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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

MAY, 1886.

ART. I.—THE CAUSES OF MODERN DOUBT.

AN acute student of the history of human thought has observed that great waves of opinion seem to pass periodically over bodies of men, gathered into nations or otherwise united by the affinities of civilization. That such a wave of sceptical opinion is passing over our own country at the present time, few competent observers will deny. One of the ablest and calmest among our Christian apologists says, "Doubts are diffused far more widely than is generally avowed. The very air is heavy with them; they pervade alike literature and society; they are not confined to the learned, they perplex parents, and confuse the young."[1]

If this malady of the intellect is to be wisely and successfully treated, we must go back with unfaltering knowledge to the causes which have produced so wide-spread an evil. Without a clear acquaintance with the origin of the mischief our attempts at a remedy are more likely than not to be mere gropings in the dark. The Christian thinker is irresistibly drawn to ask—What are the causes of modern doubt? Nor can he rest without a distinct and comprehensive answer.

The general causes of unbelief fall, of course, into two distinct classes—the intellectual and the moral.

The moral causes, that is, enmity of heart, antagonism of sympathy and feeling towards Christianity, are always at work amongst men. They exert a force that varies little from age to age. At the present time there is no reason to conclude that such causes are working with more than usual intensity and activity. Beyond question they *are* working. But this is not a licentious age, like that of Charles II., which either seeks in unbelief a shelter for its sin, or endeavours to soothe its conscience with the anodynes of doubt. The rapid increase of

[1] Wace, "Christianity and Morality," p. 3.

wealth may in some classes have fostered vice, and facilities for continental travel may have familiarized many Englishmen with unaccustomed forms of practical irreligion; but no one will contend that our difficulties find their ultimate or proximate cause in the swift growth of our national prosperity, or the greater opportunities for international communication. Immorality has not produced the present unbelief, any more than the present unbelief has, to any appreciable extent, produced immorality.

Our inquiry, therefore, into the origination of modern scepticism must be carried on amongst the intellectual causes. An examination of these is made exceedingly difficult by reason of two facts. The first is that the two principal causes already named—the intellectual and the moral—can scarcely ever be found acting separately, so as to be studied apart. Now one may be the stronger and more conspicuous, now the other; but generally they are closely combined. If the intellectual assailant be a man of immoral or unspiritual life, he will be naturally inclined to disbelief; he will eagerly lay hold of arguments that tell against Christianity; he will even at times unconsciously shape his reasonings or scientific theories into a form needlessly unfavourable to accepted Christian truth. The second fact is the difficulty, peculiar to those "who live in the stream and current of a quickly moving generation," of estimating aright the nature of those movements in which they themselves are taking part; and still more, of ascertaining the causes that produced movements as yet only partially developed. One foremost apologist considers this latter difficulty so great as to render such an inquiry as we are now undertaking a vain search. "The causes," he says, "defy any formal classification." Were this so, it might well be feared that we are still very far from the application of an effectual remedy. But the quest is not so hopeless.

At the outset, when we scrutinize closely the mental movements of this century, one notable fact stands out instantly and conspicuously. This century has witnessed an amazing and almost bewildering progress of knowledge. There has followed, in consequence, a great awakening of the human mind. In some departments our knowledge has been more than doubled. Dr. Günther, for example, tells us "that while the total number of animals described up to 1831 was not more than 70,000, the number now is at least 320,000." In astronomy, by the discovery and application of spectrum analysis, our knowledge of the nature and structure and evolutional history of the heavenly bodies has been enlarged to an almost incredible extent. These are but two instances out of many. Moreover, this unparalleled increase of scientific and other knowledge

has led to changes, to revolutions, indeed, in some of the older branches of science, and to the creation of sciences altogether new. "New material of thought," new premises to reason from, have been presented to men in a manner unequalled within the Christian era. The revival of classical learning in the age immediately preceding the Reformation of the sixteenth century, great and wide-reaching as was its influence, is scarcely to be compared for potency with the astounding discoveries of the last fifty years.

Now it has been admirably shown by Canon Farrar, of Durham, that "when any new material of thought is presented to the human mind, or when any alteration in the state of knowledge on which the human mind forms its judgment, imparts to an old established religion an aspect of opposition which was before unperceived, the religion is subjected to the ordeal of an investigation. Science examines the doctrines taught by it, criticizes the evidence on which they profess to rest, and the literature which is their expression."[1] This remark may give us the clue to a satisfactory classification of the causes which have brought about the phenomena of modern scepticism.

The causes are not one, but manifold; not simple, but complex. There is in fact what Stuart Mill calls "a plurality of causes," and this "plurality of causes" may be most conveniently classified as *literary*, *scientific*, *philosophical*, and *theological*. In dealing briefly with each of these it should be clearly understood that when any science, system or theory is said to have contributed to the origination of modern doubt, the writer does not intend necessarily to reflect upon it, or to brand it thereby as a thing of evil. The abuse of a system is no argument against its general character.

I. *Literary.*—Foremost and chief amongst this class of causes must be set the new science of historical criticism. Within the memory of living men the ideal of history has been revolutionized. The old notion and type of history are now fairly discredited. A well-known historical critic has happily compared the old masters of history to the old masters of painting. "The old writers," he says, "generally thought more of the brilliancy of their colours and the effectiveness of their pictures than of their exact truth. They thought little of close conformity to the scene or object delineated, provided they produced striking compositions with grand outline and rich tints." This witness is true. The old historians were great in grouping, but they were not great in research. By their own avowal men knew how they had put into the mouths of their

[1] "Critical History of Free Thought," p. 9.

heroes fictitious speeches, and it had long been suspected that deeds, equally fictitious, had found a way into their record of the hero's life. In justice to the old historians it must be said that the materials for accurate history were almost entirely inaccessible, and they could hardly do other than they did, if history were to be written at all.

But the new light, so long waited for, has come at last. History within this century has assumed an entirely new form. Critical investigation of facts, critical inquiry into the causes of change, critical study of the origin and development of nations and languages, have taken the place of the old portrait-drawing. "Research" is the historian's watchword to-day. Above all things he desires to make sure of his facts. No one can be surprised that a careful critical examination of statements coming down unchallenged from antiquity has resolved many a so-called fact into a myth, many a marvellous incident into a mere legend; or that it has stripped genuine facts of great accretions which had in the course of centuries gathered around a comparatively small nucleus of truth. Much, therefore, that had been universally accepted has vanished altogether and for ever from the realm of history. From Niebuhr onwards a great process of analysis and reduction has gone on. Not only so, but old facts have been set in new lights, and shown to possess an unsuspected significance. In a word, history, especially ancient history, "has become a reality, instead of the nebulous unreality it had been before."

Now it was inevitable that sooner or later the method of critical investigation should be applied to the historical books of Scripture, and that the statements contained in these books should be subjected to the most searching scrutiny. The very fruitfulness of the method in its application to secular history, ensured a similar treatment of sacred history. No Christian thinker can possibly object to this. He cannot deny to the historical critic the most careful and thorough-going examination of the historical facts of the Bible; on the contrary, he will ever heartily welcome attention to those facts which are the basis of his religion, and most welcome that attention when it is most intelligent and concentrated. The Truth never fears a cross-examination, because she never loses by it. That scrutiny has already taken place; historical criticism has been freely applied to Scripture. The issue with many investigators, and these amongst the most learned, able, and painstaking, is a firmer faith than ever in the thorough truth and reliability of the facts recorded in the Bible. The authenticity and genuineness of St. John's Gospel, for instance, are established on a stronger basis of argument and proof than they previously rested upon. We have already gained much, and shall probably gain more from

this unflinching and unsparing investigation, this patient sifting through and through of the facts of Biblical history. But in other minds the issue is doubt, nay, positive disbelief. Goldziher and Strauss, for example, have done their utmost to resolve, the one Jewish history, the other Christian history, into a series of myths. Ewald, Pfleiderer, Graf, and Wellhausen, with many more, whilst not going nearly so far as the two former critics, have nevertheless discovered, as they believe, great "developments," "compositions," and "additions," in the history of Israel, and the lives of Jesus and His Apostles. The questions raised by them are far too wide to be discussed here, but the writer may be allowed, in passing, to deplore the startling want of reverence manifested by the majority of hostile inquirers. Their irreverence suggests, and many portions of their writings confirm the suspicion that they came to the task with a rooted disbelief in the miraculous. For them the supernatural was the impossible: therefore when any narrative of a supernatural occurrence was met with in Biblical history, the incident was *ipso facto* proved to be a mere legend; the history was so far mythical, or the fruit of a "pious" imagination, and the sole business of the critic was to demonstrate its inexactness. Such a method is indeed "short and easy," but it is by no means satisfactory and convincing. Moreover, it must be urged against these critics that every man's intellectual preferences or prejudices seem to be his main canons of historical evidence. Their mode of procedure is arbitrary to the last degree. Hence the results obtained are, as a rule, in no two cases the same. Too often, indeed, the critic appears to have abdicated the functions of a calm investigator and impartial judge, to play the part of ardent advocate of some pet theory.

Be this, however, as it may, no one can doubt that in the application of the methods of historical criticism to the historical books of Scripture, we have one very potent cause of the present unbelief. As little can anyone doubt that were the worst and most destructive conclusions of historical critics established, the result would be fatal. Christianity is built on a foundation of facts; its historical truth is of vital importance to its authority and progress in the world. If Jesus Christ be only a creation of the sanctified imagination, and not a veritable historic personage, He is not Divine; our faith is vain.

II. *Scientific.*—The causes of unbelief which fall under this head have been originated almost entirely by the amazing advance of science during the last half century. The widespread influence of that advance has been felt by all intelligent persons, and even by many who are not intelligent. Its action on the public mind has been both general and specific.

The general effect has been produced, not by the bringing to light of this or that scientific truth, not by the widening or even revolutionizing of this or that science, but by the fact that so many scientific theories, long established and hitherto universally accepted, have been completely overturned; so that, as the late Professor Jevons has observed, "in innumerable instances the confident belief of one generation has been falsified by the wider observation of a succeeding one." The rejection of the corpuscular theory of light for the undulatory theory; the general adoption by biologists of the theory of evolution in place of the theory of repeated distinct creations[1]; the abandonment in geology of the theory of change through violent periodical convulsions, and the ascription of the geological structure of the earth to the action of ordinary forces working through immense periods of time—these are a few instances illustrating that general overthrow of previous theories which has taken place during the present century. Now, it is simply impossible that so large a number of long-established theories should be demolished without a feeling of general uncertainty and suspicion taking possession of the human mind. Men ask instinctively, May not theories as yet unassailed prove to be equally unfounded?—Are all that we take to be facts really and truly so? A spirit of scepticism is engendered, which infects not only the scientific, but all departments of knowledge, theology not least. The spirit of the age is, in one word, a spirit of doubt.

It is not difficult to perceive how dangerous such an attitude of suspicion and distrust may be to some people, when they come to the truths of revelation under its malign influence. For, not to revert to the moral ally which unbelief has in the human heart, it must be remembered, on the one hand, that a fair and open mind is most likely to find the truth; and, on the other, that some of the greatest truths of Scripture, such as the doctrine of the ever-adorable Trinity and the Incarnation of our blessed Lord, do not admit of proof by any methods of human reason or science. Where Christian truths do admit of verification, it is not usually such verification as this age loves to have. In such circumstances, and with such a spirit, to slide into unbelief is not a hard matter. From such an attitude of general suspicion and uncertainty, from the feeling of deep distrust in regard to everything that refuses to come within the limits of mathematical, or logical, or scientific demonstration, there is too often a swift and brief transition to the conclusion that, concerning the existence and will of a

[1] The writer cites the evolution theory simply as an illustration, without at all expressing his belief in it. The evidence for it, as yet, is far from being complete.

Divine Being, nothing whatever can be known. Agnosticism thus becomes the creed of the distrustful seeker after truth—may we not add, the blighting curse of his intellectual and spiritual life?

But the advance of science does not operate solely in this general way. Almost every step in that advance has produced its own distinct effect. Take the new facts that have been brought to light, the new theories that have become current, such as the antiquity of man, the building-up of the earth's crust through almost countless ages, the doctrine of evolution as applied to the human race. Whether these admit of being harmonized with the actual statements of Scripture cannot now be discussed, though we think Christians have no need to be alarmed on that score. It is certain, however, that they are incapable of being harmonized with some interpretations of those statements which have been commonly received. Such interpretations may have to be abandoned—in some instances are already abandoned. Now, this process of abandonment is for a certain class of minds, especially the imperfectly cultured, one of considerable peril. They seem quite unable to distinguish between the surrender of particular interpretations of Scripture statements which have nothing but human authority to rest upon, and the surrender of those statements themselves. It is as if fact and theory had in their minds so become one, that the abandonment of the theory involves of necessity the renunciation of the fact. Instead of setting out to examine fact and statement anew, in order more certainly to grasp the meaning and exact nature of both, they relax all effort, indolently let faith slip, and surrender themselves to vague unbelief—a mistake surely unreasonable enough, but undoubtedly far from uncommon.

Moreover, the first effect produced by some of those new doctrines is an effect neither legitimate nor likely to be abiding. The main part of Darwin's teaching is by no means incapable of reconciliation with the Christian faith, even should his theory be established in its integrity. Yet, as the Archbishop of York recently remarked in his address to Convocation, a "powerful drift towards materialism has set in since the publication of Darwin's principal work," the result of which is most peculiar. This, the Archbishop says, "accounts for much of the change in public opinion which we have noticed":

> There is much religious apathy; much aversion from dogmatic statements and discussions. The new views of natural history, summed up under the word "evolution," are not to my mind inconsistent with true belief in God, and in the Lord's Resurrection and loving work for us. But as they are taught they have led many away from all interest in such doctrines. My brethren who have parochial cures could witness to that

out of their experience. It has led men, not to somewhat lower views of Christian doctrine, to a creed shaded down through semi-Arianism and Arianism to Deism, like the tints of the solar spectrum ; it has left nothing at all, it has left in the creation no loving purpose, no marks of design, and no God. It has left man no sense of sin inborn, no need of atonement, no fear of judgment, no hereafter. Some have flung back with defiant rejection the creed of their youth ; but far more are content to see with philosophic calm the worship continue, and the prayer, and the popular hope and fear of things to come, from which the meaning has for them departed ; they are not unfriendly ; the charitable works of the Church they truly approve, for unselfishness is philosophic as well as religious ; and the number is increasing, and many of them are not educated in religious truth, so that they could resist the overthrow of faith. It is this class which is our danger. They support the Church, not as pillars within, but as ill-adjusted buttresses without.

Of one thing—and, we might almost say, of one thing only —in connection with the rapid advance of science, Christians may justly complain. This is the too hasty generalization of many scientific men, from which, during the last fifty years, both faith and science have suffered no little trouble and damage. In an age of great and startling discovery, when new truths seem, as it were, to pour on scientists unbidden, the temptation to many minds is almost irresistible to let hypothesis outrun investigation, and to imagine that assumptions imperfectly tested may be received as established laws. This has been an unquestionable source of unbelief. In too many cases these half-verified theories, when unfavourable to revealed truth, have been vehemently urged against us as if they were undoubted "conquests of science." After a brief existence they cease to be, for the keen-sighted, patient, and logical student comes and explodes them. But the evil they did lives after them; the unbelief started into being does not pass away with the unfounded theory. It survives, relentlessly working out its mischief within the soul it possesses—it may even be, multiplying itself and entering into other souls—to accomplish finally a ruin that no human eye can at present trace. In the interests of faith and science alike, Christian thinkers cannot insist too strongly upon the thorough-going and entirely candid verification of hypotheses. Let the "problems of science" be turned into the "conquests of science" before they are seriously set in opposition to the Christian faith.

III. *Philosophical.*—These causes of modern doubt do not admit, from the nature of the subject, of more than mere enumeration. It is a lamentable fact that most of the prevalent systems of philosophy are either distinctly out of harmony, or most imperfectly in accord with Christianity. To ascertain the relation of any philosophical system to Revealed Truth, we need only examine its teaching as to the existence of God

and the immateriality and immortality of the soul. When this test is applied to the prevalent systems the result is eminently unsatisfactory. The Sensualistic philosophy resolves the spirit and higher faculties of man into so many fine and more subtle modifications of his material frame. The Pantheistic philosophy of Spinoza, Schelling, and Hegel diffuses God through the whole universe as its animating soul and organizing principle. The Agnostic philosophy of Herbert Spencer admits the possible existence of God, but denies us any real knowledge of Him. The Positivist philosophy leaves no place whatever for a Divine Being; it denies the possibility of a revelation and the true immortality of man; it exalts the laws of Nature as "the only Providence, obedience to them as the only piety." Thus, on philosophical grounds, objections are raised to the very possibility of a true theology. These systems have widely and deeply influenced the thought of educated persons, and in the future defence of Christianity more attention will have to be paid to the attack from this quarter than it has hitherto received.

IV. *Theological.*—Perfectly distinct from the causes already dealt with is this last class in our list, which is perhaps, in its influence, the most potent of them all. The Christian faith has fared like many a noble vessel on a long voyage. As it has come down to us through the generations, accretions have gathered upon it which seriously impede its progress. The gloss of erroneous interpretation, to which every age makes its contribution, has accumulated round the Scriptures. Theologians, like men of science, are sometimes guilty of crude deductions and fanciful theories. Christian apologists, occasionally more zealous than wise, have at times erected defences around the faith, which are by no means impregnable. Enthusiastic sectaries push their favourite notions to excess, or exaggerate the favourite doctrine until it grows out of all proportion to the rest of the faith; they present the truth so one-sidedly that the proverbial falsity of the half-truth is attained. Thus, that which is no part of Christian faith is represented as belonging to the heart and centre of the truth, sometimes as being its very essence. Then, when the day of exposure and rectification comes, and these mistaken views and false defences are swept away, many simple Christians, and even some who are not simple, feel as if Christianity itself had gone with the banished notions. The truth suffers in their estimation through the destruction of that error which had improperly fastened upon it; although, in fact, nothing whatever has been done, except to clear the truth from that which was never an organic part of it, which was, indeed, only a hindrance and a burden.

To fix such a charge as this upon any system is a delicate undertaking, but the interests of truth are supreme. With all respect for those who have advocated such systems, the writer would venture to express his own strong conviction that much of the present difficulty is due to the hardest doctrines of an extreme Calvinism propagated in a past age, and to the peculiar and distinctive doctrines of the Church of Rome. On the one hand, the doctrine of the Divine Sovereignty has been so stated as to obscure God's universal love, and to set Him forth in hard and dark colours as a veritable terror to the human soul. On the other, salvation has been reduced well-nigh to a series of mechanical acts, unauthorized and unreasonable demands have been made on faith, and human freedom has been challenged by a spiritual tyranny. By these misrepresentations multitudes have been repelled from Christian allegiance and driven into the opposite camp. The scepticism which prevails to such a distressing extent in France, Italy, and Switzerland, is only too plain a proof that this change is by no means without foundation.

At the same time the position of Christian apologists has been, and is, one of extreme difficulty. As the attack has developed itself, they have had, not exactly to change front in face of the enemy, but to quit some positions and take up new ones. Such a process is most trying to all whom it concerns, and for those who cannot take a bird's-eye view of the situation it is extremely embarrassing to faith and courage. Nevertheless it is being successfully done, and in the fact that Christian leaders have had the wisdom and the daring to attempt it, consists one of the most hopeful signs for the future.

And in most sober truth we have nothing to fear. Every one of the causes we have enumerated is temporary in its hostile operation. Historical criticism is an instrument that we would not willingly be without. More and more it will win its way to settled canons of evidence. It will learn what it can do, and what it cannot do. Its youthful excesses will become things of the past, the maturity of age will bring gravity and reverence and wisdom, and from such criticism the Scriptures have nothing to fear. Science, too, which in its truth is simply the correct interpretation of the Divine Book of Nature, will not be found permanently out of harmony with the teaching of Revelation. The works of God rightly seen can never contradict the Word of God rightly read. And so it is with the other two—that philosophy which Christianity has vanquished again and again, and that science of the interpretation of Scripture which, amidst much searching, ever wins its way into the clearer light.

