---

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

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

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.

feared not only that these tactics might be successful in paralyzing the Imperial Government, but that party feeling would prevent that combination amongst English statesmen by which alone such a conspiracy could be met and overthrown. Mr. Parnell himself saw that his best chance lay in the equality of the two parties opposed to him. Hence, to neutralize the normal predominance of the Liberals, he threw the Irish vote into the Conservative scale, assailing the Liberal Party and its leaders with a wealth of invective which he very seldom employs. Mr. Gladstone, too, saw very clearly the danger of the situation when he entreated the country to give him such support that he would be able to defy the combined forces of Home Rulers and Tories. To enforce his argument, he hinted at the strong temptation to which the Liberal Party would be subjected in case the alliance of the Home Rulers became necessary for them in order to acquire a working majority. It was in the interest of political morality that this plea was urged, and it is hard to suppose that Mr. Gladstone had at that time made up his mind to be the first to give way to the temptation he so strongly deprecated.

However, when the elections were over, the new House of 670 members was found to contain 333 Liberals, 251 Conservatives, and 86 Home Rulers. That the Conservatives could not remain in office except by the united aid of the Home Rulers, or by the tolerance of a large section of the Liberals, was clear enough; but it was equally obvious that the Liberals alone, even if far more coherent than, in fact, they were, would have but a very precarious hold of a House in which they could not command quite half the members. The situation was a good deal complicated, but it is necessary to understand it in order to comprehend what followed. Although the Liberal Party was one in name, the process of disintegration within it had gone on rather rapidly since the passing of the Reform Bill of the previous summer. The Liberationists, by a premature assault on the Church—an assault in which they were supported by the Radical section—had deeply stirred the hearts of Liberal Churchmen. Mr. Gladstone's ambiguous utterances upon the subject, both in England and Scotland, had increased rather than allayed their misgivings. Again, Mr. Chamberlain and his friends had used some startling language about the rights of property as opposed to the "natural rights" of man, and the formula of "three acres and a cow" for every agricultural labourer had been employed with such effect in the agricultural districts that a large number of county members were Radicals pledged to sweeping land reforms. Against these stood Lord Hartington and the Whig Party. It was a very general opinion among

Liberals at that time that so long as the Conservative Party—whose successful management of foreign affairs was in conspicuous contrast with the bungling of their predecessors—continued to govern without offence to any distinctly Liberal principle, it would be better to leave them in office than, by turning them out and taking their place, risk an exposure of the fundamental differences of opinion latent in the Liberal ranks. How justifiable were these fears for the integrity of the party, if once called upon for united action on a great question, the sequel has shown. The point to be remembered is that though the differences on Home Rule have eclipsed all others in importance, there were other elements of dissension already existent as a danger to Liberal unity, even had the question of Irish Home Rule never been brought to the front. To return. Those Liberals who hoped for a patient treatment of the situation left out of their calculations the thwarted ambition—the words are not used invidiously—and constitutional impatience of the Liberal leader. Five years of misgovernment had sent him and his party to the polls under a cloud of defeat and unpopularity. The old constituencies would have given his opponents an enormous majority; but the power had been transferred from them to a new electorate, who might be expected at least to vote for those who enfranchised them. Mismanagement of the Church question did much to upset this favourable calculation; but the dexterous manipulation of the rural voters had redressed the balance, and though not master of a majority, Mr. Gladstone was at the head of a party which was within two of an absolute half of the House, and outnumbered his Ministerial opponents by more than eighty votes. Let him but dispossess them, and once more place his party in power, could he not trust to the generosity of his followers and to his own prestige and ability to secure a united support while he achieved one crowning triumph for the close of his career? The situation seemed to promise a chance of success, though he too—as I think will shortly appear—made too light of one element in it.

