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

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

ART. V.—WELLHAUSEN'S THEORY OF THE PENTATEUCH.

SECOND PAPER.

The Mosaic Origin of the Pentateuchal Codes. By GEERHARDUS VOS. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

IT is not the purpose of these papers to pursue the latest Pentateuchal criticism through all its phases, and to grapple with its allegations singly. It will, therefore, be sufficient to indicate that in the writer's judgment the post-exilian theory involves so much greater difficulty than it removes, as to render it utterly useless as a working hypothesis, over and above the violence it does to historical, moral, and religious questions, each one of which has a right to be considered in cases like the present. In the task the writer proposes, he is quite conscious that he will encounter the unreasoning scorn of the modern successors of the Athenians whom Paul encountered; men who spent their time in nothing else than to tell or to hear some newer thing. He is, however, retrogade enough to maintain that the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch is the most rational theory that has yet been advanced, to account for the production, authority, and preservation of the works that ordinarily pass by the name of Moses. The recent hypothesis seems to him utterly unable to cope with the settled belief of centuries—a belief that rests upon unimpeachable testimony and is supported by the highest authority that can be brought to the Christian heart.

Amongst the various points attacked by modern opponents, we find the various collections of laws that bear upon different points of political and religious life singled out for adverse criticism. It is part of the policy of the new school to make each collection appear as independent as possible of its fellows, and to talk of each as a Code—as when we speak of the pandects of Justinian, the laws of the Twelve Tables, or the Code Napoléon. The reason of this is obvious. It imparts a composite air to the Pentateuch. We are not afraid to follow our critics to this field. At the outset, we cannot do better than quote a few sentences from the exceeding lucid and able little book named at the head of this article. The writer considers these codes seriatim, and thus concludes his findings:

> We could sum up the result in the statement, that the newest phase of Pentateuch criticism presents no theory, but merely an hypothesis—one of the many ways of accounting for a number of facts. We believe that we have shown that the old hypothesis, if we may indeed call it so, accounts for these facts just as well as the new one, and in many respects better. But it is not a matter of indifference which of the two hypo-

theses we shall choose. For whilst the new one must stand or fall on the mere merits of its plausibility and applicability, the old one has all the advantage of the direct autonomy of the law itself, which lifts it out of the category of hypotheses, so that it becomes a theory founded on such facts as will admit no other interpretation.[1]

It may well be demanded of anyone maintaining the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, that he should clearly state what he means by his proposition. We must at once divest ourselves of our modern environment, which would picture an author sitting down and continuously composing a work which he issued from time to time, every word of which was his own, and which comes into our hands free from all those marks that antiquity leaves upon ancient works. It is impossible to deny the existence in the Book of Genesis of many things that owe their origin to different authors. But this is not inconsistent with the idea of one master-mind giving homogeneousness to the whole. Our present scope lying outside Genesis, is rather concerned with the remaining books. Here after the very commencement of Exodus the bulk of the books may be attributed to Moses without fear of disproof.

Of course while saying this, we are ready to admit that in the time of Ezra a very thorough revision of the historical books took place, and it is quite consistent with the hypothesis we are advocating, that this revision may have affected the body of the work, in a manner that would be impossible in a modern book. Further, it is by no means impossible that portions may have been transposed; and tradition, that in after-times modified the ritual observances, may have to some degree been admitted into the text. In the highly interesting passage that deals with the prophecies of Balaam, and presents to us that strangely mingled character in whom religious feeling and conscious fraud contend for the mastery, we have a specimen of the method of compilation that a man like Moses might easily have followed. But when we have made these necessary deductions, which will vary between well-defined limits according to the general knowledge and disposition of the critic, we have an overwhelming preponderance of matter—narrative, legislative, and bearing on ecclesiastical and ritual observance—which may without any violence be attributed to Moses, as they are attributed in the books themselves under consideration, and have been so for hundreds of years, by persons who are well calculated to give their opinion with authority, until a century of misapplied ingenuity tends to breathe doubt into men's minds, and pave the way for a chilling scepticism, that will end in depriving us of all faith in

[1] "The Mosaic Origin," etc., p. 180.

the existence of a Divine Revelation distinct from an unconscious development of natural forces.