Above all things, we need at present the patient and trustful spirit which is content to wait for wider and more exact knowledge. Through all the Christian centuries antagonism has been the law of progress. Freedom of inquiry *must* exist, and it may exist without necessarily developing into unbelief. In such inquiry what is untrue goes at last to the wall; the things that cannot be shaken remain as a possession for ever. There is temporary peril, but there is permanent gain. "The elements of truth on both sides are at last brought to light, and become the enduring property of the world."

For the present the storm rages, and in it we cannot rest and be at peace. Nevertheless this storm, like so many former ones, will exhaust itself and pass away. And when it has discharged its burden, the Church of God will find again a happy calm of faith, and in that calm the disciples will discover that they breathe a clearer atmosphere, for the storm which threatened and raged so fiercely has swept away nothing that was capable of lasting blessing to men.

JACOB STEPHENSON.

ART. II. — THE NON-ESTABLISHED CHURCH IN AMERICA.

"TWO wonders in the world: a Stamp Act in Boston, and a Bishop in Connecticut!" exclaimed the *Boston Gazette* just a century ago; and now, there are not fewer than seventy of these episcopal "wonders" scattered throughout the United States of America, from Connecticut in the east to California in the far west. The "wicked heresy" of the year 1785 was in the year 1885 a very flourishing community, organized into 49 dioceses with 3,600 clergy, and representing the highest culture and the truest piety in American Christianity. It is true that the communicants of the Protestant Episcopal Church only number some 400,000, as compared with 2,250,000 Baptists and 1,700,000 Episcopalian Methodists; but I have found all sections of Nonconformity (and their name is legion) readily admit that the Episcopal Church is gaining rapidly in the affections of the people.

After the declaration of American Independence (1776), Episcopacy and Royalty were so associated together in the popular mind, that it has taken almost a century to eradicate the notion that the two ideas are inseparable. And even now, in village communities, there are marked indica-

tions that the prejudice against Episcopacy has not altogether died out. In a neighbouring parish to the one in which I now reside, there is a venerable Puritan who never ceases to pray at the Congregational Prayer Meeting that the Lord will preserve them from the "Church of Forms"! by which he means the very modest and poverty-stricken Episcopal church which has been recently erected in his parish; and in another village which I recently visited, I find it is usual for the Nonconformists to rema in seatedduring the reading of the Church Liturgy, so as to emphasize the fact that they belong to a different communion. Nor is this ignorant and intolerant prejudice confined to small places; for in a large city a certain zealous and talented Bishop is a subject of ridicule even amongst his own Church-people when he walks abroad in Episcopal gaiters! What will happen when the good Bishop dons his shovel-hat, it is impossible to say.

From a cursory acquaintance with the condition of things, I am inclined to think that, in the earlier history of the American Church, there was too great a desire amongst Churchmen to win over the Puritans by yielding to Puritan prejudices; a desire to make it appear that the differences which existed between the Episcopalians and their Dissenting brethren were not very essential after all. There has been a vast change in this respect within the last few years. Still it is not unusual to find the vestry of a country church consisting of perhaps half a dozen Churchmen and *a couple of influential Congregationalists.* The evil of this arrangement is only apparent when it is remembered that this cosmopolitan vestry has absolute power in the election of its rector, and practically possesses the means of starving the poor man out when they are tired of his ministrations. In this respect the position of the Episcopal rector differs but little from that of his Nonconforming brother. Both are equally dependent, and both are equally at the mercy and caprice of their vestry and congregation.

In large cities the rectors of important churches are well paid; some getting as much as twelve or thirteen hundred pounds a year, but the stipend of the country clergyman is miserably small, seldom more than a hundred and fifty a year, with the certainty of it being stopped in the event of the rector becoming unpopular with his people. The controlling power of the Bishop does, perhaps, exercise some restraint on the unruly caprices of vestrymen, but it is very slight, and there are very many sad instances of destitution, I have heard, amongst the country clergy.

The Church in America had from the very first rare opportunities of endowing its churches, even in country

places, by the acquisition of land; but in this the Puritan prejudice against endowments was allowed to influence the action of the founders of the Church. What might have been accomplished may still be seen in the practical use of the magnificent endowment of Trinity Church in New York, which supports the parish church and six chapels and a multitude of charities connected with them. The church in Chicago, I am told, once possessed an endowment which at the present time would have equalled that of Trinity, New York; but it was spent by the vestry in current expenses. The Bishops are, however, now becoming fully alive to the great necessity of fostering endowments. The first thought of the Missionary Bishops in the West is to procure endowments. They invest largely in land; and as settlements increase, and as railroads develop, these investments increase at a fabulous rate. There is, I know, an impression in the endowed Church of England that a voluntary system is likely to obtain a healthy state of things in the Church; and, consequently, in its Missionary efforts, with the exception of its Colonial Bishoprics, no great exertions are made to build up the Church abroad with endowments, such as our pious forefathers bestowed on the Church at home; but let Englishmen who think that a non-endowed or a dis-endowed Church will be free from unseemly scandal, visit America.

Bishop Bedell of Ohio, in a recently published sermon, shows the strength of the Church at home, inasmuch as she is in a position to be the *Church of the people;* while he says, "in the Churches of America the Christian religion is very largely the religion of the favoured classes." Observe, the Bishop does not say "the Church," but "*the Christian religion*." The Gospel, which in the early days of Christianity was the special privilege of the poor, is now, in this land of wealth and commercial enterprise, a sort of monopoly of the "*favoured classes*." The reason for this is not far to seek. It is precisely the very reason which compelled Mr. Newman Hall in London to remove from the poor and despised regions of Surrey Chapel to the more favoured environment of Christ Church, Westminster. The evil of such a state of things is not apparent in England, where there is an endowed Church to gather up the fragments left by Mr. Newman Hall's highly favoured chapel; but in a country like the United States, where there is no endowed Church, the fact that both clergy and vestries have to look out for themselves results itself into this. The "*prominent*" clergyman (to use an American expression) is obliged to study his own worldly interests by suiting his ministrations to the demands of his people, so that his Church may be "*run*" with success; and if the poor, or even the

lower middle classes, are to be reached, it is done by establishing Mission chapels, which chapels are the means of raising up a system as hateful to the benevolent mind as the caste system of India or the slavery of old Virginia. The "favoured classes" (for of course there is no aristocracy in America) worship in a church with well-cushioned pews, a chorus and quartette choir, and richly painted windows, and an "elegant" rector, but the poor dressmaker is stopped at the portals of this luxurious church, and told to turn round the corner to the *Mission Chapel*. So dependent are the clergy upon the "favoured classes" for their support that they are often little else than the managers of religious joint-stock companies. In Mr. Beecher's church there was, in December last, a public sale of pews for the year, which resembled the auction of shares in some secular society; and although, thank God, the restraining influence of Episcopacy to some extent prevents such open scandals in the Episcopal fold, there is much in the vestry system, even in the Church of America, which is very humiliating to the clergy. Vestrymen are usually selected on account of their moneyed interest in the concern, and are often very unfit men to select a spiritual pastor for the cure of souls. Bad as the system of Church-patronage in England is, it is no worse than that in the non-established Church of America. Bishop Doane of Albany, one of the most able and zealous of the American Bishops, touches the subject in one of his recent Charges. Dr. Doane says, "Election by the vestry from a list recommended by the Bishop under Canonical provision: this is the remedy which the Church, I think, one of these days will apply to this evil when it has reached its consummation; for bad as things are, they will be worse, I fancy, before they are better." The American Church has certainly had large practical experience in the workings of popular systems of Church-patronage, and this would be invaluable to the Mother-Church in England if she will but establish a commission for a careful consideration of them.

But the evils of a purely voluntary system are most evident in country parishes, where the meagre stipend of the clergyman is raised by small subscriptions collected from individuals (seldom all Church people), and a grant from the Missionary funds of the diocese; whilst the expenses of the Church are kept up by every possible device — "Church sociables," "pound parties," concerts, theatricals, fairs, "bean-bag parties," etc. It is in this way that the Church of the Lord is prostituted throughout the country, and even the very best of the country clergy are almost powerless to stop it. The whole thing originated amongst the Baptists and Methodists;

but in poor parishes the Church is often obliged to yield to stern necessity, for the people "love to have it so." The subject has recently attracted notice in religious circles, and I take this cutting from the *Christian Advocate:*

It is with sorrow and disgust that we read such an item as the following in a secular newspaper:

"The Methodists of ——— had a full house and a grand time on Christmas Eve at the church. Many presents were distributed from the tree. Every widow received a package of candy. A few married and young ladies were disguised and sold to the highest bidder. The gentlemen were not very spirited bidders, as the highest price realized was only forty-five cents (about two shillings). The purchaser, with his prize, was provided with a ticket for the amount, for which they received lunch together in the basement."

It is beyond our comprehension how any Christian can think such performances appropriate to a church. Singling out of widows to receive packages of candy is in execrable taste; but the selling of married and young ladies in disguise to the highest bidder, with whom, though he may be a person of unworthy character, who never comes to a church except for some spree of this sort, the "sold" lady is to go to lunch, is down to the level of the lowest skating-rink. Of what use is a church that will do such things in any community? May God help the minister who tries to stop such things and cannot, and awaken anyone who does not try to prevent them. We omit the name of the place for the sake of the few decent and pious people that may be there.

Reprehensible as such a state of things is, it is perhaps the natural outcome of a non-endowed and *dependent* ministry. It is all very well for a city minister receiving an income of £2,000 a year to despise the "Church sociable" or the "bean-bag party;" but a minister in the country, with a sick wife and three hungry boys, whose stipend is £120, will shut his eyes to many things, for he, poor soul! by the necessities of his position, is interested in the *nett proceeds!*

Even one of the most popular and pious Evangelical clergy in a great city saw no impropriety in engaging one of the theatres for theatrical performances, in aid of one of his parochial charities, although it was immediately following Mr. Aitken's mission. It is not the least use saying such things should not be; nor is it fair to say that such things are "American." They are but the natural result of a Church being dependent on popular favour for support. In England an Established and Endowed Church is a restraining influence; but when those restraints are removed, England may become even worse than America. In England, three or four years ago, even dignitaries, I think, ran wild with enthusiasm at the success of the Salvation Army, whilst the good common-sense of American Christianity stamped it from the very first as but a miserable parody of the religion of Jesus.

It is in this respect that the Church in America has, in my opinion, a vast field before it. The people are disposed to

yield themselves to the requirements of our Church system; for the Episcopal Church in its well-ordered worship and ministry is exactly what the democratic spirit of America *needs* to keep it rightly balanced; and if she is but true to her best traditions, and animated with "the spirit of power and of love and of a sound mind," the American Church will in the course of the next century become the largest community of English-speaking Christians in the whole world. To accomplish this, however, she must not pose as the Church of the "favoured classes," but as the Church of the poor.[1]

"Bishop," said a rich Baptist to a Western Bishop not long ago—"Bishop, I should like to join your Church very much, but there are some things in your Prayer Book which I can't swallow." "Then, my friend," replied the Bishop, "you must change your swallow." "You must not expect the Church as a divine institution to *fit itself into you*," said another Bishop to a small congregation who wanted a veritable Angel Gabriel for sixty pounds a year; "you must fit yourselves into the Church." It is in this way that the Episcopal Church in America is becoming the honoured instrument in God's providence of giving the common people (and there are common people even in America!) a more correct idea of the commission and authority of the Church; and there is a strong feeling among all parties in the Church that there must be a combined effort to educate the lay mind in true Church principles, to impress upon the people that a Church cannot be "run," like a store; but that she has a more divine mission amongst the children of men than the mere pandering to popularity.

I have dwelt at some length upon this unpleasant side of the picture, because it is in this that there is a marked contrast between the non-established and non-endowed Church in the United States and the Mother-Church in Great Britain. The Church of England is the Church of the people; the Church of America is at present the Church of the "favoured classes."

The American Church has amongst its clergy, and especially amongst its Bishops, some of the most cultured minds in

[1] The *Andover Review*, a Congregationalist paper, says: "Episcopacy is gaining upon Presbyterianism in New York City, not because of the social drift, but because it is *better organized*, uses more men, occupies more points, and avails itself of more methods. The mission now [lately] in operation throughout the city, under the auspices of the Episcopal Church, shows the reach and the versatility of its power. Where a Congregational church of large membership, and of commanding position, employs one man, the Episcopal church, by its side, *is employing two or three;* and not altogether, as is sometimes supposed, for the performance of its services, *but for the parish work.*"

Christendom. The names of Coxe of Western New York, Doane of Albany, Littlejohn of Long Island, and Huntingdon of Central New York, are well-known in England. Bishop Huntingdon was for thirteen years a most popular Unitarian minister in the City and University of Boston. Amongst the clergy Dr. Philips Brooks of Boston, and Mr. Heber Newton of New York, seem to be men who are leading the popular mind; but I think it must be admitted, even by Churchmen, that there is at the present time an absence of marked individuality in the clergy of their Church. What I mean is this: There are but few preachers amongst the clergy of the Episcopal Church whose public utterances attract the attention of the people in the marked way those of Cuyler, or Talmage, or Storrs, or Henry Ward Beecher do. Until Mr. Aitken's mission (the great good of which only eternity itself can tell), the Episcopal Church seemed to be suffering from the paralyzing condition of "cultured" respectability — that highly respectable Christianity which is so faithfully represented in the colourless pages of the *New York Churchman*, and in the proprietary pews of Grace Church. Old Dr. Tyng, the well-known Low Church rector of St. George's, New York, was, I am told, a great power in his day; but I think I am correct in saying that, compared with the Dissenters, the clergy of the Church in America lack strong individuality. This would be a misfortune even in England, but it is a still greater misfortune in a country where public opinion has to be educated, either by the press or the pulpit.

The same may be said of the Church papers, of which there are about a dozen; they all seem to be afraid of losing subscribers. The *Living Church* of Chicago, which represents the High Church party, and the Evangelical *Southern Churchman* of Virginia seem to be most spirited productions; but they are, in literary merit, far below the three leading journals of the Nonconformists, the *Independent*, the *Congregationalist*, and the *Christian Union*. The *Independent* is the leading religious journal in the country, and a very powerful organ indeed. There is, I am aware, an absence of literary leisure amongst the clergy, the necessary outcome of an unendowed Church. In fact there are not sufficient clergy for the immediate requirements of the Church, for at the present time there are as many as 600 parishes and missions without pastors. The whole population of the United States is not far from 60 millions, and yet the supply of Church clergy for the whole country does not increase. There were 137 ordinations last year, but in the year 1874 there were 147 clergymen ordained. The work of the Church increases at enormous strides, but the supply of the clergy does not; and this notwith-

standing that the theological education of the clergy can generally be obtained free of cost. Young men will not enter the ministry as long as the clergy exist on a mere pittance, and at the same time are a little better than the paid servants of an illiterate vestry, obtaining less income than the village barber.

A great change has recently taken place in the services and ritual of the Church in America. I am not aware of any diocese in which the black gown is worn in the pulpit; and the cross on the Lord's table is not the sign of a party. In a few churches in large cities there are attempts at a spurious ritual; as for example at St. Ignatius's, New York, where I saw Father Ritchie change his vestments to the dulcet tone of a piano solo, but as a rule there are but few ritualistic excesses. The Americans (Presbyterian Americans included), when they visit Old England, simply revel in our cathedrals, and accept the ordinary cathedral worship as a standard. The average American choir is much in advance of the average English choir. Surpliced choirs are rapidly on the increase, and are no longer regarded as the sign of a party. In some churches there are still found quartette choirs, but they are rapidly disappearing. In most of the churches it is the custom to "present" the alms at the Communion office whilst the congregation rise—for they usually sit at the offertory—and sing the Doxology, the churchwardens standing reverently behind the officiating clergyman.

Prayer-Book revision is the *vexata quæstio* in the Church at the present time, and I should say, from all I read, there is very little chance of agreement on the subject. The Prayer Book now in use was compiled and ratified in the year 1789, and has lasted very nearly a century. It contains the Scotch Communion office, and a number of minor alterations. The Athanasian Creed is omitted, and the Nicene Creed stands part of the morning service. The Marriage service is reduced by one half, and the Burial office is "mutilated." The proposed revision now appears in a publication called the "Book Annexed," and exhibits a marked tendency on the part of the Revision Committee to return to the English Book of Common Prayer. The Nicene Creed is restored to its place in the Communion office, and the *Magnificat* and the *Nunc Dimittis* again appear in the evening service. The most striking addition to the book is an office for the burial of infants, in which the sentence of committal at the grave stands as in the English Prayer Book. This service deserves the attention of those who are interested in Prayer Book Revision in the old country, for it reflects the highest credit upon those who compiled it. The anthem after the third collect is restored

in the new Book, it having been most inconveniently omitted in the old. The Baptismal office stands unchanged; it might have been conveniently shortened, for in this country, with its millions of Baptists, it is most necessary to baptize both infants and adults in the midst of the congregation and at public worship. The clergy appear to be almost hopelessly divided in the matter of Prayer Book Revision. Some want the first Prayer-Book of Edward VI.; some would like to have the English Prayer-Book with a few slight alterations; whilst some are for a more complete revision. The whole controversy would suggest to the English Church that if she wants peace and unity, she had better defer the question of Prayer-Book Revision for some years to come.

I have spoken of the abridgment of the Marriage service. The long exhortation at the close has been omitted, and the service stops at the benediction after the joining of hands. The sole object of the change appears to be a desire to yield to the requirements of the laity "to get the business over as quickly as possible." Unfortunately the Church in America has no law as regards marriage; the lax laws of the different States rule the whole matter. In the State of New York marriages can be celebrated without banns or licence, and in any place and at any hour. They are very often celebrated either in the rector's study or in the parlour of the village inn, unless it is a "fashionable wedding," when the drawing-room is made into a church, or the church into a drawing-room, to meet the requirements of "the favoured classes." To an English clergyman the whole arrangement appears simply scandalous. It throws the whole responsibility of a marriage, not on the Church law, but on the individual clergyman. For example: In a certain parish a young girl was missing. The next day it was discovered that at eight o'clock at night the clergyman of a neighbouring town married her to a young man of his parish, celebrating the marriage in his study with his own wife and daughter as the only witnesses. When remonstrated with, the clergyman replied, "If I had not done it, they would have gone to the Baptist minister, and I should have lost my five dollars." Weddings in churches are, however, on the increase, and a change in public feeling is manifest.

In country parishes funerals are great occasions. The old Puritan, wherever and whatever he might have been, expects to have a grand funeral, and his sorrowing relatives do their best to carry out his wishes. The service usually takes place at the house, and not at the grave, and is very largely attended. The officiating clergyman is expected to dwell upon the virtues of the deceased in a consolatory address, and, if he will but

yield, a "union service," in which the ministers of different denominations unite, is regarded as the proper thing for a respectable citizen. The American Church Burial service "is not to be used for any unbaptized adults," but I am given to understand that this rule is often departed from. In England the rule of not giving Christian burial to the unbaptized often occasions a scandal in a parish; but the necessity of it in America is very evident. "I am not a member of any Church," is the persistent reply one gets in parish after parish as one travels through the country; and I often feel inclined to ask, "Then where do you expect to go to when you die?" The non-religious system of education which obtains even in private schools, and the non-Christian system of Baptist discipline, are, in my opinion, largely answerable for the spread of rationalism in the Eastern States. In small towns and villages where there are usually a large assortment of places of worship, the young people simply "ring changes" on the different churches and chapels, and imbibe no distinct religious principles. For example: in the town of L——, most of the young girls go to the Baptist Sunday-school in the morning, the Episcopal Sunday-school in the afternoon, and attend the children's service in the Congregational Church in the evening. "A most delightful combination," I can imagine one of my readers saying; but let him follow the religious life of these young people, and he will alter his views regarding such an eclectic form of Christianity.