It was no difficult matter to detach the Irish from their supposed allegiance to the Tory Party. The Conservative attempt to govern Ireland by the ordinary law—the law which supposes that witnesses will swear truly, that juries will respect their oath, and that society will not conspire against authority and order—had proved a failure, and firmer rule was obviously needed. The grinding tyranny of the National League, everywhere triumphant, was exciting the protests of Irish Loyalists and their English sympathizers. The Queen's Speech at the opening of Parliament spoke of an inquiry into the state of affairs, and hinted that exceptional measures might

have to be taken to secure obedience to the law and the protection of loyal citizens. It was understood that Mr. W. H. Smith had gone to Ireland to conduct the inquiry, and that action would be taken upon his report. While circumstances were gradually forcing the Government to take vigorous measures against the National League, there was no Ministerial scheme ready for reforming the government of Ireland. Already, even before the meeting of Parliament, Mr. Gladstone had allowed the Irish members to see that if the chance were given him, he would be willing to advocate very bold changes with a view to settling the perennial Irish difficulty, and as the debate on the Address proceeded, these hints became daily stronger. It is more than doubtful whether his party would have allowed him to commit them to an amendment on the Address favourable to Home Rule, and he would not, therefore, commit himself. Rumours of his views on the subject had not been received with enthusiasm by his own adherents, and it was safer to leave the matter in some obscurity till the Treasury Bench had been gained. Mr. Jesse Collings had introduced an amendment in favour of agricultural allotments, and as the Government were bound to resist this—not because it was mischievous, but because it was an amendment to the Address—it was understood that on this issue the battle should be nominally fought. The Ministry then announced that if they retained office they would move for powers to enable them to deal with the National League. They were, however, on January 26th, defeated by a majority of 79 on a combination of Radicals and Home Rulers, their own numbers being reinforced by Lord Hartington and a small body of Whigs. Many of the latter also abstained from voting.

Down to the moment of the Conservative defeat, I do not think that Mr. Gladstone seriously contemplated any such drastic measure of Home Rule as that which has since been before the country. The evidence is much stronger in favour of his having relied upon his own power to reunite the Liberal Party, when he would need only to temporize with the Irish members, between whom and the Conservatives the breach was now too wide to be closed. But the secession of Lord Hartington and his Whig followers, which assumed increasingly formidable proportions, threw him more and more into the arms of the Parnellite faction, by putting his position more and more at their mercy. It was not without some difficulty that he formed a Cabinet. The work of finding men for the minor posts in the Ministry was still more arduous; while, at the present moment, some of the Household offices are filled by members of the Conservative Party. The mistake in Mr.

Gladstone's calculations, to which we alluded above, was just this: that he never reckoned upon falling so much under Mr. Parnell's power as he since has done. When established in office his first idea was one of "investigation and inquiry;" and when it became apparent that a definite measure must be produced within a definite time, the world was assured that, though the scheme when published would no doubt satisfy Mr. Parnell, it would also be quite compatible with Imperial unity. But as the numbers of his Liberal followers diminished, the power of his Irish allies increased. Moreover, Mr. Parnell had to satisfy not only his own estimate of what could be prudently demanded, but the less moderate requirements of his ardent Parliamentary adherents and of his eager masters in America. When, at last, on the 26th of March, the scheme was put before the Cabinet, Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Trevelyan at once pronounced against it; and though every effort, short of actual submission, was made to retain them, they left the Government. It was not until the 8th of April that the first part of the Ministerial measure was laid before Parliament. A Bill for compensating such Irish landlords as were willing to part with their lands followed a fortnight later as an "inseparable part" of the scheme, brought forward in fulfilment of a "moral obligation." It would be wasting both the reader's time and the Editor's space to give any detailed account of the two Bills. It is enough to remember that they proposed to hand over the management of all Irish affairs, including the disposal of taxation, education, and eventually the management of the Police, to a composite legislature sitting in Dublin. This Parliament was to be formed somewhat after an ecclesiastical model: the upper order consisting of peers and members, elected by the propertied classes; and the lower consisting of members elected as at present. The concurrence of the two orders was to be necessary to passing a measure; but the veto of the upper body was not to last beyond three years, or the life of the Parliament—whichever might be the longer term. Certain matters, such as foreign affairs, the army and navy, the currency, commercial treaties, and trade and navigation, were withdrawn from the jurisdiction of the Irish Parliament; and it was to have no power to establish any particular form of religion. With the Parliament was to be an Executive, and over both a Viceroy, an Irishman, armed with a veto exercisable by the English Crown at the advice of the English Ministers. The taxes were to be collected by the Irish authorities, and handed over to an English receiver-general. Customs and Excise were to remain in English hands. (The first idea had been to hand them over to the Irish, but, thanks to the efforts of Mr. Childers, Mr. Chamberlain, and

