us also sacrifices and burnt offerings, that we may sacrifice unto the Lord our God." The Septuagint has, "Thou shalt give us sacrifices and burnt offerings, *which* we *will make* to the Lord our God." The other

passage is in 2 Kings xvii. 32, and is thus rendered in our version:—"and made unto themselves of the lowest of them priests of the high places, which sacrificed for them in the houses of the high places." In this case the English translators have either had a different reading of the original before them, or have understood the text differently from the Septuagint translator; for the Septuagint text, whatever else it may mean, *cannot* mean "which sacrificed for them." Rendered literally, the Septuagint version is as follows:—"and made for themselves priests of the high places, *and made for themselves*" (the very same words being repeated) "in the house of the high places." It is plain, therefore, that this passage has no place in the present argument. I may remark, however, that, even if the Greek had corresponded with the English version, the mention of 'priests' and 'houses of the high places' would have defined the meaning of ποιεῖν.

And since the Septuagint includes the Apocryphal with the Canonical books of the Old Testament, I have examined them also. It is true that the writer of *The Congregation in Church* seems to limit his use of the word 'Septuagint' to "the Greek Version of the Old Testament"; yet it may possibly be thought that our inquiry would not be quite complete, if the Apocryphal books were excluded. Fortunately Cruden has a supplementary *Concordance to the Books called Apocrypha*, and by its aid I have found the verb 'offer' twenty-six times, and 'sacrifice' twelve times in them; but ποιεῖν is not used in the Septuagint in a single instance. I proceed now to the second division of our subject.

II.

Having ascertained the extent to which, and the circumstances in which ποιεῖν is used for 'offer' in the Septuagint, I have next to examine the reason which is given, not simply for supposing it to be probable or possible, but for virtually asserting, that this use influenced our Lord's language.

The Septuagint, we are told, "was in use in our Lord's time, and read in the Synagogues." The first thing to notice here is the indefiniteness of the language used. It "was in use in our Lord's time." In use, undoubtedly, it was; but the question is, *Who* used it? The writer does not venture to affirm positively that our Lord and His followers did so; but he evidently, I think, wishes to convey that impression to his readers. Again, it was "read in the Synagogues." In *what* synagogues, and *when*, was it read? If I say that a certain version of the Bible is read in 'the' churches of the Church of England, I mean, of course, in *all* the churches, and should

rightly be so understood; but if I wish to say that the Welsh language is used at *some* of the services in *nearly all* the Welsh churches, I must express myself in less general terms, or run the risk of being almost certainly misunderstood. Now we may assume that the writer cannot mean to affirm that the Septuagint was read in every Synagogue, and at every service, throughout Palestine; because that would be an assertion absolutely untenable, and absurdly improbable. But if he means that it was read only at some services, and in some synagogues, he omits to tell us how he knows that our Lord and His followers were accustomed to be present on such occasions—a thing which his argument imperatively requires.

Without, however, attempting further to put a precise construction upon the writer's vague words, let me point out that, in order to show that the use and the reading of the Septuagint have any bearing upon the matter in hand, it is necessary to make one of the two following assumptions:—

1. If our Lord spoke Greek[1] with His disciples on the evening of the Institution of the Lord's Supper, and if, therefore, τοῦτο ποιεῖτε are the very words He used, and not a translation from the vernacular Aramaic, we must assume that He and His disciples were in the habit of using and hearing the Septuagint version, and were for that reason so familiar with the use of ποιεῖν for 'offer,' that He was able to employ the verb on this occasion (when it was, as all will admit, of the highest consequence to His Church in all ages that His meaning should be clearly comprehended) with the assurance that they would so understand it. This is the inference which the writer apparently intends us to draw from his words. If he means anything else, he certainly ought to have been more explicit.

2. To avoid, however, all unfairness, let us suppose that he disclaims the interpretation I have put upon his words—that he holds that our Lord spoke in the Aramaic, and that the words τοῦτο ποιεῖτε are due to St. Luke and St. Paul, who have reported His words to us in the Greek language. In that case the assumption must be that those two writers had themselves, *and believed their readers to have*, the requisite knowledge of Septuagint usage: and further, that, knowing that our Lord used an Aramaic word meaning 'offer,' and being anxious (as they undoubtedly would be) to convey that meaning unmistakably to their readers, they deliberately chose ποιεῖν as the proper word for that purpose.

Now it requires little consideration to see that it does not

[1] It is not absolutely certain that our Lord and His disciples did not commonly use the Greek language.

greatly matter to our present purpose which of these alternatives we adopt. If our Lord spoke Greek, we must assume that His disciples were so familiar with the Septuagint that they would understand Him to mean '*offer* this'; and if, on the other hand, the Greek word is due to St. Luke and St. Paul, we must assume that those for whom they wrote were in the same position. The question resolves itself, therefore, into the following:—Was the Christian Church in New Testament days familiar with the use of ποιεῖν for 'offer'? This question can be answered only by observing the language which was used by the Church in those days—that is to say, by examining the New Testament itself. It is obvious that if it was a well-known use, we may fairly expect so large and varied a collection of writings as the New Testament contains to furnish examples of it. The fact is, however, that in the whole of the volume there is not one clear and indubitable example of the usage. I have examined every instance in which ποιεῖν is used in the New Testament (Bruder's excellent Concordance to the Greek New Testament gives the means of doing this with great convenience), and have found only one passage (Acts xxiv. 17), which could be adduced as even a possible example. It is thus translated both in the Authorized and in the Revised Version:—"Now after many years I came to bring alms to my nation, and offerings." Having used the word ποιεῖν, translated 'bring,' in reference to 'alms' (a usage of which other instances occur in Matt. vi. 2, 3; Acts ix. 36; x. 2), St. Paul, or perhaps St. Luke in condensing the speech, adds 'and offerings,' without troubling himself to vary the verb. It does not follow that he would have used ποιεῖν with 'offerings' alone; and it is improbable that we have here any reminiscence of the Septuagint usage. I am not aware, indeed, that this passage has ever been instanced by those who maintain the meaning 'offer' in Luke xxii. 19; but I have not thought it right to withhold it from the reader's consideration.