Look at the condition of Puritan Boston, the very Boston which in the year 1785 would not have a Christian Bishop at any price! Puritan Boston, with its 400,000 inhabitants, a city as much renowned for its education and culture as any city in the world, is infidel and atheistic to the very core. An inscription on the "Old South Church Meeting-House" records with offended dignity how it was desecrated by the British troops more than a century ago; but the Churchman can still see the "King's Chapel," built by pious Churchmen, now *desecrated* by a worship which denies the divinity of the incarnate Son of God. Puritanism always drew a sharp line at the "wicked heresy of Episcopacy," but it allowed the people to run rampant after strange gods, from the deification of Ann Lee, the Shaker prophetess, in the near east, to the canonization of Joe Smith, the Mormon prophet, in the far west. Intelligent and religious minds in America are conscious of this, and hence there is a growing conviction that the Church system, with its Apostolic ministry, its Scriptural liturgy, and its well-defined ecclesiastical system, is just what a young but mighty empire like this, with its Niagara-like torrent of discordant elements, *needs* for the education and fostering of its

religious life. Last year some thirty ministers of other denominations, feeling this, joined the Episcopal Church. The most notable of these is the Rev. T. E. Green, the highly respected and successful pastor of a Presbyterian church in the great city of Chicago, who on the 7th of January last notified to his congregation his intention of entering the ministry of the Episcopal Church. Mr. Green's decision has caused quite a sensation amongst the Presbyterians, for it is feared others will follow his example. His reasons for joining the Church are exceedingly interesting, as indicating a line of thought which is known to prevail amongst certain ministers of Nonconformist communities. I will, therefore, quote a portion of them from his published sermon:

Of course you say, if Mr. Green is going away from the Presbyterian Church, why doesn't he go here, why doesn't he go there, why doesn't he go yonder? I think it is due to you to tell you why I go just where I am going. There is, in the first place, *an historical reason.* Time and again I have talked to you of that which is uppermost in my heart—the thought of bringing together again all the scattered fragments of the Church that Jesus Christ established in the Church. . . . My thought and my tendency have always been away from what we know as denominationalism.

My second reason is *a sacramental one.* Conviction of duty and conviction of truth have always led me to that which I may call the sacramental idea of the Church. I have never been able to rid myself of the conviction that Jesus Christ our Saviour, in the two supreme hours of His life, should have established a sacramental feast, and commissioned His disciples to administer Holy Baptism, unless they were a very vital and real part of Christian life and of Christian character.

My third reason is *a ritualistic one.* I believe in a service in which all the people shall join in both prayer and praise.

My final reason is *the practical one,* and perhaps the lowest of all. And that is, that I find myself unable to abide by and conform to those rules of Christian casuistry that are recognised as part of the practice and the faith of the Church of which I have been a minister.

I was asked to record in THE CHURCHMAN my "impressions" of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America; but having been in the country nearly a year, many of my first "impressions" have been somewhat obliterated.

Upon my arrival in New York I remember the first thing that struck me was the curious way in which every church advertises its undertaker. On Sunday morning, as I started out to attend church, I could see no notice-boards to acquaint me of the character of the churches, and I found it was impossible to know whether I was entering a Baptist, or a Methodist, or an Universalist, or an orthodox Episcopal place of worship; but on every church and chapel I found blazoned in letters of gold the name and address of the undertaker! Now this is really too bad, for when one goes forth on a Sunday morn one does not go in search of a coffin, but in search of spiritual food! But the Americans are a practical people.

The absence of the merry chimes of the church bells also reminds the stranger that he is no longer in Old England. Not that there are no peals of bells in America; but it is contrary to law to ring them as we do in England. I complained to a respectable citizen. "You see we are a nervous and an excitable people," was the reply. "And yet the citizens of New York can stand the ceaseless clatter of the elevated railways without a murmur!" "That is quite true," replied my commercial friend, "but you see there is *money* in it." Then as I travel from city to city, I miss the pretty country village church by the wayside, and lament the absence of cathedrals in large towns. There are no Protestant cathedrals to be found in any of the large cities of the Eastern States. There is no cathedral in New York, or Boston, or Philadelphia, or Baltimore; and even in Albany, where the Bishop is hoping to erect a structure worthy of the capital of the New York State (which State, by the way, is larger in area than the whole of England), he has the greatest possible difficulty in raising funds. The cultured Episcopalian of America delights to exhibit photographs of those "fine old cathedrals" in England, and will talk by the hour of their fretted vaults, and grand and inspiring services. But they make no effort to produce the cathedral system in their own country. Vanderbilt with his twenty millions of pounds, who was a Churchman, could have easily built a cathedral for New York, and so could Miss Catherine Wolff. Some of the finest buildings in America are the Roman Catholic cathedrals, and it is impossible to deny that Romanism has an enormous hold upon the common people. In the Western States (in Colorado, for example) greater attention has been given to the building of cathedrals, and at Denver the cathedral church is made the centre of diocesan work.

I have already dwelt upon the Church newspapers, but I ought to add that my first "*impression*" upon taking up a New York Church paper (for there is no Church paper in Boston) was the exceedingly laudatory character of its pages. When a bishop, or a rector, or a churchwarden, or a vestryman, or a wealthy spinster, or even the undertaker and sexton (notwithstanding that this useful official's name has been emblazoned on the church door for years) dies, their good deeds are immortalized in a "resolution" which is sent to the papers. It struck me as somewhat new, and I thought it must be only an "*impression*;" but I have just taken up a religious journal which wittily observes:

> What we need in these days is more action and fewer resolutions. The Acts of the Apostles have been handed down, but their *resolutions* have not yet reached us.

Another "*impression*," which has since deepened into a profound conviction, was that undoubtedly the American Church ought to excite much greater interest in England than it at present does. American Churchmen take the most minute and lively interest in everything that pertains to the Mother-Church in England, Scotland, and Ireland. They read the theology, they watch the ecclesiastical appointments, and they pray for the best interests of the Church in the old country, whilst the Mother-Church rewards her loving daughter with the merest pittance of interest, and the coldest flow of sympathy. The loss is entirely on the side of the Church at home. The American Church can know all she wishes to know of the state and condition of the Church in England. But the English Church, with the problems of Lay Co-operation, Prayer-Book Revision, and Church Patronage before it, could learn much by studying the practical workings of such reforms in the non-established Church of America. America will, it is estimated, have a hundred millions of English-speaking people at the beginning of the next century, and it seems probable that the Episcopal Church in the country will grow in proportionate rapidity. What England can do for the American Church has been recently seen in the glorious results of Mr. Aitken's Mission.

The Nonconformist bodies had always associated with the Episcopal Church in America a strait-laced system which, in reality, had had nothing whatever to do with the Episcopal Church as such, but was merely an evidence of that want of spiritual life to which the Churches in all ages have been liable. How far some of our Dissenting brethren have missed the mark may be gathered from the pages of the Presbyterian *Observer*, which says, in commenting on Mr. Aitken's services at Old Trinity :

> These services have been remarkable as an innovation on an established and heretofore rigidly observed order of worship. Much might be said of their novelty in this view, and of the virtual concessions made in the direction of a simpler ritual. We might even claim that John Wesley has been vindicated right here in the Cathedral Church of America, and along with it the simpler forms of our own and other churches, but we are in no mood to criticize the past of our Episcopal brethren. Enough for us if they have at length discovered something of the simplicity, the fervour, and downrightness that marked the first great revival at Pentecost, and has ever since been the mark of the true Church of our Lord Jesus Christ. In this aspect of the recent services at Trinity we rejoice, and will rejoice. In admitting them into that venerable church, the honoured rector, Dr. Dix, and his advisers, "builded better than they knew." The services just held are an event to be dated from, and which we cannot doubt will be felt for good for years to come.

Simpler ritual, indeed ! Why, you may go into almost any Presbyterian or Congregational church you like in America, and

you will find the "simple ritual" consist of an eloquent extempore prayer without one single audible *Amen* at the close of it, whilst real earnestness of worship is only found in those Episcopal and in those *Methodist Episcopal* churches where a liturgical form of worship is used. It is the Presbyterian form of worship which has turned the churches of America into lecture-halls and concert-rooms, with their fine extemporaneous effusions and their quartette choirs, and it is now the mission of the American Church to infuse into the worship of the country that spirit of earnest devotion which, thank God, so characterizes the Church of England at the present day. The Bishop of New York has said that the Advent Mission marked an era in the disintegration of parties. But it has done much more than this. It has shown our Nonconformist brethren that however divided a great historical Church must of necessity be, as regards ritual and even doctrine, she is one in the unity of the spirit in her mission to fallen souls, whether it be within the stately walls of Westminster, or on the sunny plains of India, or amongst the savages of Africa, or to those teeming millions of a new world which represent all that is worst as well as much that is best in the aspirations of the Anglo-Saxon race. "Criticize the past," indeed! Let American Puritanism scan the religious history of New England, and then, if it dare, first cast the stone! It must be the special mission of the Episcopal Church for years to come to establish in this great country those true principles of right which were so often lost sight of amidst the din of conflicting politics, the contentions of religious intolerance, and the sharp but sordid strife for commercial success, which have so characterized the American people during the marvellous and rapid growth of their great Republic.

A DISESTABLISHED CHURCHMAN.

ART. III.—ST. LUKE'S LITERARY PERSONALITY.[1]

THE Rev. Dr. Hobart and the Rev. H. H. Evans have lately taken up from opposite sides our Third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles. Each rests his argument chiefly on the language of the documents criticized, and each finds what seems exactly to confirm his own conclusion. But those

[1] *The Medical Language of St. Luke*, etc. But the Rev. W. K. HOBART. LL.D., etc. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis, and Co. London: Longmans. 1882.
St. Paul the Author of the Acts of the Apostles, and of the Third Gospel. By HOWARD HEBER EVANS, B.A., etc. London: Wyman and Sons. First part, 1884, second part, 1886.

conclusions are mutually exclusive of one another, that of the former being that the medical profession of the writer is established by his style, that of the latter that the personality of St. Luke, and therefore of any physician, vanishes from the authorship of both treatises alike; that they had and could have had only one author, viz., St. Paul himself. He accordingly relegates "Luke the beloved physician" to the function of an amanuensis merely.

Dr. Hobart largely overdraws the bow. Much of the language used by physicians in all ages is non-technical, and would suit an unprofessional utterance equally well. Scores of words cited from Hippocrates and Galen by the critic are no more medical than the tunics and shoes of those ancient healers would be medical. Such are the words for "dawn," "noonday," "evening," "midnight," current on all lips, and the more so when machines to measure time were not yet in popular use. They have no more of medical stamp than "the watches of the night" have necessarily of military. The same applies to "sweat" and "drops of blood" in Greek. Indeed, the latter phrase almost exactly occurs three times in Æschylus, whose theme favoured such tragicaccessories.[1] The same common usage includes under θεραπεία the senses of "a household" (or rather, a train of domestics) and "medical treatment." Again, ἐπιχειρεῖν, in the sense of "to take in hand" a task or business, occurs in a long array of classic writers, prose and verse, Ionic and Attic alike, from Homer downwards. The same is applicable to various compounds of βάλλειν, πίπτειν, σπᾶν, κ.τ.λ. That such words have a large currency among medical writers does not perceptibly tend to fix a medical sense upon them, and is valueless as evidence of a medical proclivity in the author of a popular work. Homer, or at least the poet of the "Iliad," has been by some critics set down as a surgeon on account of his exact and often anatomical description of wounds in the battle-field; while some have been equally confident that he possessed military experience, and knew how to "set a squadron in the field."

If Dr. Hobart had relied less on these loose wisps of popular language floating in Galen or Aretæus, and studied by him until he saw medical lore in them, and more on the circumstantial features of fact on which the writer whom we still venture to call St. Luke preferentially dwells, he would have strengthened his argument. These salient features are, indeed, touched incidentally in the course of reviewing the language which conveys them—*e.g.*, the extent to which, in the case of the demoniac child in Luke ix. 38, 39, the quasi-

[1] Θρόμβον αἵματος σπάσαι, Choeph. 533; θρόμβῳ δ' ἔμιξαν αἵματος, *ib.* 546; θρόμβους . . . . φόνου, Eumen. 184.

epileptic symptoms are dwelt upon; the organic seat of the lameness noted in Acts iii. 7, as also the sudden starting of the parts into exercise when the cure was effected; and the complication of ailments in Publius's father in Acts xxviii. 8. Again, St. Luke alone gives the circumstance of the "bloody sweat" in the narrative of the Agony. These circumstantial details, apart wholly from language, if extracted from all the passages in which they occur, and viewed collectively, carry great weight. Then the language in which they are couched, if certainly or probably technical, strengthens the whole case.

Still, after every proper deduction has been made, there remains a vast accumulation of instances in the Third Gospel and the Acts confirming the view that the writer's mind had had a medical training, and establishing a presumption, therefore, that St. Luke, declared by the Apostle Paul to be a "physician," and not that Apostle himself, was their author. It is further important to show that special attention was early directed, chiefly by heretical writers, to the Third Gospel, in a way likely to draw attention to the personality of its author. Thus Marcion, contemporary with Justin who died probably 148 A.D., recognized only one Gospel, that of St. Luke (revised, of course, by himself), and one Apostle, viz., St. Paul. It seems so highly pertinent to his view to have verified, if true, the identity of the writer of the Gospel, which he took as his narrative basis, with the Apostle whom he regarded as his doctrinal standard, that that identity could hardly, if a fact, have been overlooked by him. That St. Luke, the reputed author, should have had no more really to do with the work than "I Tertius, who wrote this epistle," had to do with the letter to the Romans—which is virtually Mr. Evans's view—seems wholly inconsistent with the attitude of Marcion towards him. We may put Marcion's date of "flourishing" at 135 A.D. It seems impossible that evidence should within seventy years have perished, which it was so imperative upon him to have collected, if it existed, and turned to account. Valentinus, another heresiarch, received all the Catholic New Testament ("integrum instrumentum," Tertull. *de Præscr. Hær.*, 38), but professed to derive his doctrinal standard from Theonas, a disciple of St. Paul. Valentinus was at Rome when Polycarp visited Anicetus there, about 150 A.D. Again, Heracleon, familiar with Valentinus, wrote a commentary on St. Luke's Gospel, which Clement of Alexandria quotes. This shows concurrent evidence that, in the first half of the second century, attention was specially drawn to the documents which have exercised Mr. Evans's criticism, and increases the presumption that the view of St. Luke's authorship was accepted by heretical as by Catholic writers, *i.e.*, was univer-

sally accepted. The interesting Muratorian fragment on the Canon of the New Testament belongs, or rather its original, to the earlier part of the latter half of the same century. It expressly ascribes the Third Gospel to "that physician Luke whom Paul took with him," and adds that he wrote it "nomine suo"—a remarkable phrase, which seems almost designed to negative the precise proposition which Mr. Evans seeks to establish. The fragment is unquestionably from an Italian, if not Roman, source; and at Rome the Acts, at any rate, whether written by St. Luke or by St. Paul, would have been almost certainly finished and published. The Canon then, being drawn up about a century after the death of St. Paul, falls within the period to which the archetypal MSS. of the New Testament may easily have survived. It can hardly be doubted that *nomine suo* points to the fact that either the actual archetype, or some duly authenticated copy, bore the name of Luke as the writer. But without pressing the literal sense of the widely extended term *nomen*, its use, at any rate, establishes the personality of St. Luke as the recognized author, as a fact within the cognizance of the then living Church.

To turn to internal evidence, which Mr. Evans has most carefully compiled (enriching his repertory with quotations from Zeller, Bishop Lightfoot, and others), it seems only too plain that he is a most careful observer, but unable to apply the rules of evidence to the results of his observation. He notices with great emphasis the fact of a parallelism between both the miracles and sufferings ascribed to St. Peter and those ascribed to St. Paul in the Acts. He draws out at greater length a register of descriptive incidents and phrases common to the sufferings of our Lord in the third Gospel, and to the persecutions endured by St. Paul in the Acts. He infers at once that a strong presumption hence arises in favour of Pauline authorship of Gospel and Acts. Why? The presumption seems to lie wholly the opposite way. It is natural for the ardent admirer of a man of heroic character designedly to trace or tacitly to suggest by instances selected and grouped, and by phrases repeating themselves or slightly differenced, parallels which tend to give the measure of his hero as tallying with the loftiest standards known. It is *not* the way in which a true hero goes to work, even if he sits down to write his own memoirs. As far as one can judge from the indignant reluctance with which St. Paul in 2 Cor. xi. and xii. enters on his vindication of his authority by the appeal to his sufferings, he was about the last man on earth likely to have made such a studied comparison.

Another inference of Mr. Evans's is as follows: We know

that Nero was the Cæsar to whom St. Paul appealed, and when we find the writer of this history calling him (though not indeed in the direct narrative) ὁ Σεβαστός, this is surely an indication that the history was written and read while Nero was still the reigning Emperor, the one living representative of the august majesty of Rome.—(Letter VI., p. 62.)

The conclusion here is wholly unsustained by the premise. The title ὁ Σεβαστός="His Majesty," occurs merely in two speeches, both on occasions of state: one by the provincial *regulus* to the prefect, the other by the said prefect to the same *regulus;* and each is speaking of the Emperor at the time being. Supposing the *ipsissima verba* given, what so likely as this title? It was a conventional necessity on such an occasion. But it goes no more to prove "that this history was written and read while Nero was still the reigning Emperor," than the epithet κράτιστε, applied to Felix, proves that it was "written and read" during his procuratorship.

Again (*ib.*), we read, "This *unique work* must have had an *unique* author:" which reminds one of the Johnsonian parody:

> Who drives fat oxen should himself be fat.

Boswell's "Johnson" is of course suggested by the argument. Indeed, Mr. Evans himself adduces the parallel, where he repeats his argument on p. 207. That biography is, one may say, an "unique work;" but no one would say that Boswell was "unique" in the same sense. The subject and the opportunities are what made the Third Gospel and the Acts, taken as a whole, "unique," even as they did that biography. The question of the author is not mixed up at all with the unique character of the work. Indeed, the gossiping prominence of Boswell, and the way in which he plays sometimes clown, sometimes pantaloon, to Johnson's intellectual harlequinade, is the greatest possible contrast to the studied impersonality of St. Luke, save in his introductions. "We of Paul's company" and the like phrases are the only hints of his presence on the scene. And here we strike, in fact, one sure note of authorship. St. Luke's impersonality is an unequivocal confirmation of Lucan authorship. He is lost in his great study. The hero objective absorbs the subjectivity of the worshipper. Not only so, but all others are discussed as briefly as possible. Timothy, when introduced, is so merely for St. Paul to circumcise him. His errands on the Apostle's behalf are dismissed in single sentences. Titus is nowhere even mentioned, who in Galatians and 2 Corinthians is so prominent. If St. Paul had been the author, we may be sure some generous sentences of commendation would have been bestowed on the services of

both; nor would St. Mark have been left as it were "under a cloud," contrary to the express testimony given by St. Paul himself in 2 Tim. iv. 11; nor would St. Luke have been allowed to slip away like a mute under a mask, as we find him doing. It is when tried by the ethical standard, the best and surest in judging questions of personal identity, that Mr. Evans's theory most fatally collapses.

Equally fallacious are Mr. Evans's attempts to account for the changes of person; *e.g.*, in Acts xvi. 10, "After he had seen . . . we endeavoured." On which he urges, "The writer must have been the *alter ego* of St. Paul, to be able to place thus on public record those secret inner experiences of St. Paul—even the visions of the night." Here, again, there is no particle of proving power in the premise. We know from Acts xxii. 17 foll., that St. Paul publicly declared another such vision to the mob at Jerusalem, to say nothing of his double mention of the vision of his conversion in xxii. 6 foll., and xxvi. 12 foll., and that he "comes to visions and revelations of the Lord" as part of his defence, under compulsion, in 2 Cor. xii. 1. How much more would he reveal them to his trusted comrades, whose movements with his own they directly concerned! The suggestion that St. Luke was a special confidant of the vision, and thus an "*alter ego*," in xvi. 10, is utterly baseless. The very opposite is suggested by the passage itself. The parallels adduced of Cæsar, Josephus, etc., are no parallels at all, as will be seen by any who fairly examines those authorities. It seems as plain as words can make it, from xvi. 10 and xxi. 12-14, that if St. Paul *was* the author, he stooped to designed falsification of the features of narrative to conceal his identity.