The objections against the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch often spring from the supposed fragmentary character of the laws on the one hand, and their excessive elaboration and minuteness on the other. But it seems as if the balance of probability were in favour of great fragmentariness, and of evident change in the various enactments from one stage to another. We are apt unconsciously to convey to the Moses of the past, the ideas we have formed consequent on knowing the work he accomplished, and the fame he won amongst his countrymen. We are ready to picture him, if we believe him to be the author of the Pentateuch, as sitting down, and constructing under a conscious divine afflatus, a code of laws comprehensive and symmetrical, in which no growth should be visible, and no marks remaining of alteration and improvement. Now the minute criticism to which these records have been subjected of late, does good, even though it is exaggerated and one-sided; for it forces us back to that conception of the great Lawgiver which runs through the books themselves. It is plain that the author of these records did not contemplate Moses as a legendary hero. A later spirit breathes through such expressions as, "There arose not a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face" (Deut. xxxiv. 10); but in the Pentateuch itself, with the exception of the parenthetic expression, "the man Moses was very meek" (Numb. xii. 3), which may be variously explained and defended, Moses appears as a man of affairs, weighed down oftentimes by a burden that was too much for his great strength, and which drew from an interested stranger the dark foreboding, "Thou wilt surely wear away, both thou and this people that is with thee: for this thing is too heavy for thee; thou art not able to perform it thyself alone" (Exod. xviii. 18). The author of this work is not averse from attributing to a foreign source the suggestion of a piece of practical and homely legislation, which relieved the great Lawgiver of this overwhelming load, and conferred on the whole nation the benefits of speedy and effective, although very primitive, methods of justice. We have a striking instance of this in the remarkable conversation embedded in the Book Leviticus (chap. x. 16-22). Beneath the shadow of the awful punishment which smote Nadab and Abihu with death, because, under the influence apparently of strong drink, they had offered strange fire on the altar, Moses rebuked the surviving sons of Aaron with great severity, because of supposed negligence in their duties. When he subsequently received his brother's explanation, he professed himself satisfied with

the reason alleged, and the result left upon the reader's mind is, certainly, that Moses spake unadvisedly with his lips. Similarly in the Book Numbers (chap. xxxii.) Moses is represented as being mistaken in ascribing wrong motives to the Reubenites and their associates, which imputations, after explanation on their part, he withdrew; and followed the course which at first he had stigmatized as calculated "to augment the fierce anger of the Lord against Israel." All this is most natural, and what we should expect, if the Pentateuch is historically true, but strangely incompatible with the halo writers of romances cast round their heroes. We can see no reason why in the course of thirty-eight years the Moses of reality should not compile notes of his journeyings, mark the natural features of the various encampments, frame enactments for the needs of his people, whom he was training for a higher destiny and to whose future he looked forward with increasing hope. He might gather information on all sides as to the land that his people were to inherit, and as to the tribes that surrounded him. He would enter upon his task, not as some John Cade, the illiterate leader of rough and untaught peasants, but as a man of acknowledged native genius, trained in the court of a mighty empire, and conversant with the secrets of a vast and complex civilization. Well might his system contain undeniable evidences of being indebted to the valley of the Nile for its suggestions, and his holy tent be emblazoned with an art that plainly confessed its kinship with alien nations, for its form, if not for its essence. We should go further and say it was a man gifted with such rare opportunities of knowing and recording the truth, whom God chose to write all these things in the books of the law. Nor would it be any argument against the Mosaic authorship, say of codes of sacrifice, if it were irrefragably proved that certain sacrificial rites, and directions about altars, and recurrence of feasts, had their prototype and analogue either in the cultus of Egypt, the ruder and more homely festivals of their slaves in the land of Goshen, or in the village communities in which Jethro, the father-in-law of Moses, had passed his earliest years, Under these circumstances we cannot expect to find literary finish, systematic arrangement beyond a certain rudimentary point, nor absolute novelty in legislation. In fact we are to look, not for the stains of the lamp and the smell of the midnight oil, but for the abrupt endings of a soldier's note-book, and the disconnected enactments of a general's despatches.[1]

[1] Of course it is not meant to attribute every line and letter to the pen of Moses: amanuenses were known even then, and such a man as Moses could certainly employ them. Still less is it meant to ignore

We may illustrate our meaning by two examples—one taken from the accounts of the Tabernacle, the other from the Leprosy Laws.