I have applied another test. Availing myself once more of Cruden's Concordance, I have taken every passage in which the verb 'offer' occurs in the New Testament, and examined it in the original Greek, with the following result:—The verb occurs 34 times. In twenty-one places the ordinary Greek verb for 'offer,' προσφέρειν, is used; in five, ἀναφέρειν, which means strictly, and is twice translated, 'offer up'; διδόναι, give, is used three times; σπένδεσθαι, be poured forth, twice; ἀνάγειν, παρέχειν, and ἐπιδιδόναι, once each: ποιεῖν, *never*. (It should be observed that in eight places the phrase 'offered to idols' represents a Greek adjective εἰδωλόθυτος, and these are therefore excluded from the list.)

But after showing, as I have done in Part I. of this paper,

that the use of ποιεῖν for 'offer' in the Septuagint is limited to passages in which the subject-matter allows it to be employed without risk of misconception, it would be comparatively little to the purpose to point out that it is not used at all for 'offer' in the New Testament, unless it could also be shown that the writers *had opportunities of using it in sentences similar* to those in which it is found in the Septuagint—in sentences, that is, where the context would have clearly indicated its meaning, if it *had* been used. Now in at least twenty-five passages, out of the thirty-four of which I have just spoken, the writers might have thus used ποιεῖν: in eleven, indeed, the object of the verb is actually the noun θυσία, sacrifice. Let the reader satisfy himself on these points by referring to Heb. v. 1, 3; vii. 27; viii. 3; ix. 7, 9, 14, 25; x. 11, 12; xi. 4, 17; xiii. 15; Acts vii. 41, 42; xxi. 26; Matt. v. 24; viii. 4; Mark i. 44; Luke ii. 24; v. 14; James ii. 21; 1 Peter ii. 5.[1]

We are confronted, then, with the remarkable and highly significant fact that not a single instance occurs in the whole of the New Testament in which ποιεῖν is translated by 'offer,' though the writers had twenty-five opportunities of using it under the same limitation which characterizes its use in the Septuagint. And it must be carefully taken into account, in estimating the significance of this fact, that ποιεῖν is employed very frequently, and in many shades of meaning in the New Testament. It occurs about 565 times. If, then, as we are asked to believe, 'offer' was a meaning well known to the Church in those days, how is it that the writers of the New Testament, having so many times occasion to express the idea of offering, so carefully avoided the employment of this familiar verb for that purpose, though they were constantly using it in other significations?

III.

We come now to the third division of our subject—the assertion that ποιεῖν does positively mean 'offer' in Luke xxii. 19, and 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25: and we have to ask, Is this assertion true?

The results at which we have already arrived lead us, of course, to anticipate a negative answer. But the question must really be decided by considering whether the *context* indicates that this is the meaning? Is our Lord speaking on

[1] So far is the New Testament from using ποιεῖν, 'do,' instead of προσφέρειν, 'offer,' that we find the latter verb in a passage (John xvi. 2) where the Authorized Version actually renders it by 'do'—"doeth God service."

the subject of offering? Is priest or altar spoken of? Above all, *does any such word as lamb, bird, meat-offering, follow the verb*, as in the examples in the Septuagint? If such had been the nature of the context, we must have admitted that we have here an exception to the use which prevails elsewhere in the New Testament. But in truth the contrary is the case. So far as the *object* of the verb (τοῦτο, this) goes, it can indicate nothing apart from the context, since it is a neuter pronoun; and, indeed, I shall presently show that its use with ποιεῖν is limited in the New Testament to *one* meaning of the verb, and that not the meaning 'offer.' And as to the subject-matter generally, it certainly does not point to offering. For what were the circumstances in which the Lord's Supper was instituted? As our Lord and His disciples were eating, we are told, He took bread, and blessed, and brake it, and gave to them, saying, "Take, eat: this is My body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of Me." No word indicating a victim or an offering follows ποιεῖν; nor is there any reference to priest, altar, or temple. It follows, then, that the Septuagint gives no authority for translating 'offer' in this passage. Those who assert that that is the meaning adopt the grossly unreasonable theory that the Septuagint usage has been ignorantly followed in this one instance, in which it is *not applicable*, though (as we have seen) the New Testament writers abstained from following it in at least twenty-five cases, in which they might *correctly* have done so. In other words, they assert that either our Lord Himself (if He spoke Greek), or St. Luke and St. Paul, employed, to express the idea of offering, a word which could only bear that meaning in circumstances not then present; which, moreover, so far as we are able to ascertain, was not in *any* circumstances so used at the time; which, therefore, was almost sure to be misunderstood; *and which, on that theory, has in point of fact been misunderstood in the Church from that time to this!* Surely unreasonableness could scarcely go further! We are bound, then, to conclude that the rendering 'offer' must, without any hesitation, be absolutely rejected.