Space unhappily forbids entering here upon the verbal question. Mr. Evans reckons that in the Third Gospel every *other* word, and in the Acts every *third* word, of the narrative is taken from the diction of the Pauline Epistles. Be it so—nay, assume, if you will, that cent. per cent. of Lucan diction is Pauline. This no more proves identity of author where styles differ *toto cœlo*, than identity of letters or words, where handwritings similarly differ, proves identity of penman. *Le style c'est l'homme;* and the clear, pellucid flow of Lucan narrative is to the involved, fervid, impetuous, disjointed style of St. Paul as South is to North. Further, as regards subject-matter, discrepancies hard to reconcile, if viewed from the assumed standpoint of personal identity of author, occur between some statements in the Epistles and in the narratives. If the account of the institution of the Lord's Supper offers in St. Luke and St. Paul remarkable coincidences, the post-resurrection notices in 1 Cor. xv. and in St. Luke xxiv. and

Acts i. offer no less remarkable deviations. The "Cephas" of five passages in the Epistles is a name unknown to St. Luke. The "James, the son of Alphæus," of Acts i. 13, and of the synoptic Gospels, is "James, the Lord's brother," of Gal i. 19. Other unlikenesses, obliquities, and differences of circumstance, which confirm substantial truth when distributed between two witnesses, become entanglements and paradoxes when we extinguish the difference of persons, and make their two standpoints coincide. What else, indeed, is the famous *Horæ Paulinæ* of Paley than a protest gone before against just such a theory as that of Mr. Evans—a protest the more forcible because impossible to be designed?

Mr. Evans is quite sure that the author must have been a Jew, and therefore not St. Luke. Tillemont asserted the same of Clement of Rome, and on the same ground—the copious knowledge of the LXX. and of Jewish custom manifested in his writings. But this view is now abandoned; see Hefele, *Patr. Apost. Opp. Prol.*, pp. xx., xxi.; and Hingelfeldt, *Prolog. ad Clem. Rom. epist.*, p. xxx. The LXX. was, in short, a Greek classic to religious souls, Jew or Gentile, at the Christian era and subsequently. Justin Martyr is another noteworthy witness to its influence over the Greek mind.

Yet Mr. Evans has done valuable work—more so than if he had incontestably proved his thesis of identity. He has made it impossible for any candid mind to doubt that the Third Gospel and Acts are documents of the Pauline age, and penetrated at first hand with the Pauline spirit. In "the foundation of Apostles and Prophets" upon which the Church is "built," he has brought out clearly the close relation of two master-stones to one another; he has shown that they belong to the same stratum, and contain largely the same fossils, each confirming the contemporary genesis of both, although not, as he is inclined to think, mere sundered members of one integral block.

A great deal of patient and laborious work must have gone into each of these studies of the subject which these two writers now before us have made. They in effect supplement one another. Dr. Hobart brings out that distinct repertory of terms which shows the separate individuality of him who uses them so largely among writers of the New Testament. Mr. Evans has shown a saturation of St. Luke's matter with Pauline and LXX. phraseology. Thus we have, as a resultant, a clearer view of St. Luke's personal entity, and, at the same time, an estimate of the large volume of his mental sphere which was modified and conditioned by his Pauline relations. Each commentator reflects light on the other, and is more valuable by reason of the company in which we have placed

them both. All who have ever heard of Philo Judæus will remember the proverb, "Aut Philo platonizat, aut Plato philonizat." If the study of Plato's works at the distance of three centuries in the Alexandrian Library produced such a pointed resemblance between him and Philo, how much more between contemporaries, between the only two superiorly educated writers of the New Testament, between master and disciple, between two who shared a gradually narrowing circle of comrades, which dwindled down at last to themselves (2 Tim. iv. 11). A probable ground for this constancy is to be sought in profound harmonies of personal character, while the pressure of persecution from without would force yet more closely together the impressive and the impressed mind. Mr. Evans has done well to bring this out. He seems to have been some years at work on his subject, as probably has Dr. Hobart. A few more years will doubtless bring the former that maturity of judgment which will lead him to see the limits of what can be proved by identity of phrase words and idiom, and perhaps to recognise duality in spite of seeming coincidence.

HENRY HAYMAN, D.D.

ART. IV.—A YEAR'S RESIDENCE AMONG THE SAVOYARD ALPS.

SAVOY is a part of Central Europe comparatively little known, and yet few countries on the Continent present a greater variety of interest, either for the tourist, the historian, the naturalist, or the sportsman. There are certain portions of it with which every traveller is familiar, such, for example, as Mont Blanc, and Aix-les-Bains; but those districts which lie more remote from the public route are seldom explored, and are therefore not very often visited, except by an adventurous Alpine climber, or by some settler who, either for amusement or for health, may have taken up his residence for a year or so in the interior.

The scenery is superb, the climate invigorating, and the people peaceful and inoffensive. Living is, at least was, very moderate, and the wines of the country wholesome, inexpensive, and exceedingly good. The winters are cold, but the air is dry, crisp, and bracing. From November to the end of March, mountain and plain are covered with a mantle of snow. The sun shines brightly every day, and it is very seldom that the weather prevents outdoor exercise, whether walking,

sledging, or skating. If the winters are cold, the summers are proportionately warm. The transition from the one season to the other takes place without the same intermediate experience of spring weather to which we are accustomed here in England. There is an interval, but a short one, of a mean temperature between "the cold of each December, and the warmth of each July." Still, for all that, the winter may be said to come to a more abrupt termination than what happens in our climate. So also may it be said of the summer. While it lasts it is very warm, so that it is not agreeable to walk about during the day between the hours of twelve and four in the plains. On the mountain ranges the atmosphere is cooler, so that Alpine-climbing can be comfortably carried on all through the entire season without personal inconvenience. In order thoroughly to enjoy a Savoyard residence, the best thing to do is to put up for a time at Chambéry, and make excursions all round among the mountains which form the natural barriers between Savoy, France, and Switzerland. It is quite easy to ascend all the Alps in this region—Dent de Nivolet, the Mont du Chat, Mont Grenier,[1] and other mountains within a radius of from twelve to fourteen English miles from the capital. Those of the Swiss range are a little farther.

The valley of the Maurienne and its contiguous mountains can be explored from the picturesque little town of St. Jean-Maurienne, embowered amid the foot-hills which form part of the Mont Cenis range. The interest is inexhaustible for the sportsman, the tourist, or the traveller. If a man is fond of angling he will find some very pretty mountain streams in the valley about six miles from St. Jean, where, without let or hindrance, he can go out in the early summer's morning—or, better still, in the evening—amid wild and magnificent scenery, and fill his basket with lovely trout, perfect specimens of their kind. It affords great amusement, partly from the certainty of success, and partly because of the unsophisticated character of these Alpine trout. Artificial flies seem quite a new experience to them. I do not know whether these sparkling streams have, or have not, been spoiled, like many of the once obscure but charming little rivers, by the incursion of tourists since the opening of the railway from Culoz to St. Jean-le-Maurienne. No "personally conducted" groups of sightseers in those days ever ventured into such inhospitable wilds. It was a real pleasure to live where one could enjoy in unmolested solitude the ever-varying and magnificent prospects along the range of the Mont Cenis mountain, with all its adjoining Alps.

In summer, a walk among the wild flowers, from early morn

[1] Mont Grenier may be easily ascended in four hours. It is 5,700 feet high.

to dewy eve, was a pleasure, the only drawback to which was its short-lived duration. The day was not long enough to enable me to realize to the full extent the indescribable blessing of being alone, and yet not alone, among these snow-clad mountains with their verdant slopes and quiet little oases, amid the bosom of the everlasting hills. I have been lonely, and perhaps just a little sad, when first as a perfect stranger I took up my residence in London, Paris, and other large cities upon the Continent of Europe. I have been more or less homesick when I found myself, unknowing and unknown, in New York, Philadelphia, Boston, San Francisco, and other large cities on the great Continent of America. But, never have I had one hour of solitariness amid the wild and rugged Alps, or when wandering at will among the flowers thrown together with such careless grandeur over the enamelled fields. While tracing out the wonderfully constructed handiwork of the Great Architect of the Universe, I had no time for any other feeling but that of surprise at finding the sublime and beautiful at almost every step I took amid the exquisite arrangements of the wise Master Builder. Though no human sound fell upon my ear, on those occasions when walking by myself, yet there were voices of another kind that riveted my attention, and never suffered me for a moment to feel dull or weary. I have seldom, if ever, known purer pleasures than what those Alpine rambles supplied, unstinted and unbidden. I found "tongues in trees, sermons in stones, books in the running brooks, and good in everything." The silent eloquence of those heathery glens, and the modest appeals of those wild flowers, with their quiet and unobtrusive beauty, and their agreeable and instructive variety, conveyed to me better and more enduring lessons in divinity than all the dusty and worm-eaten volumes of the Greek and Latin Fathers put together. There is no place where the student of Nature is so happy as in those wild retreats. Overweening cares about this life, or the deceitfulness of riches, or the love of human applause, or the straining after worldly honour, things that "play around the head, but come not near the heart," have no temptations for him upon those mountains of enchantment. Health, serenity of mind, and quiet thoughtfulness on the ways of Him Whose name is "Wonderful," are the sure reward of such studies in natural theology. As we walk along, Nature literally strews our path with flowers. Elegance and beauty spring up at our very feet. There is always something to study. New scenes will suggest new trains of thought. Morning, noon, and eve, each presents its own fragrance and ever-varying features. And day by day, the harmony and wisdom of the Creator become more and

more manifest, and insensibly fill the soul with thoughts too deep for utterance.

The seasons of the year have their own peculiar attractions. Winter with all its rigour of frost and snow presents a special beauty, unlike anything of the kind known in England. The out-stretched branches of the pine-trees, covering, with their darkly, deeply beautiful verdure, the sides of the valleys and the slopes of the mountains, almost up to the very summits of the smaller ranges, are covered with frozen snowflakes, which, shining in the morning sun, are like myriads of brilliants strung together with lavish splendour. The air, though cold, is clear and crisp. Unlike the spasmodic falls of snow in this country, the region of Savoy has its snowfall early in November, and during the winter all Nature is covered with a mantle of the purest whiteness. There is nothing uncertain about the weather. People get ready their sledges, and enjoy their easy-going motion over the congealed snow. It is not easy to decide between the respective claims of summer and winter. Both are beautiful in their own way. The scenery at both seasons is awe-inspiring. The treasures of the snow are inexhaustible, and as the sun each day shines forth with its genial rays, there is every inducement for exercise, and plenty of opportunities for making explorations all round.

The mountains which surround the Maurienne valley are well supplied with chamois, but let no untrained pedestrian venture in pursuit of such game. It involves very hard work, and a power of endurance that may well tax even the most vigorous constitution. One should sojourn for a time among the mountains, under the direction of a well-disciplined guide. Bears also are to be found, both the black and the brown. The Sardinian Government offered eighty francs as a reward for every bear that was killed, and they are, or were, gradually disappearing from the country. I used to go out bear-shooting among the forests on the sides of the mountains at each side of the Maurienne valley, about five or six miles this side of St. Jean. It was necessary to have a good guide, as otherwise it was difficult to find one's way among the forests. On the last occasion that I ever went out on these expeditions, I was accompanied by three or four engineers, engaged in the construction of the Victor Emmanuel Railway. After several hours' fruitless search we came upon a large bear, who on hearing us moved off. Our guide, who knew the haunts of the animal, led us almost to the very verge of a precipice. Here, pausing, he descended a few yards, when he alighted upon a jutting rock. Looking into a cave, he thought he saw in the corner "the ears of the bear," as he said; and aiming at an imaginary point between them, he fired, and to his delight he

heard the body of the bear falling on the ground. He succeeded in getting the animal, which had been shot dead, and subsequently we conveyed it to the house of the guide. It was a very fortunate shot for him. He received eighty francs from the Government. He sold all the "bear's grease," at a franc and a half per pound—such horrid stuff! it took about ten francs worth of scent to kill the strong odour of a quarter of a pound of this once famous unguent for promoting the growth of the hair, and along with the quarter pound the perfumers had to add a pound of some other grease. He charged the peasants a few sous for admission to see the bear, and for the skin he obtained about thirty francs more. It was quite a gala day in the mountain village. The guide was dressed in his best Sunday clothes, and to everyone who entered, wine was freely and hospitably offered by him. These bears do a considerable amount of damage to the crops of the peasants; they also upset their beehives and devour the honey. They are very dangerous, especially to children, if by chance any of them should be encountered in the evening as the bears prowl about the outskirts of the villages. They are a great nuisance, and it is no wonder that rewards were offered for their destruction.

There is a bird called the *Grive*—not to be confounded with the Grebe—a sort of fieldfare, with a slate-coloured patch of feathers on its back. It inhabits the tall trees in the forests, and is very fond of the mountain berries. They were considered a great luxury, and the ordinary price at a first-class hotel was five francs for one bird. Some friends of mine sat down to a dinner at Aix-les-Bains, and on looking at our bill we found that we were charged separately for two birds. When the matter was pointed out to the proprietor, he simply shrugged his shoulders and said, "Mais messieurs, les grives—que voulez-vous ?"

There were not many hares in the district round about, and the few that were there had but a short-lived existence after the first day of the opening of the shooting season, the 1st of August. Everybody who could afford to pay ten francs was allowed to carry a gun, and to shoot wherever he pleased, so that the hares had a bad time of it. In one whole season, from August to the end of February following, I never saw but one hare, though I was continually among the mountains and on the plains. The dogs of the villages killed many of them, and the "pot-hunter," who had a license to shoot all over the country, destroyed what had escaped the dogs.

Blackcock were fairly plentiful in the mountains about the town of Aiguebelle, the *Aquabella* of the Romans, so called, I suppose, because of the clear water that flowed continuously

through the streets on each side. Partridges were not plentiful, but by hard walking, and covering a good deal of ground with a good dog, one could manage to pick up a few brace, after a long day's trudging on the sides of the mountains, low down, and through the valley. As in all countries where there are no game laws, and where every inhabitant is free to shoot whatever he pleases in the way of ground-game or birds, there is but very little hope of the preservation of game in the same way as in those countries where the game laws are strictly enforced.

It must be borne in mind that I am describing Savoy as it was under the Sardinian Government, and not as it is under the French. This country has had a history of its own, in some respects unique, and in most respects unsatisfactory. Situated between France, Switzerland, and Italy, it became the battle-ground of all parties. Formerly, under the reign of Napoleon, it belonged to France, under the title of "the Department of the Rhone." Subsequently it fell to the lot of the King of Sardinia, and then it was known as the Duchy of Savoy. Together with Piedmont and the little island of Sardinia—from which the kingdom derived its name—it constituted an important part of the territory ruled over by "*il re galantuomo*," Victor Emmanuel. Unfortunately the natural barrier of the Alps separated Savoy from Piedmont so completely that the people, their language, and their sympathies, were more in accordance with France than with Sardinia. In the Franco-Austrian campaign Savoy was once more severed from Piedmont, and it has been replaced in its former position as an integral portion of the French nation. Thus it has been a sort of political shuttlecock, tossed about now by France, and now by Austria, and now by Italy, according to the fortunes of war, and the complexion of the times.

Another disadvantage under which the Savoyards were obliged to exist, and make the best of it, was the curious dilemma in which the people were placed by having to obey two opposite and contradictory sets of laws for the regulation of the public orders of the State. One of these was the old "Code pénal" introduced by Napoleon, and the other, "Le Statut," which was given by Charles Albert as the first instalment of civil and religious freedom. But the awkwardness of the case consisted in the fact that while the latter was promulgated as the inauguration of a reign of liberty, the former rigorous and despotic code had not been repealed. Hence it sometimes happened that a man was arrested, tried, and condemned for something which under the Napoleonic Code constituted a distinct offence, whereas, under the milder jurisdiction of the Code of Charles Albert, the man was perfectly innocent, and

only using the freedom to which he was justly entitled under the more recent administration. For example, I knew a man of the name of Joseph Jacquet, who lived in the village of St. Julien, not very far from Geneva, but in the Duchy of Savoy. He had been a schoolmaster, and a Roman Catholic; but from some cause or other he changed his creed, and took up his residence at the aforesaid little hamlet. There he began to distribute Protestant tracts among the peasants, and he freely conversed with them, according as opportunities presented themselves, upon the distinctive doctrines of the Roman Catholic and the Reformed Churches. He had a perfect right to do so by the recently enacted terms of the Statute, which conceded to all the subjects of the King everywhere in his dominions the privilege of civil and religious freedom. But Jacquet's conduct was naturally very galling to the Romish priests, and it was not at all to be wondered at that they should resent such a novel procedure on his part. Hitherto it had been forbidden by the Code pénal for anyone to speak, write, or preach anything against the time-honoured doctrines of the Papacy. Moreover, it was clearly contrary to one of the rival codes of legal jurisprudence to do so. Accordingly Jacquet, by the instigation of the priests, was arrested by the police at night, taken from his home and family—consisting of a wife and several children—handcuffed, and chained to a man who was accused of murder, and in this fashion was conducted to the prison at Chambéry, and there lodged in a cell, where I first visited him. It was a veritable Black Hole—about nine feet long and six feet wide—hardly a ray of light in it.

There this man was incarcerated for six weeks before his trial, doomed to bad food, bad lodging, and bad air. When I asked and obtained a copy of the *procès verbal*, I was astonished, as well I might be, to find that the only charge brought against him for which he was treated in this cruel and despotic manner was, that "he, the said Jacquet, was in the habit of selling obscene books—*des livres obscènes*—that is to say, Bibles and Testaments—and "that upon the public way—*sur la voie publique*—he was guilty of blasphemy in saying that our blessed Lord had brothers and sisters." These are the very words of the indictment copied from the document handed to me by the governor of the gaol. After a time, he appeared before "the Court of Cassation" in presence of six judges, and though ably defended by the best counsel that could be obtained, the Court decided against him. I was present, and heard the case tried and the judgment of the Court. The judges said that the accused pleaded guilty to the charge of having circulated Bibles and tracts, and that he

had stated, contrary to the religion of the State, that our Lord had brothers and sisters; that by the Code pénal this was an offence against the law, and that as such, the accused should be imprisoned in the same place for a period of six months, and also he should pay a fine of three hundred francs. Accordingly, back to his cell poor Jacquet had to go. His counsel in vain protested against the rigour of the sentence, and pointed out that it was directly contrary to the terms of the "Statut." The judges said that might be, but since the old law was not abrogated, the condemned was liable to punishment for its infringement. There were not wanting precedents for the course taken in this matter. Two were cited, one the case of a young man who was condemned to penal servitude for life for the same alleged offence—blasphemy; the other who had been for the same offence dealt with more leniently by having a shorter term of forced labour. It was openly stated by the judge that Jacquet was mercifully dealt with in the mild sentence pronounced against him. Here is one instance out of many which could be cited in order to point out the anomalous condition of the dual control of two sets of laws which in several particulars were in flagrant opposition to each other.