Here we will quote a characteristic piece from Wellhausen:

> Even such authorities as Bleek, Hupfeld, and Knobel have been misled by the appearance of historical reality which the Priestly Code creates by its learned art. . . . They have regarded the multiplicity of numbers and names, the minute technical descriptions, the strict keeping up of the scenery of camp life as so many signs of authentic objectivity. . . . The boldness with which numbers and names are stated, and the preciseness of the details about indifferent matters of furniture, do not prove them to be reliable: they are not drawn from contemporary records, but are the fruit solely of Jewish fancy—a fancy which it is well known does not design nor sketch, but counts and constructs, and produces nothing more than barren plans. Without repeating the account of the Tabernacle in Exod. xxv. word for word, it is difficult to give an idea how circumstantial it is; we must go to the source to satisfy ourselves what the narrator can do in this line. One would imagine that he was giving specifications to measurers for estimates; or that he was writing for carpet-makers and upholsterers; but they could not proceed upon his information, for the incredibly matter-of-fact statements are fancy all the same, as was shown in chap. i.—("Prolegomena," p. 347.)

The reference to his first chapter by the critic is surely an instance of his wonderful feat "of lifting up one's self by one's own waistband," to employ his elegant metaphor. How much he proved in that chapter let Dr. Bissell state. "The critic," he says, "indeed in this way gets a theory of the Tabernacle that suits to some degree his theory of development in the history; but it is at a fatal cost. How, then, on any proper principles of historical development, is the Temple itself to be accounted for? Perhaps, however, so inopportune a query will be regarded also as an impertinence. Given the theory that you have an elephant and a tortoise for the earth to rest its crushing weight upon, what difference can it make whether it be elephant or tortoise that is left dangling in the abyss?"

Let the reader ponder this passage well. Some things are indications of a contemptuous spirit, as the sneer at "carpet-makers and upholsterers"—as if carpets could, except in the critic's idea, be made without carpet-makers. But the strange statement concerning the Jewish fancy could only come from a brain that is ponderously destitute of a sense of humour. Did anyone ever hear of a fancy that "counts and constructs" and produces "barren plans," but does not "design or sketch"? Even the immortal Pecksniff did not go as far as this. His originator assures us, "Of his architectural doings nothing was

---

Divine inspiration. Our opponents serve the gods of the valley, and in contending with them, we must come down to their level, and for a time lose sight of the sacred strongholds of our faith. Judged as another book—the advanced critic's favourite canon—the Bible stands the test.

clearly known, except that he had never designed or built anything; but it was generally understood that his knowledge of the science was almost awful in its profundity." But even Mr. Pecksniff had to borrow from his pupil "his case of mathematical instruments," for in that wonderful office where were "constructed in the air Castles, Houses of Parliament, and other Public Buildings," they had not quite equalled "late Jewish fancy;" they were obliged "to design and sketch" before they produced the "barren plans" of gorgeous edifices that never had been built and never could be.

The suggestions of orthodox divines are stigmatized as harmonistic subterfuges; but what of the cool assumption that the details "are not drawn from contemporary records"? Has the professor of Oriental languages at Marburg a unique collection of contemporary records in the archives of his University that he can speak with so thunderous a voice of omniscient nescience? Can he not discover for us the name and history of the pious forger of post-exilic ages who for twenty-five centuries has "kept up the scenery of camp life," and deluded sceptical critics with the idea that they heard the voice of Moses behind the curtains of the Tabernacle? Having penetrated the arras with the sharp thrust of the critic's rapier, it seems wrong to the nineteenth century, which is greedy of facts, not to set in the light of day the corpse of "this counsellor" who

> Is now most still, most secret, and most grave,
> Who was in life a foolish prating knave.