others, the alteration was made before the publication of the Bill.) The Irish representatives were to disappear from Westminster altogether; but the Irish contribution to English finances was to be one-fifteenth of the cost of the National Debt, of the costs of National defence in time of peace, and of Imperial administration. This contribution was to be a first charge upon the Irish revenues, and was to be deducted from them by the receiver-general before paying the balance into the Irish Exchequer. Distrust of the fair dealing of the Irish people was manifested on two important points. It was felt that the Judges who had nobly endeavoured of late years to administer the law might suffer, when the friends of the men they had sentenced to death or imprisonment came into power. They, therefore, were to be pensioned. But the most serious moral obligation was to the landlords. They would be placed under the rule of an Executive which would certainly not help them to collect their rents nor permit the ordinary processes of justice to be used by them to enforce their rights. To oust them from the possession of their land was known perfectly well to be the purpose at the bottom of the whole revolution which Home Rule was to achieve. So the landlords who chose to part with their land were to have Consolidated Three per Cent. Stock given to them equivalent to twenty years of their net profits, taking the past ten years as an average. In particular cases the sum might be less, and in a very few exceptional cases it might be a trifle more. The offer was one of a much smaller income on an infinitely better security; and if circumstances should cause it to be practically tendered, the cost to the country would not be less than two hundred millions—equal to the five milliards paid by France to victorious Germany. The repayment of principal and interest of the consols thus created was to be made by a rent-charge on the land; its present tenants becoming—subject to this rent-charge, which would be materially less than their present rents—owners of the soil. Such in brief outline was, and still is, Mr. Gladstone's scheme for the future government of Ireland. There would have been no need now to give even a bare statement of the above provisions if we had not the assurance of a member of the Cabinet (Lord Kimberley) that, if Mr. Gladstone should be victorious at the polls, the Bills will be reintroduced—measures of which Mr. Bright has said that not twenty men would support them had they been introduced by anyone but Mr. Gladstone; while Mr. Spurgeon thinks they look more like the work of a madman than of a sane person. There should, however, be no mistake about the matter. Those who support Mr. Gladstone this month will be voting for these Bills, and for no other. Here and there some modi-

fication may be permitted, but substantially they will stand as they are. And this they will do, because the Home Rule Party, whom Mr. Gladstone has made his masters, will not permit them to be tampered with.