It is satisfactory to be able to add that, having drawn up a petition to the King, which was signed by the English residents in Chambéry, of whom there were about thirty or forty, and many of the inhabitants of the town, it was forwarded to the Minister of Public Justice, Monsieur de Foresta, who immediately sent back a telegram to have Jacquet at once discharged from prison, adding that he was guilty of no crime. Two gendarmes waited upon me with orders from the Intendant-Général, who lived at the château overlooking the town. It was pleasant news to hear them say that I was to accompany them to the gaol in order to receive Monsieur Jacquet, by orders received from Turin. It was an unexpected and therefore the more agreeable surprise to the poor prisoner. A very pleasant coincidence was connected with his liberation. Just as we were walking up from the prison into the main street, the Sardinian troops which had come back from the Crimea were making their public entry into Chambéry with our Queen's medals conspicuous on their breasts. That was the last dying act of despotic bigotry which the administrators of the law ever ventured to put into execution during the Savoyard connection with the kingdom of Sardinia.

It is only just to the honour and liberality of the educated inhabitants of the town to add that they were strongly opposed to the prosecution of Jacquet, and it was with feelings of indignation and disgust that they heard of the harsh sentence pronounced against him.

One other example of the old spirit of intolerance may be mentioned to show the period of transition between the old and the new administrations. No person not in communion with the Romish Church could be buried in the "Grand Cemetery." It was absolutely forbidden by the law, both of Church and State. It happened at that time that a poor man —a navvy employed on the railway—died after a lingering illness. Application was made by me to the Syndic—the mayor of the town—to allow the remains of this poor man to be buried in the cemetery, the only place of sepulture in the neighbourhood. I shall never forget his reply: "Oh no, sir; it cannot be, unless with the sanction of the Archbishop. No one who dies outside the pale of the Catholic Church can be buried there!"

"Do you think, sir," I said, "that the Archbishop would consent if application were made to him?"

"I cannot say, but it is not at all probable. Still, I will see, and let you know."

Next morning the Syndic sent word that he wished to see me. On arriving at his office I was told by him that the interment could not take place in the Grand Cemetery.

"Where then, sir?"

"There is a small enclosure outside the town, in ground not consecrated, where the body can be deposited. And the following regulations must be strictly adhered to, viz.: No public procession on foot; two small one-horse carriages only; not more than nine persons to accompany; no robes of office for the minister; and the *cortège* must not move off till the dusk of the evening;" and he added that "a member of the police will be in attendance."

All these requirements were carried out to the letter, except that there were only seven persons at the funeral besides myself. "The enclosure" was the most miserable-looking dust-hole that could be conceived. It was the receptacle for all kinds of rubbish, and was overgrown with noxious weeds. Here dead dogs were thrown, and all such superfluities which were considered as nuisances by the authorities of the town. I noticed there two little "mouldering heaps," indicating the last resting-places of two children of a native Protestant lady. Here, without any robe of office, at sundown, with seven attendants, I read the funeral service over the remains of the poor navvy. While doing so, many of the townspeople, attracted by the unusual sight of a burial in such a place, gathered round the entrance, and respectfully took off their hats while the prayers were being offered up. After all was over, several expressed themselves very indignantly at such a want of decency on the part of the Archbishop and

the police authorities, and predicted that the day was not far distant when the *parti-prêtre* would have to be taught a very different lesson. They were not wrong in their vaticinations. Within six months from that evening the Government placed a piece of ground—well situated by the side of the river which flowed through Chambéry—at the disposal of the Protestant inhabitants. The ground was laid out and planted at the expense of the civic authorities, and in due course it was consecrated and handed over to the Protestants. Soon after two men connected with the railway works died within a few hours of each other. Arrangements were made for their interment on the same day. I shall never forget that occasion. For the first time in the history of Savoy a Protestant was allowed to be buried without the illiberal restrictions as to the hour of the day, the officiating minister, the number of attendants, etc. In fact we had as much liberty in the discharge of this last solemn rite as if one were in England. It was a new and an extraordinary departure from the Papal despotism of the past; and, as something quite unique, public attention was roused to the highest pitch of excitement. The time fixed for the funeral was twelve o'clock. Two hearses bore the coffins, the one of a poor navvy, and the other of a well-to-do railway contractor. Whatever might have been the difference in their lives, there was none in their deaths. Friends subscribed freely to have the body of the poor navvy buried just as that of the rich man. As many of the railway engineers as possible came into Chambéry from the surrounding districts, and at the appointed hour there were not less than two hundred of the little colony of English Protestants assembled to do honour to the departed. Slowly and sadly the procession moved forwards through the streets of the town. Every shop almost was shut. The people to the number of about a thousand followed the hearses on foot, and on our arrival at the cemetery the place was so full of people that I found it no easy matter to make my way to the first open Protestant grave that ever was presented to the sight of the public at a midday funeral service since Savoy became an integral portion of either the French or the Sardinian Governments. Besides the people, there were fourteen Romish priests present. It was a very novel spectacle; but it was more—it was also a very emphatic token of the progress of the civil and religious freedom which, under the auspices of Count Cavour, the Sardinian Prime Minister, had begun to dawn upon the Savoyards. I was the first clergyman of the Church of England who was ever permitted—without any restraint as to time, or robes of office, or any other conventional restriction—to perform the

funeral service in all its details, according to the Book of Common Prayer.

To the credit of the people it must be said that they were unmistakably pleased at this unwonted liberality. They were not particular as to the expression of their opinion. The priests were not eulogized. In fact, the language employed by the citizens, who were almost all of them members of the Roman Church, was far from complimentary. The King and his liberal-minded minister, Count Cavour, were much commended. Many persons who were complete strangers to me came up and warmly shook me by the hand, while they expressed themselves "well pleased that the Protestants were now placed on an equal footing with the Catholics, and that it might long continue so." Many years have elapsed since then. Many changes in Church and State have passed over the little Duchy of Savoy. It was then under the sway of the King of Sardinia, and it is now under the *régime* of the French Republic. The Sardinian kingdom itself exists no more. It is among the things that have been, or, as the Greeks would say, *τὰ πρὸ Εὐκλείδου*. The sudden and unlooked-for development of Cavour's liberal policy spread itself over the Lombardo-Venetian province after Louis Napoleon defeated the Austrians at Solferino. The onward march of civil and religious liberty continued its successful progress until little by little one small kingdom after another in the distracted and priest-ridden peninsula succumbed to the all-conquering power of an enlightened patriotism. At that time Italy was torn to pieces by rival claimants of petty principalities. Besides Victor Emmanuel, who ruled over Piedmont and Savoy, and the Isle of Sardinia, there were the Duke of Parma, the Duke of Modena, the Duchess of Piacenza, the Grand Duke of Tuscany, the King of Naples, and last, but not least, the Pope of Rome. That was the state of things in 1857. The problem awaiting solution was simply this—How shall all these petty states be amalgamated into one, and under the authority of the liberal King Victor Emmanuel? In that year it seemed as hopeless a task as if one were to try to extinguish the volcanic fires in the crater of Mount Etna. I remember meeting a Genoese gentleman, with whom I got into conversation. His mode of settling the difficulty was very simple. "You see, sir," he said, "we will send the Duke of Parma to your Claremont in England, and the Duchess of Piacenza may go with him to keep him company; the Grand Duke of Tuscany we will send to your Bedlam in London; King Bomba, the King of Naples, why, we will hang him; and the Pope may go to Jericho, or Jerusalem if he likes that better. Then we will make Victor Emmanuel King of one

grand united Italy, with civil and religious freedom from the Alps to the Apennines." This short and summary method of unravelling the internal entanglements of Italian discord seemed somewhat amusing, even if it were wild and visionary.

Yet, strange to say, this very state of things substantially, within a few short years, actually came to pass, so far as Italian unity was concerned. Garibaldi drew his sword, and, with a few faithful and lion-hearted followers, he made a clean sweep of all the little dukes and duchesses, together with the King of Naples, and very nearly sent off the Pope to Jericho! Victor Emmanuel was crowned the King of Italy, and the transformation scene was thus complete. Savoy was handed over to France, and thus from the Alps to the farthest boundary of the peninsula, there was but one king and one people. A more remarkable revolution than this, and a more bloodless one, history has never recorded, considering the magnitude of the interests that were at stake, and the diversity of the principalities and powers which had to be broken up.

It was very interesting to watch the gradual and steady advance of the liberal policy of Cavour. He had made up his mind to put an end to sacerdotal exclusiveness and priestly bigotry. At that time no priest could be tried by a secular tribunal. Siccardi brought forward a Bill in the Sardinian Parliament to put an end to this exceptional legislation, and he triumphantly succeeded in carrying it, in spite of a good deal of hostility which the *parti-prêtre* had stirred up against it. Since that date there has been one law both for priest and people. This was a terrible blow to the Vatican. But a heavier one was in reserve. The impending sword was still suspended over the Papacy, and it was not to be sheathed till it cut away from the Church the entire framework of the conventual system. All monasteries and convents were to be suppressed, and the money which they fetched in the market was to be confiscated to the State.

It may seem somewhat harsh and arbitrary to ordinary readers that the property of the Church should be thus laid hold upon by the State and transferred to the public treasury. Many of the inmates of these religious houses were far from leading lives of indolence and ease. There were convents in which the nuns were occupied incessantly in teaching the children of the poor. When the King visited Chambéry on his return from England, about that time, a deputation of ladies waited upon him and presented a petition to his Majesty to spare the convents. His reply was that it was not the intention of the Government to interfere with any of those institutions in which it could be shown that their inmates were engaged in practical works of utility to the people. It was

only in those cases where the monastic or conventual houses were the receptacles of men and women whose useless lives were passed in obscurity, and whose attentions were confined to rules and regulations connected with the interior economy of the convent or monastery in which they lived. This was not the whole of the reasons for the abolition of the system. There can be no doubt that many abuses had arisen in those institutions, of which the Government had ample proof. It was a repetition of what occurred in our own country in the sixteenth century. The question is one into which it is impossible here to enter. I am responsible only for the fidelity of reporting what passed under my own notice during my residence in Savoy, without discussing the merits or demerits of the conventual system which received its death-blow in 1856-57. It is a curious fact, and it reads at this day somewhat like the grim irony of fate, that, previous to the overthrow of the convents and monasteries in Sardinia, the Pope offered the Government a perpetual gift of £40,000 per annum. if they were spared. A very shrewd and intelligent and well-informed priest in the neighbourhood of Chambéry, whom I often visited, assured me that this was perfectly true, and that he stated it on the most reliable authority.

It would be impossible to convey to anyone not resident in Savoy at that period what a complete revolution in ecclesiastical jurisdiction was effected by the introduction of the new code of laws as advocated and enforced by the Liberal Government. Since the days of the Reformation the Romish Church never received a more fatal wound than that inflicted upon her by the policy first introduced by the King into the Sardinian States, and afterwards extended to the whole of Italy, with certain modifications, according as it became subject to his sway.

The history of Italy under Victor Emmanuel forms one of the most interesting episodes in the regeneration of that country. Pio Nono saw the rising tide gradually encroaching upon the States of the Church. He also felt his impotence to arrest it. Still, he decided on doing something; and as in the olden time a Papal Bull produced direful effects upon the minds of those who were easily alarmed by the terrible because unknown power that was attributed to it, so he resolved once more to adopt that line of policy. But it was "too late." The time had gone by in which such spiritual thunder carried terror and alarm into camps and palaces, as well as among the masses of the people. The general feeling was one of pity for the poor old man whose power of punishing fell so far short of his inclination. Civil liberty in its integrity was proclaimed by the King in no uncertain words, and from that

moment the Royal and the Papal programmes were utterly at variance. And here I leave the different administrations of the secular and ecclesiastical powers. Time gradually is showing where, in this conflict of opinion between rival parties, the victory lies. Everywhere the voice of public opinion is heard challenging the *raison d'être* of every institution; and, in the tests which are being applied, everything in Church or State that cannot show cause for its existence will probably be either reformed or entirely swept away.

I turn away from the arena of political animosity to scenes of peaceful repose, and I shall ask my reader to accompany me while I give him a brief sketch of a moonlight ascent of Mont Cenis. There is nothing difficult in it. Anyone with ordinary strength of limb and lung can do it. You can, if you like, keep on the track of the old diligence road all the time. It is not the love of adventure that tempts one to go to the summit of this mountain, but the loveliness of the scenery and the weird wildness of the surroundings. Mont Cenis is not the most picturesque of mountains, but it has the advantage of a very good road, at every turn opening up changes of the landscape which leaves no room for monotony. As I ascended, everything around me was as still as the grave. Silence and solitude reigned complete. The heavens above my head seemed to be more brightly studded with "diamonds in the sky" than I ever remember to have seen on any previous occasion. The Alpine atmosphere was evidently the cause of this increased illuminating power. The air was the purest I ever breathed, and its bracing qualities imparted unusual energy both to mind and body. Sir Walter Scott tells us that if we want to view "fair Melrose aright," we must visit it "by the pale moonlight." But if anyone wants to experience a new sensation of indescribable grandeur, let him go to the summit of an Alpine pass, under the same conditions, like that of Mont Cenis, where, without being in danger of tumbling down some yawning precipice, he can calmly survey the magnificence and the beauty of the expanse of the heavens above him, and the summits of towering mountains below and around him.

As I gained the summit, the silence of the vale below yielded to the roar of the rushing wind tearing along the mountain side. The clouds scudded before the rising breeze, and an imaginative person could easily picture all sorts of fantastic shapes to his mind, as the ever-changing clouds kept altering their fleeting forms at almost every instant. If you never looked upon an Alpine wilderness, you can have no idea of the scene. There is a feeling of the supernatural perpetually present with you, unless you happen to be one of those un-

enviable specimens of the phlegmatic temperament that views everything from a prosaic, matter-of-fact point of view. Let such persons never venture among the poetic regions of Alpine sublimity. Let them get into the train at the nearest station, and go through the Mont Cenis tunnel in darkness made visible by the dim glimmer of a railway lamp. When I ascended the mountain there had been no attempt made to bore a tunnel from Modane to Bardonnèche. We had to go over the summit in the old-fashioned diligence, drawn by a dozen or more mules, "with many a toilsome step and slow." But it gave you the opportunity of walking over the pass, and by getting ahead of the lumbering vehicle you could plunge into the mystic darkness of the scenery, feeling a sense of protection and conscious security from the felt assurance that the diligence was coming on behind. I cannot explain why it was that memory, from its great storehouse, drew forth things and persons from the long and almost forgotten past, which seemed as if the things had only occurred yesterday, and the persons were still in the land of the living. There seemed to be a complete annihilation of time. The old, old past and the present were brought into immediate contact, as if no breach of continuity had ever taken place in the treacherous records of the mind. Things that happened long, long ago appeared to present themselves in all the vivid colouring of the present. Words spoken by old friends came back to me as if by magic. My whole life passed in review before me, and if it were not that I knew I was not far from the track of my fellow-travellers, I verily believe that I should have been overpowered by the impressions made upon me by the feeling of awe which the whole of the circumstances had presented to my mind as a living reality.

There are times of awful heart-searchings in our experience of life—times when past, present, and future, seem commingled in hopeless entanglement. Whence came we? What are we on this earth for? What is the next stage in our history after death? These are questions which from time to time present themselves to the mind of thoughtful men. The patriarch Job was reminded of this mysterious communing of some occult influences by his too candid friend Eliphaz the Temanite. He tells him that in the dead of the night while lying on his bed, and musing upon the visions which had just appeared to him in his dreams, at that solemn hour when other men lay buried in profound sleep, "Fear came upon me, and trembling, which made all my bones to shake. Then a spirit passed before my face, the hair of my flesh stood up. It stood still, but I could not discern the form thereof. . . . . an image was before mine

eyes, there was silence, and I heard a voice." The minds of men have often been agitated by such ghostly ideals, when thus lying on their beds half asleep and half awake. But if anyone who has a soul open to spiritual impressions wants to realize to the fullest extent the solemnity of secretly communing with his own heart, let him make the experiment, for once in his life, of the silence and the solitude of a midnight in the Alps. It is something awful, but also grand. All the moral forces of the soul seem to array themselves before you. Conscience asserts its sovereignty. Memory becomes more than usually suggestive. Reason forces upon you the dread significance of "judgment to come." And then, as you walk slowly on, fancy begins to paint all sorts of imaginary pictures, till you are tempted to mistake the ideal for the real. Phantoms of the imagination seem to present themselves in quick succession, but you cannot, as in the experience of Eliphaz the Temanite, "discern the form thereof." Strange sounds, "the voices of the night," fall upon your ear, and altogether you become so bewildered with excess of feeling, that you almost begin to doubt your personal identity. The whole scene is so unearthly that you cannot explain it to yourself. It is unlike anything you ever felt before. You forget that you are a lonely wanderer, walking in the dead of night in the solitude and silence of an Alpine mountain. I have looked upon many a lovely landscape; I have beheld with delight the summits of towering mountains; I have watched with awe and wonder the heaving billows of the mighty deep; I have gazed in silent rapture upon the heavens, as they rolled in starry splendour above my head—but, what I saw and felt when alone with Nature in her wild retreat, on the bleak top of that solitary mountain, filled my soul with deeper emotions than anything that I had ever before, or since, looked upon on earth.

When Victor Emmanuel visited London, and beheld the pomp and circumstance of State, and the splendour of the reception given to him on his public entry into the Metropolis, he turned to the Marquis D'Azeglio and said, "Contace, Que petits nous sommes en Piémont!"

The one permanent and abiding thought which has ever since my Alpine experience been attending upon me like my own shadow, is the utter littleness and insignificance of man. As I surveyed that wondrous scenery, the words of David came upon my lips—"LORD, what is man, that Thou art mindful of him?" When I saw the moon, in the freshness of her beauty, unveiling her peerless light and throwing her silver mantle over the dark valleys and deep ravines, I felt that I wanted some new language to give expression to my feelings. And as the green and yellow radiance illuminated

the noble panorama, I could but feel, in the spirit of the king's words, Oh! how small we mortals are in this little corner of creation, compared with the greatness and the glory which fill the universe of God!

G. W. WELDON.

ART. V.—WELLHAUSEN'S THEORY OF THE ORIGIN AND STRUCTURE OF THE PENTATEUCH.—PART I.

Prolegomena to the History of Israel. By JULIUS WELLHAUSEN. Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black.

The Pentateuch, its Origin and Structure. By EDWIN C. BISSELL, D.D. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

IN considering the last and most popular modern theory of the constitution of the Pentateuch, it may be well to quote the frank confession Wellhausen makes of the method by which he arrived at his present notions. "In my early student days," he says with charming *naïveté*, "I was attracted by the stories of Saul and David, Ahab and Elijah; the discourses of Amos and Isaiah laid strong hold on me, and I read myself well into the prophetical and historical Books of the Old Testament. Thanks to such aids as were accessible to me, I even considered that I understood them tolerably, but at the same time was troubled with a bad conscience, as if I were beginning with the roof instead of the foundation; for I had no thorough acquaintance with the Law. . . . . My enjoyment of 'the historical and prophetical books' was marred by the Law; it did not bring them any nearer to me, but intruded itself uneasily, like a ghost that makes a noise indeed, but is not visible, and really effects nothing. . . . . At last I learned that Graf placed the Law later than the Prophets, and, almost without knowing his reasons for the hypothesis, I was prepared to accept it. I readily acknowledged to myself the possibility of understanding Hebrew antiquity without the Book of the Torah."[1]

The fact that prepossessions count more with this school of critics than is usually avowed amongst scientific men is evident from another statement in the preface to Wellhausen's "Prolegomena." Speaking on the arguments drawn from passages "quoted from Amos and Hosea as implying an acquaintance with the Priestly Code," he calmly remarks that "they were not such as could make any impression on those who were

[1] "Prolegomena," English translation, p. 4.

already persuaded that the latter was the more recent."[1] Can anything be more likely to pervert the findings of a critic than this secret bias, so frankly disclosed, towards a theory that he is determined to establish? We shall give many proofs that this unhappy prepossession attains a fatal ascendency over the mind of Wellhausen, although he has passed through the student phase and now poses as a master in the science.