Every statement of Wellhausen's may be traversed, and that not unsuccessfully. In his first chapter, on which all his argument reposes, Wellhausen carefully distinguishes between the Sacred Tent of Exod. xxxiii. 7 and the Tabernacle of Exod. xxv. In this distinction he is undoubtedly right, but in his inference he is wrong. This was not an ancient sacred tent, having its analogue in idol tents, but it was a temporary makeshift. Dr. Bissell states the case here with great clearness and force:

> After Moses received the order to build the Tabernacle, the dreadful defection of the people in the matter of the golden calf took place. This naturally interrupted the execution of the plan. In the meantime a provisional tent was used, not improperly called by the name subsequently given to the Tabernacle—"tent of meeting;" since it, too, actually served as the meeting-place of the congregation. It is pitched at a short remove from the encampment, in order, as the historian is careful to inform us, to manifest the Divine displeasure at Israel's recent sin (Exod. xxxiii. 7). It is not in the midst of the camp (Num. xi. 24, 26, 30; xii. 4, 5); but just as little is it wholly apart from it. . . . This very tent, moreover, had probably been known before as the tent of Moses. . . . Joshua, as temporary leader in Moses' absence, occupies it

(Exod. xxxiii. 7). There is no impropriety in his doing so previous to the establishment of the Levitical system. For the same reason God without the mediation of sacrifice makes revelations of Himself here (Exod. xxxiii. 7, 9, 11 ; cf. xiii. 21). Now, when so much has been admitted, all the principal difficulties involved in the narrative have disappeared.[1]

With the difficulties disappear also the "Priestly Code," J, and all the paraphernalia of the critic's laboratory.

"The question before us," says Wellhausen,

has reference exclusively to the particular tent which, according to Exod. xxv. *seq.*, was erected at the command of God as the basis of the theocracy, the pre-Solomonic central sanctuary, which also in outward details was the prototype of the Temple. At the outset its very possibility is doubtful. Very strange is the contrast between this splendid structure, on which the costliest material is lavished and wrought in the most advanced style of Oriental art, and the soil on which it rises, in the wilderness amongst the native Hebrew nomad tribes, who are represented as having got it ready offhand, and without external help.[2]

This passage again reveals—and we must ask our readers to be patient at our reiteration—the inherent faults of this subjective criticism. It is founded on the prepossessions of the writer. It insinuates doubts, and treats them as facts amply demonstrated. It exaggerates statements, and then takes exception to the absurdities it has created. It is acute in its criticisms, but absurdly narrow in its circle of knowledge. Is the contrast greater between the Jewish Tabernacle, reared under the direction of skilled artificers, and a monastic church of the middle ages and the population that crouched under its shadow? But on a closer inspection of the whole structure and the accounts given of its erection, the greater part of the supposed difficulties vanish. Chap. xxv. of Exodus may seem to a grammarian a barren plan; to an architect like Mr. Fergusson it is a working plan, from which he can reconstruct the Tabernacle. One reason, we may observe in passing, why so many things in the Pentateuch have been obscured by the remarks of learned commentators is that instead of experts being asked for explanations of the statements, men have attempted the explanation without a shadow of practical knowledge. A full statement of the materials of which the Tabernacle was made, and of the proofs of a close connection between it and Egyptian art, can be read in the Introduction to Exodus in the "Speaker's Commentary." Paragraph 5 is worthy of careful consideration as a fine example of cautious criticism compared with rash conjecture.

Before leaving this topic, we should like to apply Wellhausen's method to a passage of "Cæsar's Commentaries," sadly

[1] "The Pentateuch," p. 224.

[2] Wellhausen, "Prolegomena," p. 38.