The publication of the scheme was followed by a moment of surprise; and then protests began to be made, and secessions from the Government were announced on all sides. The Irish Home Rule Party did not much applaud the measure. Mr. Davitt significantly spoke of it as a breakfast which he would thankfully eat without forfeiting his subsequent demand for dinner and supper. The artificial device of a "first order" provoked only a smile; and even Mr. Parnell hinted very broadly that the financial arrangements would have to be amended. In criticizing the Bill, however, the Irish Party always kept the buttons on their foils, for they saw that though it might not effect their purpose, it would serve it. Their avowed end and aim is separation; and it matters little to them whether we complete the split ourselves or merely place the wedge in position and give them the mallet to drive it home. Obviously Mr. Gladstone's scheme would do the latter; and it is upon that ground, quite as much as on any matter of detail, that it has been so peremptorily rejected. The banishment of the Irish representatives from the Imperial Parliament would go a long way towards separation; but the creation of an independent Executive, with an Irish Parliament as its instrument, leaves the thread of connection so slight that a touch might snap it. The so-called guarantees for British supremacy would be worthless unless supported by military force. The reconquest of Ireland would no doubt be possible (though we should almost certainly be called upon to undertake it when engaged elsewhere); but surely we are not to be asked to create an independent Ireland with the deliberate view of reconquest! That, at any rate, could not be called "finality"! The other great blemishes of the scheme were the taxation of Ireland for purposes beyond her own control or interference; the enormous cost at which one numerically small section of the minority was to be rescued from thraldom, while nothing was to be done for the rest; and the want of any separate provision for Ulster. The necessity of a land-purchase scheme itself condemns the coming rulers of Ireland as men not to be trusted. If so, the scattered Loyalists of Ireland have at least as much claim on us as the landlords. The cost of their transplantation would be enormous; but the mere item of two hundred millions required to buy out the landlords suffices to cast doubts on proposals against the consequences of which such costly provision has to be made. Most serious of all was the omission of any

special provision for Ulster. By race, by religion, by history, and by habit of life, the people of a great part of Ulster are widely different from those of the other three provinces; and, to crown all, they are enthusiastically devoted to the English connection. Mr. Gladstone promised at first that their case should be considered later on; but he has not since been able to make any suggestion for meeting this difficulty, and this for the very simple reason that Mr. Parnell will not permit the case of Ulster to be separated from that of the rest of Ireland. Ulster is the quarter from which he and his friends expect most of their future revenue, and, to use Mr. Parnell's own expression, they "cannot spare it." On the other hand, Belfast has never yet taken its orders from Dublin, and never will; so that even if Home Rule were granted to-morrow, the disagreement would begin the day after. Not civil war at once; but the North would refuse submission and defy coercion. No English Government would dare lend England's power in aid of coercion, while both sides would receive aid and encouragement from sympathizers abroad. Thus the war would begin; and the first bullet fired would pierce the heart of Home Rule. From this point of view, Home Rule, whether voted or not, is impossible; and the attempt to enforce it can only lead to bloodshed, which would have to be stopped by England resuming her responsibility as ruler. I speak here neither in praise nor blame, but merely state facts which are to my mind decisive of the case. People in England are beginning to see this more clearly than they did at first. The absence of a separate provision for Ulster must be even more fatal to any scheme for Home Rule than the neglect to provide for the scattered minority of Loyalists.

Such are the principal objections which, in the opinion of the House of Commons, made the Bill one which could not safely be read a second time. The decision does the more honour to the independent section of the Liberal Party, because every inducement was resorted to that could be held out to them to secure, if not their approval of the Bill, at least their vote for the second reading, having regard only to its principle; or if not even that, why, then their abstention rather than their hostility. Of actual concessions, indeed, there was little pretence, for the reasons above given; but the Prime Minister was prodigal of promises to "consider" anything and everything in Committee, if only the second reading were passed as a matter of form. To conciliate the Radical section, the Land Purchase Bill, founded on "moral obligation," was tacitly dropped; and to persuade the newly-elected members, who strongly objected to a dissolution, the promise was given that if the Bill now passed its second reading, it should not be

further proceeded with this session, but reintroduced—possibly with some amendments—in the autumn; whereas if it were now rejected there must be a dissolution. Lastly, the pressure of the caucuses was brought to bear, and hesitating or hostile members were roundly told that all Liberals who voted against Mr. Gladstone were marked to lose their seats at the coming elections. As all these intrigues took time, one pretext after another was seized upon for prolonging the debate on the second reading, which began on Monday, May 10th; and it was not until the morning of Tuesday, June 8th—the anniversary of Mr. Gladstone's overthrow last year—that the division was taken, in the fullest House ever known. By 341 against 311, the Bill was rejected, and an immediate dissolution rendered practically inevitable, though not constitutionally necessary. The majority was considerably larger than either the friends or the foes of the measure had anticipated, and showed that between ninety and a hundred Liberals had voted with the Opposition, while eight were absent from any cause other than illness.