It may be well to put the theory of the Pentateuch, as now adopted by Wellhausen, into an easily remembered formulary that may be expressed algebraically thus: [JE+D+PC(Q)]R= Pentateuch, or rather Hexateuch. This means that the earliest writers, the Jehovist and Eloist, manipulated a mass of traditions and put them forth side by side, till a third hand re-worked them; this is JE. Then the Deuteronomist made his edition. Then another edition of the "four Covenants" was redacted, and was put into its present form substantially. This is PC(Q). That finally all this many-edited compilation was moulded by unknown hands, and the final result is the Hexateuch, or five Books of Moses, plus a piece of Joshua. It is not to be supposed that these are laid side by side, and one continuous work presented, as if a man should compile a history from four or five monastic chronicles, and leave his mark upon the whole, while he incorporated sections of various lengths from his authorities. On the other hand, the fragments remain separate, as in a mosaic work, and not confused one with another. The character of the conglomerate formed by the various processes is best expressed in Wellhausen's own description: "The Priestly Code," he says, "is not a perfectly incomposite structure; it has one main stock marked by a very definite historical arrangement, and preserved with little admixture in the Book of Genesis; but on the one hand some older elements have been incorporated in this stock, while on the other hand there have been engrafted on it quite a number of later *novellæ*, which in point of form are not absolutely homogeneous with the main body of the Code, but in point of substance are quite similar to it, reflecting the same tendencies and ideas, and using the same expressions and mannerisms, so that the whole may be regarded as an historical unity, though not strictly a literary one."[2]

The first question that presents itself is, by what solvent do the critics loosen this literary mosaic, and by what criterion

[1] "Prolegomena," English translation, p. 11.

[2] Wellhausen, *Encycl. Brit.*, vol. xviii., p. 507. For an exact analysis of PC, and passages attributed to it, see Bissell, p. 83. It wanders from Gen. i. to Josh. xx. 9-34, and often consists of small pieces ending abruptly in the middle of a verse.

do they detect whether a phrase belongs to one or other of the different constituent elements which they are pleased to enumerate in the Pentateuch? We must make, Wellhausen tells us, "two principal assumptions, that the work of the Jehovist, so far as the nucleus of it is concerned, belongs to the course of the Assyrian period, and that Deuteronomy belongs to its close. . . . . Deuteronomy is the starting-point. . . . . When its position has been historically ascertained, we cannot decline to go on, but must demand that the position of the Priestly Code should also be fixed by reference to history."[1] Here the process is revealed: first make the assumption that certain distinct sources exist, and then attribute to them such portions of the Pentateuch as suit your theory. The analysis is then complete.

Before letting our readers see how this process is carried out, we must give them warning as to what they will encounter in the course they are invited to take under the guidance of their new instructors. *They will find the historical character of the records entirely destroyed.* In dealing with the Priestly Code, Wellhausen tells us that "the legal contents are supported on a scaffolding of history, which, however, belongs to the literary form rather than to the substance of the work."[2] With what small compunction he casts down this "historical scaffolding," appears from his cavalier treatment of the giving of the Law. It "has only a formal, not to say dramatic, significance. It is the product of the poetic necessity for such a representation of the manner in which the people was constituted Jehovah's people as should appeal directly and graphically to the imagination. . . . . For the sake of producing a solemn and vivid impression, that is represented as having taken place in a single thrilling moment, which in reality occurred slowly and almost unobserved. Why Sinai should have been chosen as the scene admits of ready explanation. It was the Olympus of the Hebrew people, the earthly seat of the Godhead, and as such it continued to be regarded by the Israelites even after their settlement in Palestine (Judges v. 4, 5)."[3] No wonder, with such views, that disparaging terms are applied to the Hebrew Scriptures, and that we meet with such expressions as these: "the narrator of these legends;" "the recapitulation of the contents of this narrative makes us feel at once what a pious make-up it is, and how full of inherent impossibilities;" "there cannot

[1] "Proleg.," p. 13.

[2] Wellhausen, *Encycl. Brit.*, vol. xviii., p. 506.

[3] *Encycl. Brit.*, vol. xiii., p. 399. The quotation is from the Song of Deborah: "The mountains flowed down at the presence of the Lord; even yon Sinai at the presence of the Lord, the God of Israel."

be a word of truth in the whole narration. Its motives, however, are easily seen;" "unconscious fictions;" "2 Kings xxii. 3, 8, is an interpolation which does credit to Jewish acuteness." Again: "I do not mean to maintain that Abraham was not yet known when Amos wrote, but he scarcely stood by this time at the same stage as Isaac and Jacob. As a saint of Hebron he might be of Calibite origin, and have something to do with Ram (1 Chron. ii.). Abram may stand for Abiram, as Abner for Abiner, and Ahab for Ahiab." But surely this last passage is criticism gone mad, and utterly unworthy of the name of exact scholarship. It has, however, one excellent result. We are shocked at its recklessness, but we treat it with utter disdain, and refuse to be affrighted at its unparalleled audacity. No one can believe that "the Ark of the Covenant no doubt arose by a change of meaning out of the old idol," and that "it was a standard adapted primarily to the requirements of a wandering and warlike life." Nor will many be convinced by mere assertion, that "Jehovah ('God of the thunderstorm or the like') is to be regarded as having originally been a family or tribal God, either of the family to which Moses belonged, or of the tribe of Joseph. Jehovah was only a special name of El, which had become current within a powerful circle, and which, on that account, was all the more fitted to become the designation of a national God," and "is derived, in a certain sense, from the older deity of Sinai." Nor will the conjecture "that the verb of which Torah is the abstract, means originally to throw the lot arrows," commend itself to our sober judgment. In fact, as we have read this criticism, we have been often reminded of the throwing of arrows referred to in the Book of Proverbs to the madman, who scatters with them firebrands and death.

But the pious reader will be not less shocked to find that "it is extremely doubtful whether the actual monotheism which is undoubtedly pre-supposed in the universal moral precepts of the Decalogue would have formed the foundation of a national religion. It was first developed out of the national religion at the downfall of the nation, and thereupon kept its hold upon the people in an artificial manner, by means of the idea of a covenant formed by the God of the universe with, in the first instance, Israel alone."[1] In accordance with this, the same author tells us in a manner truly characteristic of his assumptions, "If there were stones in 'the Ark of the Covenant' at all, they probably served some other purpose than that of writing materials, otherwise they would not have been hidden as a mystery in the darkness of the sanctuary; they must have been exposed to public view. . . . . It results from this

[1] Wellhausen, Art. "Israel," *Encycl. Brit.*

that there was no real or certain knowledge as to what stood on the tables, and further, that if there were such stones in the Ark—and probably there were—there was nothing written on them.[1]" It is well to warn those who are tempted to follow these guides that hereafter they will be numbered amongst those "who falling down, looked up for heaven, and only saw the mist."

This brings us to another point, on which we would be very emphatic. In reading these theories we must never forget the old caution, "Verify your references." Many and many an argument advanced by these critics with a jaunty air would never deceive the most unwary, if the passages referred to in the footnotes were quoted at length in the body of the text with sufficiency of context. An example of this occurs very early in the dissertation on sacrifice. It is part of the theory to prove an evolution of ritual from chaotic and idolatrous orgies to the worship as we find it in the Pentateuch ritual.[2] In the course of this dissertation we find the following astounding statement:

> That perfect propriety was not always observed might be taken for granted, and is proved by Isaiah xxviii. 8, even with regard to the Temple of Jerusalem: "All tables are full of vomit; there is no room."

If the reader will turn to the passage quoted, he will see that there is not a word concerning the Temple of Jerusalem, but that it is a declaration of woe against "the crown of pride, the drunkards of Ephraim." One more example from the same section may be sufficient for the present:

> The ancient offerings [writes Wellhausen] were wholly of a joyous nature—a merrymaking before Jehovah with music and song, timbrels, flutes, and stringed instruments (Hos. ix. 1 *et seq.*; Amos v. 23; viii. 3; Isa. xxx. 32). No greater contrast could be conceived than the monotonous seriousness of the so-called Mosaic worship. Νόμος παρεισῆλθεν ἵνα πλεονάσῃ τὸ παράπτωμα.[3]

The passage from Isaiah is thus rendered in the Revised Version: "Through the voice of the Lord shall the Assyrian be broken in pieces, which smote with a rod. And every stroke of the appointed staff which the Lord shall lay upon him shall be with tabrets and harps; and in battles of shaking will he fight with them." It would puzzle the most acute criticism to found any inference as to the joyousness of early Hebrew offerings in the problematic allusion to the wave-

---

[1] "Proleg.," p. 393. An instructive lesson may be learnt as to the position and value of the Ten Commandments by comparing the estimate of Wellhausen with the eloquent comment of Kalisch on Exodus xx. and xxxiv.

[2] "Proleg.," p. 433.

[3] "Proleg.," p. 81.

offering (tenufah) in this verse.[1] Hosea ix. 1 *et seq.* seems equally beside the mark. The context charges Israel with the crime of "forgetting his Maker and building temples," and proceeds, "Rejoice not, O Israel, for joy, as other people, for thou hast gone a whoring from thy God." It then denounces as a punishment, "Their sacrifices shall be unto them as the bread of mourners," and asks, "What will ye do in the solemn day and in the day of the feast of the Lord?" But if this can be used to show that the character of the worship that the pious Israelite deemed fit to be offered to the Lord altered so greatly in the course of time, the answer is at hand. It is exactly the language used by the so-called Deuteronomist (Deut. xxviii. 47): "Because thou servedst not the Lord thy God with joyfulness and gladness of heart for the abundance of all things, therefore shalt thou serve thine enemies which the Lord shall send against thee, in hunger and in thirst and in nakedness, and in want of all things." In a similar way in the passages in Amos the destruction of the joyous character of the service is declared to be a great punishment. The first text reads: "Take thou away from me the noise of thy songs, for I will not hear the melody of thy viols." The second declares, "The songs of the temple" (or, as many render, "palace") "shall be howlings in that day." Can we conceive, we may ask, a greater contrast than this to the picture of the great festivals of the Jewish Church as drawn by post-exilic writers? Thus we find the whole string of references utterly irrelevant; and though we are far from saying this is always the case, yet too frequently the reference cannot bear the weight of argument that rests upon it. Nor can we take the critic's passing reference as a proof for his statement, or we should believe that "Moses himself is said to have made a brazen image which down to Hezekiah's time continued to be worshipped at *Jerusalem as an image of Jehovah.*"[2] This throwing in most important statements as *obiter dicta* is a great trick of the new critics, and one has constantly to be on his guard against it. We subjoin a most characteristic passage, that those who are unacquainted with this literature may learn on what *feeble bases the most momentous* conclusions are made to rest. Wellhausen is treating of the oral and written Torah, and thus writes: "Just as it is in evidence that Deuteronomy became known in 621, and that it was unknown up to that date, so it is in evidence that the remaining Torah of the Pentateuch—for there is no doubt the law of Ezra was the

[1] The same word occurs in Isa. xix. 26, to describe the shaking of the Lord's hand over Egypt; and there is no reason whatever for believing the expression is anything but "tumultuous battles."

[2] Wellhausen, Art. "Israel," *Encycl. Brit.*

whole Pentateuch—became known in the year 444, and was unknown till then. This shows, in the first place, and puts it beyond question, that Deuteronomy is the first, and the priestly Torah the second, stage of the legislation."[1] It is this method of assertion that enables him to conclude this paragraph in this peremptory style: "It would require very strong internal evidence to destroy the probability, thus based on a most positive statement of facts, that the codification of the ritual only took place in the post-exile period." No one can account for the conclusions of this school until he has mastered the method.

We may now follow the process of disintegration, falsely called analysis, as it is applied to the Pentateuch, only premising that there is by no means absolute unanimity among the critics as to the different portions to be assigned to each document, and that the latest theories are adopted because serious flaws have been discovered in the previous suppositions.[2] Considerable acuteness, however, is shown in selecting the point of attack. It is thus opened by Wellhausen: "The Five Books of Moses and the Book of Joshua constitute one whole . . . . Out of this whole, the Book of Deuteronomy, as essentially an independent law-book, admits of being separated most easily;"[3] "and accordingly its independence was very early recognised . . . . The very name of Deuteronomy shows that from the earliest times it has been recognised as at least possessing a relative independence; the only difficulty is to determine where this section of the Pentateuch begins and ends. In recent times opinion has inclined more and more to the judgment of Hobbes and Vater, that the original Deuteronomy must be limited to the laws in chaps. xii.-xxvi. . . . . Some attempts to date Deuteronomy before the time of Josiah, in the reign of Hezekiah (2 Kings xviii. 4, 22), or even still earlier; but on the whole the date originally assigned by De Wette has held its ground. That the author of Deuteronomy had the Jehovistic work before him is also admitted, and it is pretty well agreed that the latter is referred to the golden age of Hebrew literature—the age of the kings and prophets before the dissolution of the sister-states of Israel and Judah."[4]

Let us suppose that in some remote period—say of one thousand years from the present date—a critic were to take

---

[1] "Proleg.," p. 408.

[2] For a condensed but very lucid statement of these theories, and a comparison between them, the reader is referred to Herzog's *Encyclopædia*, Art. "Pentateuch;" and for a more extended statement and refutation to Dr. Bissell's work on the "Origin and Structure of the Pentateuch."

[3] "Proleg.," p. 6. [4] Art. "Pentateuch," *Encycl. Brit.*

up Gibbon's "Decline and Fall," and subject it to similar processes. He would at once attack the celebrated fifteenth and sixteenth chapters "as essentially an independent" essay on Christianity, and admitting of being "most easily separated from the rest of the work." He might allege that the last sentence but one in the fourteenth chapter dealt with the resignation of Licinius, and the seventeenth chapter began with the words, "The unfortunate Licinius was the last rival who opposed the greatness, and the last captive who adorned the triumph, of Constantine;" plainly showing that the intermediate matter was an interpolation that did credit to English "acuteness." He might proceed to fortify this position by showing that the affairs of the Christian Church, when they came naturally in the way, were treated by the real Gibbon in chronological order and without violence to his history. The language of these chapters, too, he might allege was unlike Gibbon, especially the use of the word "obtrude," and the frequent repetition in them of the word "melancholy." The writer of these chapters had evidently suffered redaction at the hands of some unknown author, for he uses, concerning Cyprian, the most fluctuating language, at one time speaking of him as "the zealous, the eloquent, the ambitious," at another saying that "an account of his behaviour was published for the edification of the Christian world;" that he "pleaded with modest confidence;" that he was a man of "extreme caution" yet "vehement declamation" and "imperious declamation." In one sentence "the patriotism" of the inferior clergy is praised in opposing the pretension of the bishops, and their overthrow ascribed to Cyprian, "who would reconcile the acts of the most ambitious statesman with the Christian virtues which seemed adapted to the character of a saint;" yet this prelate is subsequently called "patriotic," plainly showing the influence, as our critics say, of a "priestly tendency" in the redactor. In chap. xv. it is said that "the memorable distinction of the laity and clergy was unknown to the Greeks and Romans," while in chap. xx. we find that "the distinction was familiar to many nations of antiquity," and a Greek author is quoted for the information in the text. In chap. xv. it is said, "the public functions of religion were *solely* entrusted to the established ministers of the Church, *the bishops and presbyters;*" but in chap. xx. we read, "in the Christian Church, which entrusts the service of the altar to a perpetual succession of consecrated ministers, the monarch, whose spiritual rank is less honourable than that of the meanest deacon, was seated below the rails of the sanctuary;" which evidently implied that some part of the "public functions of religion" was entrusted to deacons, who are not the same as

the ministers of the first passage. Similarly the language as to Christianity fluctuates. At one time it is praised as "pure and simple," and at another every scandalous story is repeated against it. But to maintain that these discrepancies proved the non-Gibbon character of the chapters would only enter into the mind of a man fresh from an analysis of the Pentateuch on the Graf-Wellhausen methods—an analysis that produces such results as these inspires doubt and not conviction.

Let us now take the Book of Deuteronomy in our hands and read it carefully through. It does not convey the impression of a law-book, but of a series of speeches upon matters of history, duty, and civil and religious obligations. "It would," says Bissell, "surprise one unacquainted with the subject to know how large a portion of the book is put directly into the mouth of the lawgiver, and is represented to be spoken by him. . . . Out of nearly a thousand verses there are but about sixty that are not in the form of direct address—that is, that do not purport to be the word for word utterances of Moses himself. If the first thirty chapters be taken by themselves, the relative disproportion is much more marked; the average of introductory or explanatory material to what remains being only about that of a single verse to a chapter."[1]

The new criticism affirms that the original Deuteronomy begins at chap. xii., with these words: "These are the statutes and the judgments, which ye shall observe to do in the land which the Lord, the God of thy fathers, hath given thee to possess it;" and ends, "that thou mayest be an holy people unto the Lord thy God, as He hath spoken." But is there any conceivable reason why they should begin here rather than iv. 1, "And now, O Israel, hearken unto the statutes and unto the judgments which I teach you for to do them," or end at the conclusion of the twenty-ninth chapter? There is no particle of external evidence that such a mutilated edition ever existed; there is no difference of idiom or of words that recommends this carving out a portion of the book and styling it the original document. It is purely and absolutely an arbitrary proceeding. Nor do the contents of this book allow us to attribute it to a different stratum of ritual and practice, to adopt Wellhausen's favourite expression, from the remainder of the Pentateuch. In calling this an arbitrary method of criticism, we bear in mind Wellhausen's statement: "The Deuteronomic legislation begins just like the Book of the Covenant, with a law for the place of worship. But now there is a complete change: Jehovah is to be worshipped only in

[1] Bissell, p. 259.

Jerusalem (*sic*), and nowhere else. The new law-book is never weary of repeating this command. . . . All is directed against current usage, against 'what we are accustomed to do at this day;' the law is polemical, and aims at reformation. This law, therefore, belongs to the second period of the history, the time when the party in Jerusalem was attacking the high places. When we read, then, that King Josiah was moved to destroy the local sanctuaries by the discovery of a law-book, this book, assuming it to be preserved in the Pentateuch, can be none other than the legislative part of Deuteronomy, which must once have had a separate existence in a shorter form than the present Book of Deuteronomy; this, too, is the inference to which we are led by the citations and references in Kings and Jeremiah." [1]

It is noteworthy that Jerusalem is never mentioned in Deuteronomy, only the ambiguous "place which the Lord thy God shall choose to put His name there." The assumptions, too, are simply astounding, and are such as would never be allowed for a moment were we investigating the age of the Rig Veda instead of the composition of the Pentateuch.

The old view of Deuteronomy was that it contained an authoritative revision of former legislation, both expanding its scope and contenting itself with brief allusion to the priestly ritual, and dealing with many questions in a hortatory style. It was allowed that a few verses stood in the text that in modern works would have been relegated to foot-notes, but in so ancient a document it was admitted that they might have assumed their present position. The "Song of Moses" presented so many archaic forms and was of so peculiar a character as to be allowed a unique position, and on its language and methods of expression critical ingenuity was permitted to expend itself, on condition that it left the authentic character of the composition intact. This, however, is all changed, and having been arbitrarily treated, Deuteronomy is exalted into a separate document, D; and it is eagerly searched to find differences between its statements and those of other portions of the Pentateuch, torn from their connection in just as arbitrary a manner, and accused of interpolation or mutilation if they offer any obstacle to the will of the theorist.[2]

---

[1] Art. "Pentateuch," *Encycl. Brit.*

[2] For an example of this let the reader carefully peruse the subjoined passage, p. 370 of the "Prolegomena": "Nöldeke finds, it is true, a reminiscence of the priestly code in the ark of acacia wood, Deut. x. 1; but the ark is here spoken of in a connection which answers exactly to that of the Jehovist (Exod. xxxii. and xxxiii.), and is quite inconsistent with the PC (Exod. xxxv. *et seq.*). . . . True, the ark is not mentioned in JE (Exod. xxxiii.) as we now have it, but in the next Jehovistic piece (Num. x. 33) it suddenly appears; and there must have been some state-

But this hypothesis, even were it accepted, leaves too many difficulties unexplained, and raises fresh ones that cannot easily have a solution within the limits imposed by the hypothesis. Some one must have written the original short recension, and for a purpose. If written in the interests of a purer faith and practice than then prevailed, why was the air of antiquity assumed and so perfectly maintained? Can a parallel to this be found anywhere of a writer forgetting his own country and his father's house, and projecting himself into a dim past into which he does not allow a ray of the present to penetrate? How is it that the writer of the longer recension encumbered himself with the fiction of a personal Moses, and put into his mouth statements that were utterly untrustworthy? and how is it that he, too, maintained this air of antiquity with so perfect a disguise that it imposed upon everyone until the modern era of criticism? How, further, can we imagine these different editors inventing the sublime and composite character of Moses, and meeting one another with imperturbable countenances as they build up the ever-lengthening myth, and no one to be smitten with the passion of discovering and denouncing his views? Above all, what is the morality of men that conceived of God as forbidding them to bear false witness against their neighbours, but accepting their unworthy artifices when they bore false witness against Himself?