too familiar to most English schoolboys. It is found in the fourth book of the "Gallic War," and commences in the well-known words, "Rationem pontis hanc instituit." Cæsar, like Moses, was a man immersed in affairs. The same questions have been raised as to his power on campaign to write accounts of his wars, and the people he encountered. Taken all in all, Cæsar's Bridge and Moses' Tabernacle are fairly parallel structures. That Cæsar never built the bridge at all, but that it is an account inserted in the so-called "Commentaries" by a mediæval monk, whom we may call "M.," is evident from the following considerations. Generally the redactor (for the fiction that Cæsar wrote the Commentaries that bear his name is exploded, and we must acknowledge the presence of redactions) has well maintained the scenery of the camp, and spoken of Cæsar in the third person. Occasionally the mask is dropped, and in chap. xvii. he writes: "Cæsar his de causis, quas commemoravi." This slip occurs again in the same book, chap. xxvii. Interpolations in the narrative are, therefore, to be expected. A notable one is found in chap. x., as flagrant as occurs in Num. xxi. 14, "Amon is the border of Moab, between Moab and the Amorites." Some ten lines are violently inserted to describe the course of the Mosa. What strengthens our belief in this being an interpolation is that, according to the critics, here, the reading of the best MSS. is undoubtedly faulty. Nor is this a slight matter. We cannot now tell what two points Cæsar—or rather "M."—wished to represent as eighty miles from the ocean. This passage also makes the Rhine pass "per fines Nantuatium;" but in the undoubted Cæsar, "Gallic Wars," iii. 1, this people is placed between Lake Geneva and Mont Blanc. All attempts to explain these two statements are evidently "harmonistic subterfuges," and quite unworthy of modern scholarship. Not only so, but the end of the passage says of the Rhine, "Multis capitibus in oceanum influit;" this use of "caput" is unusual, as Kraner says, "'Mündungen,' sonst gewöhnlich Quellen." Just here, too, the topography is hopelessly entangled. In chap. xv. we read, "Ad confluentem Mosæ et Rheni." It is believed by some that "confluence" here means a river joining the Mosa and the Rhine; others interpret it as the confluence of the Mosa and a part of the Rhine; and others tells us that in Cæsar's time the Waal did not enter the Meuse at Gorkum, but near Batenberg or Fort Saint André. But we really must protest against this altering of rivers to suit the theories, even of the third Napoleon. Another commentator tells us, with the assumption that distinguishes orthodox divines, that the confluence of the Rhenus and the Mosa is the confluence of the Rhenus and Mosella at Coblenz; and we must explain Cæsar's mistake as

well as we can.[1] There is no doubt that we are led astray by the many interpolations of "M.;" and if men will believe that Cæsar built a bridge over the Rhine, they will maintain anything, though Cæsar's present text allows us to put the scene of decisive engagement at Gueldres or Mayenfeld. But let us now come to the story of the alleged building of the bridge. It is impossible to convey to any reader by quotations the minute directions of the passage. One would imagine that it was an examination-paper set to subalterns in an Engineer corps. Can we imagine a great general, such as Cæsar is said to have been, writing down the dimensions of beams, and troubling himself with the strength of cross-pieces? We are too well aware of "Cæsar's Thrasonical brag" to be astonished with most of his utterances, but even he would have hesitated to write of a bridge, "that so great was the strength of the work and such the arrangement of the materials, that in proportion as the greater body of water dashed against the bridge, so much the closer were its parts held fastened together." This plainly proves that the redactor "M." lived in an age that honoured Virgil as a wizard, and thought of Cæsar as a Troll that built magic bridges. Moreover, let anyone master the description if he can, and see if he agrees with anyone else—anyone, that is, who at this period of enlightenment as to Roman history believes in Cæsar's bridge. Were there eight fibulæ, four at each junction of beam and bearers? and if so, in what position were these put? Or were there only two, and was there no cross-piece between the bearers? Or is Napoleon right—did they cross from bearer to bearer, like an elongated letter "X," suggesting to the puzzled schoolboy a fresh ending for the "Pons asinorum"? Does anyone suppose that Cæsar went hurrying after the Germans with "pile-drivers," and "rammers," and all appliances of engineering? No more than Moses went about the wilderness with an ark and a tabernacle! Is a truth-loving age to be deluded into believing, that in ten days after he began to collect the timber, Cæsar led his whole army over the Rhine, whether at Bonn or Coblenz matters nothing? Certainly not; at least, no Englishman who knows what it means to make a road at Suakim with all modern appliances, will credit Cæsar with this feat. But notice the conclusion. After beginning with misgiving the story of the magical bridge, that grew stronger as the stream rose higher and the current more powerful, "M." had prescient fear of the critics. The redactor of the Priestly Code left the Tabernacle standing, and Wellhausen triumphantly cries, "Hebrew tradition knows nothing about it." But the redactor

[1] Mr. Long in Smith's "Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography."

of the Priestly Code was a "midnight fumbler" compared with "M." Was ever a stroke of genius greater than this?

Quod ubi Cæsar comperit, omnibus rebus iis confectis, quarum rerum causa traducere exercitum constituerat, ut Germanis metum iniceret, ut Sugambros ulcisceretur, ut Ubios obsidione liberaret, diebus omnino decem et octo trans Rhenum consumptis satis et ad laudem et ad utilitatem profectum arbitratus se in Galliam recepit—pontemque rescidit.

Exactly as a legend of the middle ages should end—"He cut down the bridge"—and thus the legend of the famous bridge concludes, cut off from all credibility by the pen of its foolish creator, a warning against modern credulity and a primary example of what a clever and unscrupulous redactor may accomplish!