Nor must we stop here. There is much more to be said. Not only are there the indisputable reasons, which I have given, for *rejecting* the translation 'offer,' but there are also very strong grounds for *adopting* the usual rendering 'do,' especially since the verb is followed by the neuter pronoun τοῦτο, 'do *this thing*.' Having carefully gone through all the examples of ποιεῖν in the New Testament with this point specially in view, I have ascertained the following facts:

(i.) The phrase τοῦτο ποιεῖν (*i.e.*, ποιεῖν followed by the singular neuter pronoun 'this') is used twenty-six times,

besides the three in the accounts of the Institution of the Lord's Supper; and in every instance it means "*do* this." The significance and great importance of this fact will be evident to everyone capable of considering the question under discussion.

(ii.) In twenty-five other passages the neuter plural ταῦτα, 'these,' is used with ποιεῖν; and here, too, the verb means 'do' in every instance, except one (Acts vii. 50), in which it means 'make.'

(iii.) There are 112 other passages in which ποιεῖν is followed by neuter pronouns, singular or plural; and in all, without exception it means 'do.'

(iv.) We have in St. John's Gospel (chaps. xiv.-xvi.) a long discourse *spoken by our Lord on the same evening* as the words "Do this in remembrance of Me." The verb ποιεῖν occurs in it sixteen times, and no less than fourteen times is translated 'do'; once (xiv. 23) 'make,' and once (xvi. 2) 'put' (here also really equivalent to 'make,' when taken in connection with the Greek adjective used—"put you out of the synagogues," Greek, "make you excommunicated"). It is interesting to notice, also, that this discourse contains one of the examples of τοῦτο ποιεῖν, of which I have just spoken—"that (or, this) will I do" (xiv. 13).

'Offer,' then, must be rejected, not only because it is itself untenable, but also because there is overwhelming evidence in favour of translating 'do.'

Summary.

It may be useful to conclude with a summary of the results at which we have arrived.

I.

In about four-fifths of the instances in which we have the verb 'offer' in the English Version of the Old Testament, the Septuagint translators used a word bearing that specific meaning. In nearly one-fifth, consisting of some of the passages in which the context, and especially the object of the verb, precludes misconception, they employed the general verb ποιεῖν, 'do' or 'make.'

II.

There is no evidence that this use of ποιεῖν for 'offer' in the Septuagint was familiar to the Church in New Testament days. Even if it were known (as it may possibly have been to *some*), the New Testament writers scrupulously abstained from adopting it (with the one very doubtful exception of

Acts xxiv. 17), although there are at least twenty-five passages in their writings, in which they might have done so with perfect accuracy.

III.

(*a*) The Septuagint usage gives no authority for translating 'offer' in Luke xxii. 19 and 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25, since the context does not indicate that meaning.

(*b*) There is overwhelming authority in the New Testament for the rendering 'do,' especially since the verb is followed by the pronoun τοῦτο.

(*c*) The translation 'offer' must therefore be absolutely rejected.

CHARLES M. OSMOND.

ART. V.—THE RELIGIOUS POETRY OF TENNYSON.

ALFRED TENNYSON, born in 1809, in a Church of England rectory, was about thirty years of age when the Oxford Movement began to stir in the Church of England and to revive ecclesiastical theories long dormant or discarded, while about the same time criticism and philosophy, which had passed over to Germany from England in the last century, were now returning with renewed vigour, to search the foundations of belief, to drive many into scepticism, and to widen religious belief, and make thought more tolerant. By the former movement he was influenced only in his sense of the picturesque; to the teaching of Coleridge, Maurice and Kingsley his own is nearly akin. Tennyson, having probably the most representative mind in the present century, and sensitive with poetic responsiveness to every wind of thought, speculation and emotion, with a very firm and independent will and a noble character, becomes a figure typical of the mental difficulties and struggles of his era, and the positive conclusions at which he arrives are of profound importance to contemporary religious belief.

All through his life he took a deep and even passionate interest in theology and religion. Thus we read in the Biography that in 1842, "the new poems dealt with an extraordinarily wide range of subjects: chivalry, duty, reverence, self-control, human passion, human love, the love of country, science, philosophy, simple faith, and the many complex moods of the religious nature. 'It was the heart of England,' wrote Aubrey de Vere, 'even more than her imagination, that

he made his own. It was the humanities and the truths underlying them that he sang, and he so sang them that any deep-hearted reader was made to feel through his far-reaching thought that those humanities are spiritual things, and that to touch them is to touch the garment of the Divine. Those who confer so deep a benefit cannot but be remembered.' "[1] The service of Tennyson to religion was that in an age when literature and philosophy are largely agnostic he brought religious thought, truth, and feeling into the very front rank of the mental results of the age, and kept them there. Our religious debt to him is inestimable.

"His creed,"[2] says his son in another part of the Memoir, "he always said he would not formulate, for people would not understand him if he did; but he considered that his poems expressed the principles at the foundation of his faith.

"He thought, with Arthur Hallam, that 'the essential feelings of religion subsist in the utmost diversity of forms,' that 'different language does not always imply different opinions, nor different opinions any difference in *real* faith.' 'It is impossible,' he said, 'to imagine that the Almighty will ask you, when you come before Him in the next life, what your particular form of creed was: but the question will rather be, 'Have you been true to yourself, and given in My Name a cup of cold water to one of these little ones?' "

"'This is a terrible age of unfaith,' he would say; 'I hate utter unfaith; I cannot endure that men should sacrifice everything at the cold altar of what with their imperfect knowledge they choose to call truth and reason. One can easily lose all belief, through giving up the continual thought and care for spiritual things.'"

"And again: 'In this vale of Time the hills of Time often shut out the mountains of Eternity.'"