We are now, therefore, on the eve of a General Election, the second within nine months. There are, however, some material differences between the situation now and what it was then. Then the electoral divisions were newly mapped, and the bulk of the constituents newly enfranchised. It would have been hard to tell which way they would go, even if the issues on which they were to vote had been clear. And this they certainly were not. Some voted for the Church, more for the "three acres and a cow;" a few in disgust at what they understood to be a Tory alliance with Mr. Parnell; most of all, perhaps, for the name of Mr. Gladstone and whatsoever it might please him to do. On the present occasion there is hardly a man in England who does not know the issue about to be tried; that it has been narrowed down till it comprises no more than one political question—the independence of Ireland as provided in the defeated Bill—and that question one for which the Prime Minister's friends would gladly substitute a vote of personal confidence in him. For the moment the matter is taken out of the region of discussion, and has come into that of electioneering mechanism. On the 8th of June, in a House of 670, there were 341 members who were opponents of separation. It is the business of the Unionist Party to see that these 341 members do not suffer for their vote, and that their numbers are increased at the expense of their opponents. The Conservatives are fairly safe. In almost every constituency that returned a Conservative last November it is reasonable to assume that the Conservatives and Unionist Liberals together constitute a majority capable of

keeping him in his place. And, on the other hand, where a Liberal Unionist at present holds the seat, the Conservatives are in almost every case pledged not only to abstain from running a candidate of their own, but to support the sitting member against any Gladstonian candidate. These tactics, if fairly adhered to, should be successful in securing the 341 Unionist members of the late House. Of the eighty-six seats held by Mr. Parnell's immediate followers, it is calculated that two will fall to the Conservatives, whilst in Scotland the feeling of sympathy for the Ulster Presbyterians, and a strong sense of the impracticability of Mr. Gladstone's proposals, will operate in favour, not so much of Conservatism as of Unionist Liberals, who will have the support of the Conservative vote. In England and Wales most of the Separatist candidates will be opposed, according to circumstances, by either a Tory or a Whig, on the understanding that, in either case, the combined votes of the two parties shall be given in his favour.

It would be presumptuous to attempt any confident forecast of the result; but one may say, without much risk, that if the compact between Conservatives and Liberal Unionists should be adhered to in a fair majority of cases, the Conservatives may look to increase their numbers by about forty, and the Liberal Unionists by nearly as many, the former gains being chiefly in the south of England, and the latter in Scotland and the north. We should then see either Lord Hartington Prime Minister, endeavouring to settle the Irish question with the support of the Conservatives, or Lord Salisbury engaged on the same task, with the aid of the Moderate Liberals. No doubt a coalition would be very welcome, but is hardly at this moment to be expected. For if once Mr. Gladstone, as a factor in politics, is eliminated, his present adherents will flock to the standard of Lord Hartington, and the disintegration of the Liberal Party will be stayed for the moment, until the progress of Radicalism under Mr. Chamberlain once more gives it an impetus.

Meanwhile we may congratulate ourselves that the recent convulsion, although subjecting the country to all the loss and inconvenience inseparable from a General Election, has not been without enormous compensating advantages. First and foremost it has dealt a blow at the "one-man" system of government, which is the ever-present danger of a democracy. The personal devotion of large classes of the people to Mr. Gladstone seemed at the last Election to be proof not only against all the criticisms of his enemies, but even against all his blunders, and his most conspicuous failures at home and abroad. All the machinery of the Liberal caucus was brought to bear in support of this personal predominance, and sentences