We beg the serious reader's pardon for thus treating the grave question of the higher criticism; but until the eyes of men are put out they cannot help seeing the summer madness of this new dream.

To return to the codes that are said to give evidence of a post-exilian origin. We cannot do better than quote from the "Pentateuchal Codes Mosaic," because in a few sentences, on a test case, the whole question is stated with great clearness:

The following facts, as stated by Delitzsch, concur to establish the Mosaic origin of the Leprosy Laws almost beyond dispute: (*a*) The Exodus of Israel has been identified by nearly all Egyptologists with the expulsion of the lepers spoken of by Manetho, Chæremon, Lysimachus, Tacitus, Diodorus, and Justinus. (*b*) The peculiar form in which Egyptian tradition has preserved this memory of the Exodus can only be accounted for by the assumption that leprosy prevailed more or less among the Israelites. Over-population, the result of their rapid increase in Goshen, may have been the natural cause of this impurity. This is confirmed by Scripture testimony of Jehovistic character (Exod. iv. 6; Num. xii. 10, 15). (*c*) On account of this plague, the Egyptians would necessarily consider the Jews as the importers of leprosy, and, as they carried their systematic purifications to an extreme for themselves, would exert an influence in the same direction upon the Israelites. (*d*) This sanitary, and more especially prophylactic, treatment of the disease was among the Egyptians assigned to the priests, and must have been pursued in accordance with fixed rules, as was the case with their medical practice in general. (*e*) It admits of no doubt, that the Israelites would follow in their treatment of the plague Egyptian usage. (*f*) Actually we find in these laws a carefully prescribed method of dealing with it, diagnostic criteria given; it appears also as the special task of the priests to discern the various phases of the disease, and declare the persons clean or unclean after a careful inspection. All these traits combined amount almost to a logical demonstration of the Egyptian, and consequently Mosaic, origin of the law of leprosy. That there was such prior to the Deuteronomic code, the passage (Deut. xxiv. 8) shows. When the critics resort to the arbitrary assumption that some other law may just as well have been referred to by the Deuteronomist, we have reached the sphere of the unknowable, where it is not safe to carry on the discussion.[1]

[1] Vos, "Pentateuchal Codes," etc., pp. 239, 240. This is a most useful

We might pursue the argument point after point, and we should find, not that we could unravel every knot in this perplexed question, but that the Wellhausen theories tie the old knots tighter by tying new ones round them that must be untied before the original perplexity is solved.

We take leave of this branch of our inquiry thoroughly convinced that the old opinion is correct, that in the main and for all practical purposes the Pentateuch is the work of Moses or those deputed by him to perform such parts of the task as are capable of being performed by amanuenses. We should go further, and fully credit the assumptions made in the books themselves of their Mosaic origin, and rest satisfied that the modern subjective criticism is too fantastical to be true, and that it is just as likely that Bacon wrote Shakespeare's plays and Herbert Spencer wrote Dickens's novels, as that a post-exilian scribe compiled the Pentateuch. But we must add one word more. Hebrew writers of great antiquity confirm the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch. Jewish history is a mass of impossibilities and contradictions without it. The preaching of apostles and evangelists of the Christian Church is founded on it. To a pious mind the most dreadful result of all, should this modern criticism prevail, is that He who spake as never man spake is convicted of being the prey of the same delusions as others. This may seem a little thing to some, but to many it would mean rayless night in the moral world.

FREDK. E. TOYNE.

ART. VI.—THE HOME RULE CAMPAIGN.

ALTHOUGH the forces culminating in the recent political tempest, which has overwhelmed a Parliament and wrecked a great Party, had long been gathering to a head, there were, at the last, but few premonitory symptoms as to the moment of its outbreak or the precise direction from which it would come. The knowledge that with its enlarged Franchise Ireland would, at the elections last autumn, return a solid body of at least eighty supporters of Mr. Parnell, who would in all probability hold the balance between tolerably equal forces of Conservatives and Liberals, led to the very general expectation that the Home Rulers would take care to render all government impossible except upon the condition that their demands—made from time to time piecemeal, but culminating in the repeal of the Union—were granted. It was

little book, and contains all that anyone requires to understand the part of the question it professes to elucidate.