The Bishop of Ripon wrote of him: "With those who are impatient of all spiritual truth he had no sympathy whatever; but he had a sympathy with those who were impatient of the formal statement of truth, only because he felt that all formal statements of truth must of necessity fall below the greatness and the grandeur of the truth itself. There is a reverent impatience of forms, and there is an irreverent impatience of them. An irreverent impatience of formal dogma means impatience of all spiritual truth; but a reverent impatience of formal dogma may be but the expression of the feeling that the truth must be larger, purer, nobler, than any mere human expression or definition of it. With this latter attitude of

[1] Tennyson, "A Memoir," l. 189. [2] *Ibid.*, l. 308.

mind he had sympathy, and he expressed that sympathy in song: he could understand those who seemed

> To have reached a purer air,
> Whose faith has centre everywhere,
> Nor cares to fix itself to form.

He urged men to "cling to faith, beyond the forms of faith." But while he did this, he also recognised clearly the importance and the value of definitions of truth; and his counsel to the very man who prided himself upon his emancipation from forms was:

> Leave thou thy sister, when she prays
> Her early heaven, her happy views;
> Nor thou with shadowed hint confuse
> A life that leads melodious days.
>
> Her faith through form is pure as thine,
> Her hands are quicker unto good:
> Oh, sacred be the flesh and blood
> To which she links a truth divine!

(Flesh and blood here would of course mean the outward form or intellectual presentment.)

He warned the man proud of his emancipation from formal faith that in a world of so many confusions he might meet with ruin "even for want of such a type." And we are not surprised, knowing how insidious are the evil influences which gather round us.

> Hold thou the good; define it well,
> For fear "Divine Philosophy"
> Should push beyond her mark, and be
> Procuress to the lords of Hell.

"And thus he had (at once) sympathy with those who feel that faith is larger and nobler than form, and at the same time he had tenderness and appreciation of those who find their faith helped by form. To him, as to so many, Truth is so infinitely great, that all we can do with our poor human utterance is to try and clothe it in such language as will make it clear to ourselves and clear to those to whom God sends us with a message; but meanwhile, above us and our thoughts, above our broken lights, God in His mercy, God in His love, God in His infinite Nature, is greater than all."

"Assuredly," says the present Lord Tennyson, "religion was no nebulous abstraction for him. He consistently emphasized his own belief in what he called the Eternal Truths:

(1) In an Omnipotent, Omnipresent and All-loving God,
(2) Who has revealed Himself through the human attribute of the highest self-sacrificing love.

(3) In the freedom of the human will.
(4) And in the Immortality of the soul.

But he asserted (and with that every man of faith would agree) that 'Nothing worthy proving can be proven'; and that even as to the great laws which are the basis of science, 'we have but Faith: we cannot know.' He dreaded the dogmatism of sects, and rash definitions of God. 'I dare hardly name His Name,' he would say, and accordingly he named Him in 'The Ancient Sage' 'The Nameless.' 'But take away belief in the self-conscious Personality of God,' he said, 'and you take away the backbone of the world.' 'On God and God-like men we build our trust.' A week before his death I was sitting by him, and he talked long of the personality and of the love of God, 'that God whose eyes consider the poor,' 'Who catereth even for the sparrow.' 'I should,' he said, 'infinitely rather feel myself the most miserable wretch on the face of the earth with a God above, than the highest type of man standing alone.' He would allow that God is unknowable in 'His whole world-self and all-in-all,' and that therefore there was some force in the objection made by some people to the word 'personality,' as being 'anthropomorphic,' and that perhaps 'self-consciousness' or 'mind' might be clearer to them; but at the same time he insisted that although 'man is like a thing of nought' in 'the boundless plan,' our highest view of God must be more or less anthropomorphic; and that 'personality,' as far as our intelligence goes, is the widest definition, and includes 'mind,' 'self-consciousness,' 'will,' 'love,' and other attributes of the 'Real,' the 'Supreme,' 'the High and Lofty One that inhabiteth Eternity, whose name is Holy.'"

There are many of his poems that express this idea of God, the deepest, truest, and most comprehensive, perhaps, outside the New Testament. Tennyson had a wonderful way of summing up a whole philosophy by a happy phrase. These are the words which he composed for an anthem about God, at the request of Professor Jowett, for Balliol College Chapel:

Hallowed be Thy name. Hallelujah!
Infinite Ideality!
Immeasurable Reality!
Infinite Personality!
Hallowed be Thy name. Hallelujah!

We feel we are nothing—for all is Thou and in Thee;
We feel we are something—*that* also has come from Thee;
We know we are nothing—but Thou wilt help us to be.
Hallowed be Thy name. Hallelujah!

It would be impossible to put more tersely the great truths that in God we live and move and have our being; that we

are differentiated from Him in order that He may be surrounded with happy existences; and that unless we co-operate with Him, and submit voluntarily to His will, we shall not fulfil the end of our being, but shall die the "spiritual death" of theology.

There is another magnificent poem on this subject, which turns the tables in the most brilliant manner on Pantheism. The doctrine of Pantheism is that "Everything is God"; the doctrine of Christianity is that "God is everything." Tennyson seizes this idea, and treats the material universe as the vesture of God, and ourselves as only separated from Him for the purposes of individual entity:

> The sun, the moon, the stars, the seas, the hills and the plains—
> Are not these, O Soul, the Vision of Him Who reigns?
>
> Is not the Vision He? Tho' He be not that which He seems?
> Dreams are true while they last, and do we not live in dreams?
>
> Earth, these solid stars, this weight of body and limb,
> Are they not sign and symbol of thy division from Him?
>
> Dark is the world to thee: thyself art the reason why;
> For is He not all but that which has power to feel "I am I"?
>
> Glory about thee, without thee; and thou fulfillest thy doom,
> Making Him broken gleams, and a stifled splendour and gloom.
>
> Speak to Him, thou, for He hears, and Spirit with spirit can meet—
> Closer He is than breathing, and nearer than hands and feet.
>
> God is law, say the wise: O Soul, and let us rejoice,
> For if He thunder by law, the thunder is yet His voice.
>
> Law is God, say some; no God at all, says the fool:

and the reason of these various views is:

> For all we have power to see is a straight staff bent in a pool;
>
> And the ear of man cannot hear, and the eye of man cannot see;
> But if we could see and hear this Vision—were it not He?