The attempt to disparage the historical value of Deuteronomy cannot be understood unless we follow the criticism in its search after another stratum in the Pentateuch of legislation and history. It finds one embedded in the so-called Priestly Code. "This too, like Deuteronomy, is a law-book. . . Its main stock is Leviticus, with the cognate part of the adjacent books, Exod. xxv.-xl. (except chaps. xxxii.-xxxiv.), etc. The legal contents of the code are supported on a scaffolding of history." Again we protest there is not the faintest shadow of proof that such a document ever existed as the Priestly Code.

---

ment in the work as to how it came there. The tabernacle also appears ready set up in xxxiii. 7, without any foregoing account of its erection. The institution of the ark, as well as the erection of the tabernacle, must have been narrated between xxxiii. 6, 7, and then omitted by the present editor of the Pentateuch, from the necessity of paying some regard to 2 Exod. xxv. That this is the case, many other considerations also tend to prove." The assumptions here are of the usual character, confirming the impression that is soon made upon one in reading this style of comment, that such writers and such documents as they require for their hypotheses never existed in this world, and never will. Nor does the critic content himself with attributing strange actions to his fellows. He thus unfolds the Divine counsels: "By making an image the Israelites showed that they could not do without a sensible representation of the Deity, and Jehovah therefore gave them the ark instead of the calf."

Its central position, its enlargement, its differentiation from other documents, are all matters of subjective criticism, on which the most diverse opinions are advanced by men equally competent to decide. It would lead us far beyond all limits to follow the analysis of the Priestly Code at length, but we may be allowed to put before our readers one or two difficulties. According to Wellhausen, the Priestly Code writes thus about the Sabbath: "Ye shall keep the Sabbath therefore, for it is holy unto you; everyone that defileth it shall surely be put to death; for whosoever doeth any work therein, that soul shall be cut off from among his people" (Exod. xxxi. 14). But why is it not part of the Priestly Code in Deut. v. 12, "Keep the Sabbath day to sanctify it, as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee"? and why is "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy" (Exod. xx. 8) put over to JE? Why in Gen. xiii. should verse 6, 11b, and 12 alone belong to PC, and all the rest to JE? Again, why is Gen. xxvii. 46, xxviii. 9, a portion of the Priestly Code, and xxviii. 10 a portion of JE? or why should the verse, "And Rachel died and was buried in the way to Ephrath, which is Bethlehem," be assigned to JE in Gen. xxxv. 19, but the verse, "But as for me, when I came from Padan, Rachel died by me in the land of Canaan in the way, when yet there was but a little way to come unto Ephrath, the same is Bethlehem," in Gen. xlviii. 7, belong to the Priestly Code? It is sufficient for our purpose to adopt the finding of Green in Herzog's *Encyclopædia*, English edition: "The criteria of this proposed analysis are so subtle, not to say mechanical, in their nature, so many conjectural assumptions are involved, and there is such an entire absence of external corroborative testimony, that no reliance can be placed in its conclusions where these conflict with statements of the history itself." We may add that it is so shifting in its conclusions as it is pushed by its adversaries that it rivals the chameleon in changing its appearance to avoid danger. When the criticism we are considering has obtained its documents, arranged them, and taken care to have the influence of the redactor working through all, so that at the last resort any stubborn passage may be eliminated as an evident interpolation, violence is further done to them, and they are made to testify to different strata of practice and ritual. These differences fall under distinct heads. One set affect the place of worship; another show different developments of sacrificial rites; another deal in the same way with the sacred feasts; another with the duties of the priests and their endowments. Here is one great charm of the theory. It introduces development into religion; but it forgets the kindred doctrine of degradation, and endeavours to win adherents by false hopes

of explaining the existence of the doctrines of revelation on naturalistic grounds. We purpose, therefore, to examine the new theory on the alleged discrepancies in the codes as to the place of worship.

It is alleged that "from the earliest period of the history of Israel, all that precedes the building of the Temple, not a trace can be found of any sanctuary of exclusive legitimacy."[1] This result is obtained by skilfully avoiding the point in dispute. It is not maintained that a central sanctuary and altar were established by Moses which, during the conquest and times of the Judges *de facto*, absorbed all the religious feeling and practices of the time. These were objects of ideal legislation, and were only brought within the sphere of practical religion by the erection of Solomon's Temple, which gave a dignified and fitting example of what the Temple of Jehovah should be in the midst of His people. That this is not a modern theory invented under the pressure of adverse arguments is admitted by Wellhausen, although he strongly condemns the originator of it. "The author of the Book of Kings," he writes, "views the Temple of Solomon as a work undertaken exclusively in the interests of pure worship, and as differing entirely in origin from the sacred buildings of the kings of Israel, with which accordingly it is not compared, but contrasted as the genuine is contrasted with the spurious. It is in its nature unique, and from the outset had the design of setting aside all other holy places—a religious design independent of and unconnected with politics. This view, however, is unhistorical; it carries back to the original date of the Temple, and imports into the purpose of its foundation the significance it had acquired in Judah shortly before the exile."[2] We may add that to complete the whole *bouleversement* of our ideas, we are taught to regard all the so-called history of the Jews as a manufactured article assuming its present form under the influence of various redactors. Those who believe the legislation preceded the history have their fatuity thus exhibited to them. "The great antiquity of the priestly legislation is proved by relegating it to an historical sphere, created by itself out of its own legal premises, but is nowhere to be found within, and therefore must have preceded actual history. Thus (so to speak) it holds itself up in the air by its own waistband."[3]

The conclusions of the new criticism about the place of worship are drawn from comparisons between the different

---

[1] "Proleg.," p. 17. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 20, 21.
[3] "Proleg.," p. 39.

documents it has arbitrarily created; and we hope to show that they are utterly baseless. The opposition is thus drawn out by Wellhausen:

> The main Jehovistic law (he says), the so-called Book of the Covenant, contains (Exod. xx. 24-26) the following ordinance: "An altar of earth shalt thou make unto Me, and thereon shalt thou sacrifice thy burnt offerings and thy peace offerings, thy sheep and thine oxen; in every place where I cause My name to be honoured will I come unto thee and will bless thee. Or if thou wilt make Me an altar of stones, thou shalt not build it of hewn stones, for if thou hast lifted up thy tool upon it thou hast polluted it. And thou shalt not go up to Mine altar by steps, that thy nakedness be not discovered before it." Unquestionably it is not the altar of the tabernacle, which was made of wood and plated over with brass, nor that of Solomon's Temple . . . that is here described as the true one. On the other hand, it is obvious that a multiplicity of altars is not merely regarded as permissible, but assumed as a matter of course. For no stress at all is laid upon having always the same sacrificial seat, whether fixed or to be moved about from place to place; earth and unhewn stones of the field can be found everywhere, and such an altar falls to pieces just as readily as it is built. A choice of two kinds of material is also given, which surely implies that the Lawgiver thought of more than one altar; and not at *the* place, but at *every* place where He causes His name to be honoured will Jehovah come to His worshippers and bless them. Thus the law now under consideration is in harmony with the custom and usage of the first historical period—has its root therein and gives its sanction to it. Certainly the liberty to sacrifice everywhere seems to be somewhat restricted by the added clause, "in every place where I cause My name to be honoured." But this means nothing more than that the spots where intercourse between earth and heaven took place were not willingly regarded as arbitrarily chosen, but, on the contrary, were considered as having been somehow or other (!) selected by the Deity Himself for His service.[1]

But surely the passage in itself cannot bear the interpretation put upon it. It simply restricts the place of sacrifice to the site chosen by God. It has nothing to do with the number of such places. The tabernacle was not yet in existence; when it came into existence it would come under this law, and the usual explanation is quite as good as this newer one, viz., that the place chosen afterwards was first the tabernacle—or, at any rate, before the Ark—and afterwards the Solomonic Temple. That this passage, which speaks after all of only one altar, does refer to some well-known spot is supported by the command, in Exod. xxiii. 14 *et seq.*, for all the males to appear three times a year before God. It is not absolutely correct to say that "JE sanctions a multiplicity of altars," and to appeal to the patriarchal history in confirmation of the idea. That history deals with a different sort of religious life, the family life. The legislation of the Jews was for a nation which, according to the orthodox theory, was to be fashioned ulti-

[1] "Proleg.," pp. 29, 30.

mately to an actual unity of worship and faith through slowly evolving periods of history."[1]

The opposition between JE and D is thus declared by Wellhausen to be emphatic and material: "The Deuteronomic legislation begins (Deut. xii.) just like the Book of the Covenant, with a law for the place of worship. But now there is a complete change; Jehovah is to be worshipped only in Jerusalem and nowhere else." We have already drawn attention to the subtle error of Wellhausen, substituting Jerusalem for the vague phrase "the place which the Lord your God shall choose," and repeat the remark not to charge him with intentional deceit, but simply to show how naturally a writer lets fall a phrase that fixes his date, and how exceedingly able those ancient scribes must have been who imposed for so many generations on unwary readers with the local colour of the wilderness. We wish particularly to press the objection to its reception that this supposed discrepancy between JE and D must have presented at first, if the theory of its origin now under consideration were true. It was first discovered, we are asked to believe, under King Josiah, and instantly converted into a means of reformation under that king. Before that date it had been unknown. Was there no one amongst the old party to reply that the new document contained laws hitherto unknown amongst them, and contrary to what had been in force from the earliest time? Can we suppose that one, who on the supposition clearly foresaw and forestalled so many objections, allowed this discrepancy to remain on the face of the documents; and were all the nation so slow of perception that none resisted the assumption built on so strangely novel a document?

But we should deny any discrepancy between Exod. xx. 24-26 and Deut. xii. 5 to 14. The law that was sufficient in the wilderness would not be sufficient in the altered circumstances of the settled habitation in Canaan. It was forty years since it had been promulgated and acted upon by the representatives of the congregation, if not by all its individuals. But now the opportunities for idolatry and the inducements to it

[1] This would allow us to consider the "Book of the Covenant" to be a collection of traditional rules handed down from earliest times, and receiving the sanction of Moses. "These must have been old and accepted rules for the building of altars, and they are not inconsistent with the directions for the construction of the altar of the court of the tabernacle (Exod. xxvii. 1-8). There is no good reason to doubt that they were observed in the 'brazen altar,' as it is called, although no reference is made to them in connection with it. That altar, according to the directions that are given, must indeed have been rather an *altar case*, with a mass of earth or stone within, when it was put to use."—"Speaker's Commentary," *loc. cit.*; also Kalisch.

would be vastly multiplied, and it was absolutely necessary to secure an immunity from fancy rituals. This was secured by limiting sacrifice to the "place which the Lord shall choose;" and though it may please our modern critic to say that "by this only the capital of Judah can be meant," yet Jeremiah calls Shiloh "the place where God set His name at the first," and the Lawgiver was, we believe, ignorant of Jerusalem, as far as its future place in the history of Israel was concerned. And further, Moses distinctly orders that an altar should be built and sacrifices offered on Ebal, which at least shows that he did not consider it improper to build altars elsewhere than at Jerusalem.[1] In fact, the discrepancy between the two documents is one that is manufactured by the critics, and any apparent differences may easily be reconciled.

We are told that "the Priestly Code presupposes unity of worship, and transfers it, by means of the tabernacle, to primitive times." The Priestly Code rests upon the result which is only the aim of Deuteronomy. Everywhere unity of worship is tacitly assumed as a fundamental postulate, but nowhere does it find actual expression.[2] We would remind our readers that according to Wellhausen's theory the Priestly Code was composed in "the third post-exilian period of the history of the cultus," and that "it is proved that the tabernacle rests on an historical fiction," "and it is the copy, not the prototype, of the Temple at Jerusalem." We are, therefore, to admit that the Priestly Code is the successor of Deuteronomy. It has been held by many acute critics that the Priestly Code is the most ancient part of the Pentateuch, and certainly the idea of strictness of service at one central place culminates in D. But there is no valid ground for seeing growth in this matter, and it matters very little whether JE+PC+D, or JE+D+PC= Pentateuch, as far as development goes; but the old order is historically correct. Again we call attention to the curious way in which documents are dealt with in this theory. Nowhere, we are told, does unity of worship find expression in PC. We instinctively turn to Lev. xvii. 8, and read, "Whatsoever man there be of the house of Israel, or of the strangers which sojourn among you that offereth a burnt offering or sacrifice, and bring it not unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation to offer it unto the Lord, even that man shall be cut off from his people." But a couple of lines of print in the "Prolegomena" disposes of this objection—"the

[1] Deut. xxvii. 4-8. Of course if this is a post-exilic passage the argument from it falls to the ground; but this is the difficulty of contending with its statements: it can do what it will with its authorities. For a full and able note on Deut. xii. 4-15, see the "Speaker's Commentary."

[2] "Proleg.," p. 35 *et passim*.

small body of legislation, Lev. xvii.-xxvi., is the transition from Deuteronomy to the Priestly Code." It does not follow without exception that PC rests upon the idea of a state in which all ritual is a settled thing, for the story, as told in Numbers, which is put into this code by the critics, brings out a state anything but settled as to worship and its auxiliaries.

On this branch of the subject we think we have adduced sufficient evidence that the three strata of cultus and legislation are due to the dream of the critic, and can adopt the words of Wellhausen, with a slight difference of application—"A law so living, which stands at every point in immediate contact with reality . . . . . and which proceeds with constant reference to the demands of practical life, is no mere velleity, no mere cobweb of an idle brain," but is, as we have always been led to believe, the work of Moses, who was faithful in all his house. The other chief branches of objection are equally weak, and if carefully followed out in detail refuse to bear the interpretation put upon them.

FREDK. E. TOYNE.

Correspondence.

"THE HOUR OF COMMUNION."

To the Editor of "THE CHURCHMAN."

SIR,—Able and candid as is the article of Mr. Dimock in your last, I think he has exceeded greatly in his estimation of the force of two authorities, alleged by him in favour of non-fasting Communion—the *Teaching of the Apostles* and *St. Ignatius.*

These, he says, are "perhaps the most important witnesses in this matter," and, of the former, "it represents a state of things in the Church, or some portion of it, in which post-prandial or post-cœnal Communion was the ordinary rule and practice;" and "we see a scene of post-Apostolic times, and . . . the Eucharist partaken of by Christians (*sic*) after being *filled* with a repast (or as part of a repast) . . . which none will maintain to have been the meal of the morning."

I note that a *morning* meal would be no more allowed, in a question of fasting Communion, than one in the evening; but there is really *no* note of time in the Διδαχή, and so the whole of its two chapters—ix. and x.—*may* even be read of an *early* Communion.

But the force of the example, upon which so confident a conclusion is made to rest, is wholly in the words, Μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἐμπλησθῆναι, of which I will only remark that more than one interpretation is allowable (Rom. xv. 24), even though the words were in no special connection with their context; but in the Διδαχή they are in an indissoluble connection, which, I think, determines absolutely their special reference, and that is to the Eucharist, and not to any other "eating" whatever. The previous chapter contains the direction as to the "Eucharist," and this includes the Bread *broken* (κλάσμα), and forbids anyone to "eat or drink of the

Eucharist" unless baptized. Then follows chapter x., completing the direction, Μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἐμπλησθῆναι οὕτως εὐχαριστήσατε. . . . Is it possible to dislocate and separate the *one* subject of these two chapters, and to make the one speak of the Eucharist, and the other of some other "eating" or "filling," when the words in both chapters are literally the same? To do so, seems to me almost a paralysis of the interpretative faculty and of the critical function, notwithstanding that some scholars have so wrenched the probabilities of the case.

It is not enough to say (as Mr. Dimock quotes Dr. P. Schaff, in his *Didache*) "the Communion and the *agape* were then inseparably connected," for if this were as certain as it is open to question, the difficulty of construing τὸ ἐμπλησθῆναι of the *agape* would be not lessened, seeing that this word does not occur in either chapter, and that the constructional connection is restricted to the Eucharistic action, or to the elements, as alone spoken of throughout. My edition of the *Didache* (by Dr. Aug. Wünsche, 1884) confirms this view, by the translation, *Nachdem ihr aber vollendet habt* (*d.i. wenn die heilige Handlung vorüber ist*) *so danket also: Wir danken dir.* . . . "When the holy action is finished" is, in a note, varied by "after the use of the bread and wine."

Professor Swainson, in his "Greek Liturgies," p. xlix, gives the *Didache* and the Apostolical Constitutions in exact comparative connection, and the latter have the very probable, tolerable, and consistent reflex of the former in the words Μετὰ δὲ τὴν μετάληψιν, corresponding to the τὸ ἐμπλησθῆναι in the *Didache;* and that τὴν μετάληψιν has the technical sense of a sacramental reception will scarcely be denied. Nor if the words be only a "paraphrase" will they be the less forcible as a witness of an early interpretation, not favouring the confusion of the *agape* with the Communion.

Mr. Dimock's second authority, "strongly confirming" his view of the *Didache*, is the Epistle of St. Ignatius (ad Smyrn. VIII.), which says, "It is not lawful, apart from the Bishop, either to baptize or to hold an *agape*" (οὔτε βαπτίζειν οὔτε ἀγάπην ποιεῖν). It is not safe to assert confidently what is the exact force and reference of ἀγάπην ποιεῖν here; but it is certainly not the way to attain to a right sense of the words to look at them ever so hardly and long, *apart from their context.* Now the things forbidden in the context are not only baptizing and ἀγάπην ποιεῖν, but it is forbidden for anyone to *do anything* affecting the Church without the Bishop: and a valid *Eucharist* is declared to be that which the Bishop has charge of, or is by episcopal appointment. Then, lastly, follows the somewhat strange, seeming repetition, or special selection of two acts, by way of emphasis, which are affirmed to be Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Mr. Dimock insists that the "Eucharist" must be meant here, and not a love-feast; for if not, he says, we are driven to the conclusion that St. Ignatius "did not think it necessary to prohibit the celebration of the Eucharist without the Bishop, while he did feel it necessary to forbid a social meal—a *reductio ad absurdum.*"

Mr. Dimock plainly errs here from his oversight of the context. St. Ignatius *did* forbid a Eucharistic action, apart from the Bishop; and so there is no absurdity, and we are not forced upon "the only alternative" of supposing "that ἀγάπην ποιεῖν included the partaking of the Supper of the Lord."

I hope not to be thought presumptuous if I doubt that ἀγάπην ποιεῖν has any conclusive force here, either as to the Eucharist or the *agape.* The great names who have thought otherwise will surely forgive a modest doubt, when the question is less one of exact scholarship than of the general interpretation of the passage. My reasons for hesitation are (1) the fact that St. Ignatius has, in the chapter in question, before

spoken emphatically of the Eucharist, and a *repeated* mention of that is not easily accounted for; (2) that ἀγάπην ποιεῖν is nowhere else used for the Eucharist; (3) that the form of this expression is, may I say? suggestive of τὴν ἐλεημοσύνην ὑμῶν μὴ ποιεῖν, and ποιοῦντος ἐλεημοσύνην (St. Matt. vi. 1, 3), and *may* refer to some general Church action in "distributing to the necessities of the saints," such as the "daily ministration" (Acts vi. 1), which required to be under episcopal control. Such action, and the gatherings at stated times for baptism, would not unmeetly be selected for special mention together, as we find in the Ignatian text, and this would be no repetition of the previous order as to the Eucharist. Baptism, notably as administered in the early days of the Church, being the public admission of members at once, and mainly of adults, into the Church's ranks, and the distribution of the Church's contributions to its members, were matters of the earliest concern; and the latter, whether at some *agape* (when collections *were* made) or otherwise, would be a special matter of episcopal supervision—as, in fact, it was actually ordered in after days.