of political ostracism were promptly pronounced against all who dared to challenge Mr. Gladstone's dictatorship. Under this *régime* the Liberal Party was being rapidly degraded into a mere mechanism for registering the decrees of a despot, and all conscience, and all sense of individual responsibility, seemed in danger of vanishing. To Mr. Goschen in the first place, and, next, to Lord Hartington, and to a few independent Liberal journalists of influence, such as Mr. Edward Dicey, belongs the credit of having first awakened the party from this disgraceful *fainéance*. The conversion to responsibility and independence has yet to become general; but the indispensable beginning has been made, and the rest will follow rapidly, when the disappearance of Mr. Gladstone from the leadership forces men to think for themselves, if only to choose the ship to which they will attach themselves as barnacles. Closely connected with this benefit is another. The fashion has been set for putting the interests of the country before the immediate advantage either of the individual or of the party. Sir Henry James's refusal of the Lord Chancellorship is a conspicuous example of the one, and the secession of Mr. Chamberlain of the other. The name of Mr. Chamberlain is specially mentioned because in his hands rested at the last moment the power of victory or defeat; because he might, by holding with Mr. Gladstone, have dominated a successful Cabinet; and because, to all appearance, he will have some time to wait for his reward. But above all, the noxious superstition that a politician may never join with those of the opposite party to secure a common end for the good of the country, has been broken through. In the possibility of this co-operation lies the difference between Party and faction, and in the present instance it is also the first step towards a definite rearrangement of parties on more natural lines. It is true that, at present, Conservatives are not prepared to be classed with Liberals, nor Liberals, even of the mildest type, with Conservatives. But facts are stronger than names: the Whigs and Tories who to-day find themselves at one on the Irish question, will—or at least some of them—find themselves in the same lobby again to-morrow, when, it may be, the Church will be assailed, or a determined attempt made to extort "ransom" from property. Co-operation produces fellowship, and common action will soon be followed by a common name. A crisis like the present puts, so to speak, the political salts in solution; when they again solidify it will be found that they have crystallized according to their respective affinities. We may then look for a period of more honest politics than that through which we have been passing of late years.

And while there are these incidental gains to politics

generally, there is also a considerable clearing of minds on the Irish problem itself. The first thing that stands out unmistakably clear is that unless we are prepared either to give the Irish Party a separation, or to put into their hands the machinery by which they may get it for themselves, we must abandon all hope of satisfying the Irish Party. Again, unless we make separate provision for Ulster, civil war will be the result of the establishment of an independent Irish Legislature. Lastly, whether we grant separation, or the means of separation, or reduce Ireland to the status of a colony, or give local self-government of a moderate kind, or content ourselves with subduing the National League and restoring the Queen's authority, we must not expect finality for many years to come. Eventual success will depend not so much upon which of these latter methods we try as upon our determination that Irish questions shall no longer be party questions; that the Irish vote shall no longer demoralize English statesmen; that our Irish policy, once deliberately adopted, shall be steadily maintained, and that our Irish fellow-subjects shall be impressed with the conviction that their persistent agitations, complaints, grievances, and whimperings are as much lost time as crying for the moon.

GILBERT VENABLES.

# Short Notices.

WE heartily recommend Mr. Bullock's charming and most timely little volume, *The Queen's Resolve*, a Jubilee Memorial.

*Our Island-Continent.* A Naturalist's Holiday in Australia. By Dr. J. E. TAYLOR, F.L.S., F.G.S. With map. S.P.C.K.

A capital little book; bright, instructive, and very cheap. The concluding words are timely: "When will our Statesmen learn that Australia is another part of England?"

*Our Father; or, the Lord's Prayer expanded in the Words of Holy Scripture.* A series of Morning and Evening Prayers, adapted from the Bible, for every day in the week, for private and for family use. Elliot Stock, 1886.

We are much pleased with this book, and gladly quote words from the recommendation given, in an Introduction, by the Rev. A. M. W. Christopher. The esteemed and honoured Rector of St. Aldate's, calling each series "admirable," says:

I feel very thankful that a brother clergyman has decided to publish these prayers, which are all in the very words of Scripture. The preparation of them was originally commenced by his late Bible-loving mother, for the use of her younger son. . . . . The general conception of the prayers is excellent. . . . . Each prayer seems to combine in due proportion the leading divisions of prayer.