To the enormous difficulties suggested by the facts of Nature he is keenly alive. Partly he discounts them by the majestic theory of evolution; partly by a humble confession of human limitations and blindness, and a confidence in the abiding reality of truth, could we but see it.

> The wish, that of the living whole,
> No life may fail beyond the grave,
> Derives it not from what we have
> The likest God within the soul?
>
> Are God and Nature then at strife,
> That Nature lends such evil dreams?
> So careful of the type she seems,
> So careless of the single life;

That I, considering everywhere
Her secret meaning in her deeds,
And finding that of fifty seeds
She often brings but one to bear,

I falter where I firmly trod,
And falling with my weight of cares
Upon the great world's altar-stairs
That slope thro' darkness up to God,

I stretch lame hands of faith, and grope,
And gather dust and chaff, and call
To what I feel is Lord of all,
And faintly trust the larger hope.

But the difficulties increase. Science shows past and obsolete stages of creation.

"So careful of the type?" but no.
From scarped cliff and quarried stone
She cries: "A thousand types are gone:
I care for nothing: all shall go.

"Thou makest thine appeal to me:
I bring to life, I bring to death:
The spirit doth but mean the breath:
I know no more. And he, shall he,

"Man, her last work, who seemed so fair,
Such splendid purpose in his eyes,
Who rolled the psalm to wintry skies,
Who built him fanes of fruitless prayer,

"Who trusted God was love indeed,
And love Creation's final law—
Tho' Nature, red in tooth and claw
With ravine, shriek'd against his creed—

"Who loved, who suffered countless ills,
Who battled for the True, the Just,
Be blown about the desert dust,
Or sealed within the iron hills?

"No more? A monster they, a dream,
A discord. Dragons of the prime
That tare each other in their slime
Were mellow music matched with him.

"O life as futile, then, as frail!
O for thy voice to soothe and bless?
What hope of answer or redress?
Behind the veil, behind the veil."

Who has not felt these difficulties? Would that all could be satisfied with the true answer: "Here we know in part, but then shall we know even also as we are known." "The earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God, because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious

liberty of the sons of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now."

Belief in God is not so much derived from scientific investigation, as from innate conviction and irrefragable experience:

> That which we dare invoke to bless:
> Our dearest faith, our ghastliest doubt;
> He, They, One, All; within, without;
> The Power in darkness whom we guess;
>
> I found Him not in world or sun, (Natural Science.)
> Or eagle's wing, or insect's eye;
> Nor through the questions men may try, (Metaphysics.)
> The petty cobwebs we have spun:
>
> If e'en, where Faith had fallen asleep,
> I heard a voice, "Believe no more,"
> And heard an ever-breaking shore
> That tumbled in the God-less deep;
>
> A warmth *within* the breast would melt
> The freezing reason's colder part,
> And like a man in wrath the heart
> Stood up and answered, "I HAVE FELT."
>
> No, like a child in doubt and fear;
> But that blind clamour made me wise;
> Then was I as a child that cries,
> But crying, KNOWS HIS FATHER NEAR;
>
> And what I am beheld again
> What is, and no man understands;
> AND OUT OF DARKNESS CAME THE HANDS
> THAT REACH THROUGH NATURE, MOULDING MEN.

In lines which blend with the truest philosophy, he sums up "In Memoriam" by describing the purpose of God in creation:

> A soul shall draw from out the vast
> And strike his being into bounds,
>
> And, mov'd thro' life of lower phase
> Result in man, be born and think,
> And act and love, a closer link
> Betwixt us and the crowning race
>
> Of those that, eye to eye, shall look
> On knowledge; under whose command
> Is Earth, and Earth's, and in their hand
> Is Nature like an open book;
>
> No longer half akin to brute,
> For all we thought and loved and did,
> And hoped and suffered, is but seed
> Of what in them is flower and fruit:
>
> Whereof the man that with me trod
> This planet was a noble type
> Appearing ere the times were ripe,
> That friend of mine who lives in God,

That God which ever lives and loves;
One God, one law, one element,
And one far-off divine event
To which the whole creation moves.

The birth of the soul, its earthy sojourn and trials, its future regeneration and perfection either in some kind of millennium, or in Paradise or heaven, and the abiding ever-progressing purpose of the Almighty Eternal Omnipresent Being, are all touched in with unparalleled power.

God's purpose and process in making man is nobly described in the ode to his son:

I.

Out of the deep, my child, out of the deep,
From that great deep, before our world begins,
Whereon the Spirit of God moves as he will—
Out of the deep, my child, out of the deep,
From that true world within the world we see,
Whereof our world is but the bounding shore—
Out of the deep, Spirit, out of the deep,
With this ninth moon, that sends the hidden sun
Down yon dark sea, thou comest, darling boy.

II.

For in the world, which is not ours, They said
"Let us make man" and that which should be man,
From that one light no man can look upon,
Drew to this shore lit by the suns and moons
And all the shadows. O dear Spirit half-lost
In thine own shadow and this fleshly sign
That thou art thou—who wailest being born
And banish'd into mystery, and the pain
Of this divisible-indivisible world
Among the numerable-innumerable
Sun, sun, and sun, thro' finite-infinite space
In finite-infinite Time—our mortal veil
And shatter'd phantom of that infinite One,
Who made thee unconceivably Thyself
Out of His whole World-self and all in all—
Live thou! and of the grain and husk, the grape
And ivyberry, choose; and still depart
From death to death thro' life and life, and find
Nearer and ever nearer Him, who wrought
Not Matter, nor the finite-infinite,
But this main-miracle, that thou art thou,
With power on thine own act and on the world.

The place of man in Evolution is again designated with sympathetic insight and skill in "Locksley Hall Sixty Years After":

Evolution ever climbing after some ideal good,
And Reversion ever dragging Evolution in the mud.

What are men that He should heed us? cried the king of sacred song;
Insects of an hour, that hourly work their brother insect wrong,

While the silent Heavens roll, and Suns along their fiery way,
All their planets whirling round them, flash a million miles a day.

Many an Æon moulded earth before her highest, man, was born,
Many an Æon too may pass when earth is manless and forlorn,

Earth so huge, and yet so bounded—pools of salt, and plots of land—
Shallow skin of green and azure—chains of mountain, grains of sand!

Only That which made us, meant us to be mightier by and by,
Set the sphere of all the boundless Heavens within the human eye,

Sent the shadow of Himself, the boundless, thro' the human soul;
Boundless inward, in the atom, boundless outward, in the Whole.

WILLIAM SINCLAIR.

(*To be continued.*)

Short Notices.

The Biblical Illustrator: 1, 2, 3 John and Jude. By Rev. J. S. EXELL, M.A., 1898. Price 7s. 6d. London: Nisbet.

THE value of Mr. Exell's "Biblical Illustrator" is too well known by this time to require more than passing notice. The compiler has gathered together a host of illustrative matter on the verses of the Bible, from a wide range both of English and foreign literature. Hence the volumes of the "Illustrator" cannot fail to be serviceable to the clergy in particular, with a view to sermon-preparation. No man can preach effectively without giving careful thought to his sermon beforehand; and thought is quickened and enriched by reading the thoughts of others, as well as by private meditation.

The only fault we have to find with the book is its very untaking appearance; clipped margins, small and closely-packed type in long unbroken paragraphs, offend the eye, and make continuous reading a by no means easy task.

The Mutable Many. By ROBERT BARR. Pp. 394. Methuen and Co.

An extremely interesting and well-written novel on the subject of strikes, dealing with the reasons for and against, and giving both points of view with great fairness. The book tends to show how easily the people are led astray, and how great a responsibility lies on agitators.

Norman's Universal Gambist. By JOHN HENRY NORMAN. Pp. 275. Effingham Wilson.

This is a ready-reckoner of the world's foreign and colonial exchanges; of 7 monetary and currency intermediaries, with the aid of less than 60,000 figures, by which 756 tables of exchange, consisting of from 13,800 to 200,000 figures each, can be dispensed with. The volume also contains further aids to the construction of the science of money since 1892. It is in reality the second edition of Mr. Norman's "Ready Reckoner of the Exchanges of Gold and Silver," issued in 1893. This is a clear and scientific work by a great authority on a very obscure and difficult subject, but of great interest to mathematicians and to those engaged in the vast and intricate commerce of the British Islands.

Among the Sailors. G. HOLDEN PIKE. Pp. 328. Hodder and Stoughton.

A capital and well-compiled account of the work of the British and Foreign Sailors' Society during the Queen's reign. Among the contributors are Agnes Weston, John Britten, D.D., and E. W. Matthews, the secretary. There are many illustrations, and the book should do much to help and popularize one of the most interesting features of Christian work in the British Islands.

The Life-work of Archbishop Benson. By Canon CARR. Pp. 273. Elliot Stock.

The visit of the late Archbishop to Ireland immediately before his death indefinitely increased its value and interest. Canon Carr had already written many papers and articles on the Archbishop's work and speeches, and there were few men for whose biography more abundant material existed. Canon Carr has woven all this into a pleasant, appreciative, and interesting narrative. One of the Archbishop's sons is understood to be writing the large and permanent biography, but in the meantime this smaller volume raises a welcome memorial of a truly sanctified life, typical of all that is best in the modern English Church.

The Clerical Life: Letters to Ministers. Pp. 257. Price 5s. Hodder and Stoughton.

These are twenty letters by eminent Scottish professors and clergy to young men entering on the ministry. They have a certain local colouring, but will be very useful also to English clergymen. They are full of wit and humour and practical good sense, and if taken to heart by young men would help them to avoid many failures, disappointments, and mistakes. Among the writers are Ian Maclaren, Marcus Dods, Professor Denney, and Dr. Robertson Nichol.

Church and Realm in Stuart Times. By the Rev. C. ARTHUR LANE. Pp. 393. Printed for the author at the Old Printing Press, 123, Fulham Road.

This is the letterpress of ten courses of Church History Lectures, given by the well-known lecturer on behalf of Church Defence, on 600 different slides. Mr. Lane has arranged his information in a graphic and picturesque manner. He does not intend to give a connected or philosophic history of the times, but merely facts and illustrations, which, however, produce a permanent effect of a more vivid character than the reading of many more ambitious histories. Mr. Lane seems to have steered his way through the difficult controversies of the period with fairness and skill.

When thou Prayest; or, Suggestions for Daily Private Prayer. By Rev. W. HEWETSON, M.A., Association Secretary C.P.A. With a Preface by the BISHOP OF COVENTRY. London: *Home Words* Office.

An unpretentious little book, likely to be helpful to young communicants and others.

Candlewicks: a Year of Thoughts and Fancies. By CAROLINE TILBURY. London: Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row, E.C. (In small 4to.) 1897.

Miss Tilbury set herself a difficult task when she essayed to write a book of "thoughts and fancies" suitable for every day of the year. Considering the initial difficulty, the book is not without merits, and, though not calling for any special remark here, has attained some measure of success. Some of the maxims scattered up and down these pages are neatly turned. The illustrations to the various months—presumably by the authoress's sister—are gracefully done.

The Sacrament in Song. By E. A. D. Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press Warehouse, Amen Corner, E.C. Price 2s. 6d.

This is a particularly charming collection of extracts from English poets on the Holy Communion, arranged for the Sundays and Holy Days of the Christian Year. The book is exceedingly well produced, and its contents have been selected with admirable discrimination. We recommend it cordially to all.

The Month.

THE dispute between the United States and Spain over Cuban affairs has gone on steadily, till at last an ultimatum has been sent from the States to Spain, calling on the latter country to withdraw her army and navy from the island, and granting only three days' grace, an answer being required by April 23. The immediate result was that Señor Polo de Bernabe, the Spanish ambassador at Washington, applied for his passports, which were sent him. No instructions had been sent to General Woodford to apply for his passports at Madrid.

Thus has this Paschal and Easter season been made memorable to America and to Spain. To ourselves it has been made so by the victory granted to our forces in Egypt in the great battle fought on Good Friday, in which Mahmud was taken prisoner. Osman Digna, "with his customary alertness," made good his escape. It is pleasing to find that on Easter Sunday a Church parade of our troops was held to give thanks to Almighty God for this success. Egypt seems to be that part of the world in which, for some time past, we have been most prosperous. Does the fact just recorded indicate a reason?

At home the season has not passed without calamities. Besides an accident, which might have been still worse, to a train which was carrying some of our volunteers home, there has been a shocking catastrophe in a mine at Whitwick, near Leicester. A fire, which had long been burning in this, which was commonly thought a very safe mine, burst its bonds on April 19, and it is feared that some thirty-five victims have in consequence perished.

Of another character is another fire. This fire, above ground, broke out in what is known as Mr. Spurgeon's Tabernacle on April 20, and left only the walls standing. The chapel records seem happily to have been saved.

Turning to Church affairs, we find the season marked by the much-debated action of Mr. John Kensit, who has made public protests by word of mouth against illegal ceremonies in certain churches, and has laid hands on a crucifix which was being "venerated" in St. Cuthbert's, Philbeach Gardens, on Good Friday, and carried it down the chancel, when it was snatched from his hands. This proceeding brought on a prosecution before Mr. Rose, the magistrate at the West London Police Court, on Easter Eve. What further consequences will follow remain to be seen. The attention of the press is turned to these matters. Canon Fleming apologises for the excitement of a strong Protestant, while the Dean of Windsor writes with grave severity. The account of Mr. Kensit's inter-

view with an emissary of the *Daily News* contains some noteworthy reading.

It was observed last month that in losing the Rev. Isaac Hawker, Plymouth was parting from one of the oldest incumbents of the town. It is pleasant to have to record that he is not leaving without public testimony to his worth, as he has been presented, at the Corn Exchange, with a purse of £156, besides other tokens of goodwill to himself, his wife, his daughter, and his son.

Mr. Hawker is succeeded by the Rev. H. B. Bisshopp, M.A. of Caius, and Ridley Hall, Cambridge, who has been an honorary worker at St. James's, Bermondsey.

Another church in Plymouth is changing incumbents, too. The Rev. Philip Williams is leaving St. Matthias's, of which he was the first incumbent, for St. James's, Exeter. To succeed him the Rev. W. B. R. Caley has been appointed. But trouble threatens. Mr. Williams is said to have told his vestry meeting on Easter Monday: "We were rudely shocked to find that an appointment had been made which did not give fair promise of a continuity of our teaching and order."

Yet, we are told, Mr. Williams "pleaded with his people for the new Vicar." Not so his curate, the Rev. R. F. Fleming. The Vicar's warden, Mr. W. W. Rickard, said he would do his best to see that fair play was awarded Mr. Caley, "but for the rest his attitude was menacing. It was Mr. Caley who must fall in line with the congregation, and not the congregation who should fall into line with Mr. Caley. They must have no interruption with the ritual of the Church; and if Mr. Caley was not prepared to continue it, Mr. Caley must find another congregation." What is this—Congregationalism?

The Bishop of Bristol has issued a commission to inquire into the need of Church extension at Swindon.

At St. Mark's, Tunbridge Wells, on Easter Sunday, the Vicar announced, says the *Record*, that on the following Tuesday the C.M.S. would enter upon its hundredth year, and invited anyone to send him a birthday gift, which he might forward at once to Salisbury Square as a token of affection. By noon on Monday he had received in his letter-box £116, composed of shillings and half-crowns, from boys, men, and domestic servants, besides large gifts from wealthy parishioners. Some of the scraps of paper contained badly-written and ill-spelled, but very touching, words of love and devotion, as well as prayers on the Society's behalf.

When the Principal of Ridley Hall speaks he commands attention; and since he has thought it needful to speak some very serious language on the danger he finds existing among young men of abandoning the home field for foreign, we may be sure such a danger exists; and it is a grave one. Principal Moule is so ardent a sympathizer with missionary work, and has trained so many labourers for it, that such a caution from him carries peculiar weight.

The C.M.S. may have pecuniary difficulties to face just now; but, at any rate, the state of things in and about Sierra Leone brings its burden to the committee—and not to the committee only. The Rev. W. J. Humphrey, Principal of Fourah Bay College, has, it seems, been made a prisoner by the insurgents. His wife, as well as others, may well have

sad forebodings about him; and if Mr. Alvarez himself at Falaba is "a long way beyond the other places named in connection with the disturbances," messengers from Falaba have been more than once attacked, and all letters destroyed, so that news of him had for weeks (on March 28) been lacking.

Some correspondence which has lately been begun in the *Record*, moreover, is disclosing some very disquieting facts in connection with the supply of candidates for Holy Orders among us. The pity is that so much writing, in such cases, is anonymous. The want of an attesting signature must carry its own disadvantages with it. But the statements made are, if true, painful enough.

Arrangements are being made for two public meetings in London on behalf of the Queen Victoria Clergy Fund, one in the Great Hall of the Church House on Tuesday, May 10 (Convocation week), at 3.30 p.m., under the chairmanship of Earl Egerton of Tatton; and the other by kind permission of the Lord Mayor, at the Mansion House, on Monday, July 4, at 3 p.m., when it is hoped that the Lord Mayor himself will preside.

The Archdeacon of London presided at a meeting of the City clergy, convened for the purpose of considering an order shortly to be issued by the Charity Commissioners for regulating the annual sums paid to incumbents and churchwardens of City churches for maintenance of Divine service and fabric. The order is to empower the Commissioners to reduce such annual payment, or entirely suspend it when circumstances arise which would warrant their doing so. This explanation, however, it is stated, does not satisfy either the clergy or churchwardens. They hold that such power might easily be abused, and many of the churches dispossessed of the funds on which they rely for the payment of officials and repairs to fabrics. A memorial was drawn up, setting forth their objections to the proposed order, which will be duly forwarded to the Commissioners.

The Church Missionary Society is just entering upon its centenary year, and the Bishop of Exeter has written strongly urging the committee to make an effort to raise the sum of one million sterling during the year. As a beginning he offers the sum of £1,000, and intimates his readiness to give at the close of the year a second £1,000 if it should be needed to make up the million suggested.

Donations, Bequests, and Appeals.

Mrs. Charles Turner has made another munificent contribution to the diocese of Liverpool, having promised £1,000 conditionally for the new Diocesan Church House. Mrs. Turner has already given £2,000 to the same object.

We quote the following from the *Guardian:* "Sir J. W. Maclure, M.P., has received the following from Sir W. Cunliffe Brooks:

"'Close Brooks, Antibes, Alpes Maritimes, March 20, 1898.—Dear Sir John William Maclure,—So pleased to receive enclosed from you. Gladly I have added my name, and ordered payment of the amount. The effort of giving is one thing, but the effort of arousing public interest to a practical result is another. This has happily been accomplished by you and by your very reverend brother. The thanks of the community are accorded to you both.'

"The enclosure referred to was a list of contributions to the building fund of the west front and Victoria porch of Manchester Cathedral. The sum subscribed up to the present is £6,093 2s., of which Sir William

Cunliffe Brooks has contributed £2,000. This special fund is in addition to the £50,000 which was raised mainly by Sir J. W. Maclure and the Dean of Manchester for the restoration of the cathedral."

SELECTED NEW BOOKS.

Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar (as edited and enlarged by Kautzsch). Revised by A. E. COWLEY, M.A. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Menander's ΓΕΩΡΓΟΣ. A Revised Text of the Geneva Fragment, with Translation and Notes. By B. P. GRENFELL, M.A., and A. S. HUNT, M.A. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Price 1s. 6d.

Aristocracy and Evolution. By W. H. MALLOCK. A. and C. Black. Price 12s. 6d.

Divine Immanence. By J. R. ILLINGWORTH, M.A. (Bampton Lecturer, 1894). Macmillan. Price 7s. 6d.

Life and Work of Archbishop Benson. By J. A. CARR, LL.D. (author of "The Life of Archbishop Ussher"). Elliot Stock. Price 6s.

Introduction to the Study of Sociology. By J. H. W. STUCKENBERG. Hodder and Stoughton. Price 9s.

Obituary.

THE Rev. R. B. Tritton, M.A., of the well-known banking family, died, at the age of 79, on March 31, within a day or two, says a writer in the *Guardian*, of the death of his wife's sister (known, first as Miss Lindsay and later as Mrs. Bliss, by her pathetic songs), after five years of retirement from public life. One of a group which comprised such men as Cayley, Mours, and Clarke (so the *Guardian* writer, or his printer, spells the names), that sat at the scholars' table at Trinity, Cambridge, years ago, and marked, even then, by the devotional habits which characterized his subsequent life, he was for thirty-two years at Oxford, where Archbishop Warham built so costly a palace, and subsequently for twelve at Bognor. On an excursion to Rome, a few years ago, when Mrs. Bliss above-mentioned was one of the party, he suffered a double calamity in the sickening and dying of his wife and a daughter who were with him, and from the effects of that sorrow he never seems to have recovered. The church and the vicarage of Bognor were largely helped by his liberality.

On Easter Day there died one who had been thirty-eight years connected with Bath—the Rev. Prebendary Buttenshaw. Though he seems to have held no incumbency since 1873, he did a great deal of work, and was, till 1886, the regular afternoon lecturer at St. Andrew's, Walcot.

The day before Good Friday there was laid in the churchyard of Little Wenlock, near Wellington, in Shropshire, the body of its late rector, Canon T. A. Nash, of whom Canon Christopher (whose curate he was for eight years) supplies a feeling notice in the *Record*. Not ordained till he was thirty, he spent thirty-six laborious years in the ministry. His work lay in Oxford; at Heigham, in Norwich; at Ball's Pond, in Islington; and at Lowestoft, before he went to the Shropshire village. And his last days were cheered by the help of a very valuable curate, the Rev. D. H. J. Cranage, so well-known for his architectural skill as well as his spiritual character.