What the *agape* of St. Iguatius may have been is not without some doubt. What were afterwards known as *agapæ* fell into abuse, and the Council of Laodicea (fourth century) forbad any to be held in "basilicas or churches," using the very phrase of Ignatius, but in the Latin, "*Agapem facere;*" and this settled use of the term is some evidence that the Ignatian words were not meant to refer to the Eucharist. But neither this nor the mention of the *agape* by Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, and in the Apostolical Constitutions is decisive, as to the exact meaning of ἀγάπην ποιεῖν in Ignatius at an earlier date.

If it were absolutely certain that "In the Apostolic age the Eucharist formed part of the *agape*," it would be very reasonable to allege this fact in support of the argument that Ignatius had that in view, when writing within, say, seventy years from the example of the Corinthian Church (1 Cor. xi.); but strict evidence that this *was* the Apostolic use is wanting. The Eucharist is not named—nor proved to be referred to—by St. Jude when, some years after, he speaks of the "feasts of charity," and it is only an "inference" that the *agape* is referred to by St. Paul in 1 Cor. xi. 17. Whether the Apostle in verse 20 refers to the Eucharist or to some *agape*, is admitted by great authorities to be uncertain, though a current of opinion is in favour of both being the object of one meeting. I venture to doubt whether the Corinthians came together to "hold" what was afterwards strictly called an *agape*, but is not so named here, and whether that name has not been reflected backwards from later days to the action of the earlier Church. Is it not allowable to think that the Apostle's whole language and warning point rather to a total abuse and *misconception* of the character of the Holy Eucharist, as if it were essentially and only a *meal* partaken of in common? It is to this *false* character of the observance that all the fervour and weight of the Apostolic authority and inspired testimony are turned throughout the chapter. The Corinthians came together in such action as was not to keep *the Lord's* institution—the eating of His Body. They "despised the Church of God" by convivial, common, disorderly "feeding themselves without fear" (Jude 12). They came together in the church, but not for sacramental action and use, "not discerning the Lord's Body." How absolute is the distinction between a common meal and a sacramental reception: "Have ye not houses to eat and to drink in?" "If any man hunger, let him eat at home, that ye come not together unto condemnation"! And how is the retributive effect of this abuse and radical misconception enforced, "For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep"!

Looking at the whole record of the Apostle's action, his aim can scarcely be missed—to stop the intrusion of *any* non-sacramental eating in the church, and to affirm the true ideal of the Eucharist; and surely if any acknowledged authority and inspiration of knowledge could stop the mischief, St. Paul's would suffice. It is allowable to think the evil *was* stopped at once, and warded from re-entrance for a long period by the further "order" which he promised to promote and most probably *did* effect. At least there is no evidence of its recurrence till after Ignatius and the *Didache*. There is a strata of Church history, after the Corinthian scandal—for, say, seventy years—with no record save St. Jude's, and the external notice of Pliny. The former does not indicate a connection of the *agapæ* with the Eucharist, or give any hint of the time of their being held; but the latter, not uncertainly, gives both, and perhaps, at less than forty years' interval, may help to illustrate the hour of St. Jude's *agapæ*. Pliny determines the early dawning as the hour of the Eucharistic meeting, and also that the common meal or *agape* was *afterwards*, at an uncertain hour, after some delay.

Recurring to St. Paul's language to the Corinthians, I am unable, even with the great weight of Waterland's name, to see with him the difficulty of the Apostle's "quick transition" from the *agape* to the sacrament. In fact, the transition does not exist if the Corinthian abuse was not an *agape*, but a fundamental misconception, and a travesty of the sacrament. To the Apostles' thought there was really only one subject—our Lord's institution, with the false observance overshadowing it; and this thrown aside and cast out, the word of the revealed truth shone forth, to complete by divine contrast the condemnation of the evil perversion.

I hope it may be some justification for this restricted examination of Mr. Dimock's two special authorities that both have been my special attention, and the subject of comment in print long ago; and that the proper valuation of both is of real concern to the general argument, upon which I do not now remark.

Your obedient servant,
W. F. HOBSON.

TEMPLE EWELL, DOVER,
March 22nd, 1886.

To the Editor of "THE CHURCHMAN."

SIR,—I have to thank you for kindly allowing me to see Mr. Hobson's letter, and affording me space for a note on its contents.

For the importance of the subject, the letter deserves, and I hope will receive, a fuller and more satisfactory reply. But now, very briefly, as to—

I. The argument from the Διδαχή. I think the way may be cleared by two inquiries: (1) Could the words μετὰ τὸ ἐμπλησθῆναι have been naturally used of the Eucharistic service as altogether separate from the partaking of a meal? (2) Have we any warrant whatever for supposing that, as connected with a meal, it was ever connected with any other meal than a supper?

Some discussion on the meaning of the expression will be found in Schaff's edition, p. 60. See also note, pp. 194-5.

II. The language of Ignatius. The argument from the context, as anticipated (in part) by Bishop Pearson, has been ably and (as it seems to me) effectually dealt with by Bishop Lightfoot in a note (v. ii., s. i. pp. 313-4), the pith of which I have quoted on pp. 426-7 (Reprint, p. 10). But the whole of the note should be read, as well as the important observations on the subject in vol. i., pp. 386-7.

I have, however, noted, for correction in any future edition, some words which, I gladly acknowledge, might convey a misapprehension.

III. Mr. Hobson's interesting discussion of 1 Cor. xi., which will, I trust, receive due attention. I do not understand that it is questioned by Mr. Hobson that in the Corinthian Church the Eucharist was, in some sort, made to be a part of (or, by error, made into) a social meal, and that this meal was a *supper*.

Not but what, beyond this, Mr. Hobson's argument has an important bearing on the subject.

I will only add that, in speaking of Pliny as determining "the early dawning as the hour of the Eucharistic meeting," Mr. Hobson is inadvertently begging the question (not altogether an unimportant one) on which I have touched in my note on pp. 431-2.

Yours faithfully,
N. DIMOCK.

ST. PAUL'S VICARAGE, MAIDSTONE,
April 2, 1886.

Reviews.

A Dictionary of Islam. A Cyclopædia of the Doctrines, Rites, Customs, and Theological Terms of the Muhammadan Religion. By THOMAS PATRICK HUGHES, B.D., 1885. London: W. H. Allen and Co.

IF the reader expects to find in this review a blind and wholesale abuse of Muhammad and his doctrines, and an uncritical disregard of the great fact that one hundred and seventy-five millions at this moment adhere to this persuasion, he is mistaken. The subject is a very solemn one, and should be treated with solemnity. The writer has lived a quarter of a century in intimate acquaintance with Muhammadans. The servants who cooked his dinner and waited at his table; the coachman who drove his carriage; the horsemen who were his companions in his rides; many of the clerks and officials who engrossed his orders and transacted his business; the judges of first instance who presided in the Civil Courts; the Collectors of the State-Revenue; and the superintendents of the police stations were, in a very large number, followers of Islam, intermixed with an equal number of Hindus; and yet they were upright, trustworthy, and esteemed, full of affectionate interest, and entirely devoid of fanaticism. The Muhammadan nobleman or prince is a born gentleman, stately in his bearing, courteous in his expressions, and yet dignified and reserved.

The great leading error, disfigurement, and misfortune of a Muhammadan is simply this—*that he is not a Christian*. He has no idols to get rid of; no abominable customs, such as widow-burning, female infanticide, human sacrifices, or cannibalism, to be trodden down; his laws, his ceremonies, his customs, are reduced to writing, and in these latter days are printed. He is not ashamed of his past history, for his creed has filled a large page in the world's chronicles, overrunning large portions of Asia, Europe, and Africa. If the political influence of that creed is now on the wane, the propagandist power is by no means diminished. We must consider the phenomena of its existence with judicial calmness. It cannot be supposed that such a mighty factor in the world's history came into play without the special sanction of the Almighty. The promulgation of the doctrines of Muhammad is one of the greatest land-

marks in history. Human sacrifices, idolatry, and sorcery fell before the approach of Islam ; for there is found in its texts an expression of an everlasting truth, a rude shadow of the great spiritual fact, and beginning of all facts, "the infinite nature of Duty;" that man's actions never die, or end at all ; that man in his little life reaches up to heaven or down to hell, and in his brief span holds an eternity fearfully and wonderfully shrouded from his sight and conception. The doctrine promulgated was so simple that it could be understood at once, never forgotten, and never disproved; so consonant to reason, unassisted by revelation, that it seemed an axiom ; so comprehensive that it reached every human state, and embraced all the kindreds and races of mankind. "There is no God but one God." Simple as was the conception, none of the earlier religions, fashioned by human intellect, had arrived at it. There were no longer to be temples, altars, or sacrifices, or anthropomorphic conceptions, but a God incapable of sin and defilement, merciful, pitying; King of the day of judgment; one that heareth prayers, and will forgive, so long as the sun rises from the east; a God not peculiar to any nation or language, not the God of the hill-country, or the plain-country, of the Hebrew, the Egyptian, the Assyrian, the Hittite, or the Moabite, but the God of all, alone, omniscient, omnipresent, and omnipotent.

Much, if not all, of this grand conception had been borrowed from the Jews and the Christians, but it had been purged from the follies and degradations with which it had been overlaid in the sixth century after Christ, and it had never been so distinctly enforced, nor so extensively and endurably promulgated in such gleaming phraseology. It was, indeed, an indignant protest against the degradation to which the Syrian, the Nestorian, the Greek, and the Coptic Churches had fallen in their insane discussions about Homoousion and Homoioousion, and the awful mysteries of the Trinity, and the Divine Person of our Saviour. Until these latter days, when the germs of pure and healthy Christian belief are planted in every part of the world, where soil can be found ready to receive them, it had been given to no propagandist religion to find such immediate and vast expansion. It not only trod out the decaying and corrupted Christianities, but it passed beyond the bounds of the Roman Empire, the Euphrates, into regions to which the Christian religion had never reached, and extinguished for ever the ancient ritual of the Fire-worshipper, and pushed on beyond the Indus, to hold its own against the great Brahmanical legends of India. The Arab merchant carried it backward and forward, and still to this day carries it, over the deserts of Africa, giving it to black races as the first germs of civilization ; the Malay pirate carried it to the cannibals and head-hunters of the Indian Archipelago, telling them of the natural equality of man before God, the abolition of priestcraft, and the certainty of a day of judgment, and everlasting happiness or torment. These doctrines may have lost their youthful vitality, but not their truth. Over vast regions they have propagated themselves, and are still propagating, by the force of their own superiority, for there is nothing in the simple formula to stagger reason, or make large demands on intelligence and faith.

But much of the Paganism which it tried to supersede clung to its skirts ; being but a human conception, it had not the power to sound the depths of the human heart. And the heathen, when he accepts Islam, is not a changed man, a converted man, born again, but the same man with a new formula, and a new creed ; and a new law of commission and omission, but the same unrenewed heart. Then it was essentially an Oriental conception ; it was crystallized into a civil and criminal code,

which may have suited the Arab or the Oriental neighbours of the Arab, but was not susceptible of expansion to meet other wants, and other intellectual and social environments, of which its human framer in his limited knowledge had no conception. Herein is the Divine marvel of the Christian conception, fashioned, indeed, in an Oriental model, but capable of being adapted to every possible circumstance and state of culture of the human race. Thus it has happened that slavery and polygamy are rightly or wrongly deemed to be part and parcel of the Muhammadan faith, though among the fifty millions of Muhammadans in India slavery is absolutely extinct, and polygamy on the wane. Thus also customs such as circumcision, abstention from certain foods, formal prayer in a language totally unintelligible to the worshipper, prolonged fastings, and lengthy pilgrimages have survived into an age which has outgrown such ceremonious observances, which laughs at so large a husk round so small a kernel of doctrine, not likely to survive under the scorching heat of public opinion, and the unsympathetic contact of a nineteenth-century occidental civilization.

It would be a bad time for the Christian missionaries if any large section of a Muhammadan nation were to wake up to the fact that men's minds grow wider with the progress of the suns, and were to add monogamy to their existing practice of total abstinence from all spirituous liquors, were to substitute a careful study in the vernacular of the really grand and beautiful portions of the Koran for the vain repetition of incomprehensible Arabic formulæ; were to add purity of morals to their existing purity of dogma, and to live the lives of decent Europeans, adding a hatred of slavery to their present hatred of idolatry and worship of images, whether by Pagan or Roman Catholic; if to this they added a careful study of the Old and New Testaments, which are in fact as sacred to them as to us, and still failed to be converted, and, setting their faces like flint against Christian interpretations of the Bible, were themselves to send out missionaries of a Reformed Islam, they would indeed become a factor in the mission-field of a most formidable import. We may congratulate ourselves that they are as we find them. Many a Hindu is better than the religion which he nominally professes, and his religion is incompatible with education and civilization. But every Muhammadan is far worse than the religion which he nominally professes; he never really understands it, for it is never taught in its integrity. If uneducated, he knows nothing beyond the dogma, the rite of circumcision, the daily prayers, and the annual fastings; if he is educated, he is either a debauchee, breaking the very laws of the faith which he professes, or he is notorious for his fierce prejudices, his intolerant notions, his entire deficiency of philosophical and historical acumen, and is despicable as an antagonist. The Muhammadans in Turkey or Persia will talk wildly about the impossibility of a follower of Islam submitting to any law but that of the Koran and its accompanying traditions; but we in India know that fifty millions live very happily under Anglo-Indian codes of law without a particle of Muhammadan law, except what relates to marriage and inheritance, and that a very large section of converted Hindus, or Neo-Muhammadans, reject even that fragment, and prefer to retain the Hindu laws in these particulars.

The book before us is one of extreme importance; the very best authorities admit that it is an accurate representation of Muhammadan doctrine and practice, and a most complete one. It errs on the side of exceeding rather than falling short of the requirements of the case, and there is a want of relative proportion of the length of some of the notices to the importance of the thing noticed; and the book would have

been handier if it had been of less bulk, and more available to students in being cheaper. Still it is a noble and important work, but it is the work of an able and experienced Protestant missionary, whose knowledge of living Muhammadanism, as distinguished from knowledge acquired from books, is confined to the Afghans of Peshawar, thorough ruffians, and totally uneducated. The vision of a missionary, in itself of necessity narrow, by the requirements of his holy calling, is, in this case, further contracted by the limited contact with the professors of the religion which he describes.

He states in his preface that his "intention is to give, in a tabulated form, a concise account of the doctrines, rites, ceremonies, and customs, together with the technical and theological terms, of the Muhammadan religion." We must admit that his task has been fully accomplished, and that no missionary would be justified in entering upon the Muhammadan field of labour who has not studied this volume. It cannot be too thoroughly understood that the epoch for the missionary, pious yet ignorant, self-consecrated but untrained, is past. The brave savage does not inquire into the strength of his antagonist, but the skilful general takes no forward step until he has obtained every possible information of the enemy's strength, resources, and tactics. It is fair to state that the author's statements are remarkably sober, fair, and impartial.

His method of treating the subject appears to be very judicious. A dictionary is not pleasant for continuous reading, and is by its alphabetical necessity disjointed; yet for any *pro re natâ* reference, commend me to a dictionary. We all know what time is lost hunting through tables of contents, or running the eye down an unscientific index. Having selected his topics, the author usually begins his notice by a quotation from the Koran, supplementing it by quotations from the traditions and esteemed Muhammadan commentators; to this he has added quotations from European scholars. Now this is very conscientious and exhaustive treatment. A kind of doubt must, however, seize the mind of the reader, whether the author is acquainted with the Arabic language beyond spelling out the Koran, and whether he is acquainted with any of the European languages; for the subject of Muhammadanism has been so elaborately discussed by French, German, and other Continental scholars, none of whom he quotes.

This opens out another question. Muhammadanism extends from the Western Provinces of China, right through the Continent of Asia, as far north as Kazán on the Volga, to the Mediterranean and Black Sea, over some portion of Europe, over a considerable portion of Africa, as far as the Straits of Gibraltar eastwards, and southwards as far as Zanzibar on the East Coast, and the Basin of the Niger on the West. The author's personal knowledge of the practice of Muhammadans is restricted to a small province in Afghanistan across the Indus, and the people of the Panjáb. The area is enormous, but the circumstances are extraordinarily different of portions of these religionists. There are millions under the rule of England, France, Holland, and Russia, strong Christian Governments, which know how to make themselves obeyed. There are millions under the rule of the Sultan of Turkey, the Khedive of Egypt, the Shah of Persia, Muhammadan sovereigns, yet still exercising a reality of substantial rule. There are millions under barbarous systems of government, such as the Chinese Local Governors in Chinese Tartary and the Province of Sechuen, the Amir of Afghanistan, the Amir of Khiva and Bokhara, the Sultan of Morocco, the Sultan of Zanzibar, and the Imam of Muscat; and there are millions without any semblance of Government at all, such as the inhabitants of the islands of the Indian Archipelago, the nomads of Arabia, and of the great African Sudán,

which extends from the Nile to the Niger, and beyond to the Atlantic. There is a great diversity in their practice and their tenets. The Indian and African would naturally be deemed very bad Muhammadans from the contact of the corruption of their Pagan neighbours ; the Egyptians are notoriously bad Muhammadans, the Malays are only skin-deep converts.

The author, in his preface, hopes that the book will be useful (1) to the Government official called to administer justice to a Muhammadan people ; (2) to the Christian missionary engaged in a controversy with Muhammadan scholars ; (3) to the student of comparative religions ; (4) to all who care to know the leading principles of thought of 175 millions of the human family, who have adopted the tenets of Muhammad.

To the fourth class a consecutive treatise would have been more agreeable. It is difficult to conceive anyone who had not some direct duty to, or relation with, Muhammadans deliberately reading a dictionary such as this. The third class would certainly consult the original documents, which are readily and amply available. The second and the first class will furnish the readers of this book. There are Christian missionaries at this moment in Turkey, Egypt, Algiers, Morocco, at Zanzibar and on the Niger, in Persia, Afghanistan, and India ; and they will have to use caution in reading this book, or they may be misled. Much of it is applicable to Muhammadanism in its early period, but totally inapplicable now. Some of the precepts of the Koran are about of as much practical value as the Book of Leviticus. The convert accepts circumcision, repeats the Fatihah, abjures pork, and enjoys entire freedom of matrimony up to four, and that is pretty well all that he knows of his new faith. Even the Maulawi themselves are found to be grossly and ridiculously ignorant. The missionary who has mastered the Koran, either in its original or a translation, and who studies Mr. Hughes' book, will be as much above the level of the knowledge of the people among whom he dwells, as one of the Old Testament Company would be among the nominal Christians of towns in England.

There remains the first class, the Government official. This can apply only to the official in Anglo-India. The wildest enthusiast can hardly imagine a Muhammadan Kadi, or Wali, or Kaimmakam, or the petty local tyrants of Morocco, Persia, and Afghanistan, or the Sheikhs of the independent nomads, or the French préfet, or juge, or the Russian military commandant, studying Mr. Hughes' book. But the official in Anglo-India is just the very person to whom the book would be useless ; at least such is the opinion of one who was judge and magistrate over Muhammadans for more than twenty years. The Code of Positive Criminal Law and Procedure, and the Code of Civil Procedure, has made a clean sweep of Muhammadan laws, and, as already stated, with the exception of the two reserved subjects of marriage and inheritance, civil decisions follow the precedents either of English or Roman law. When we consider the topics of slavery, eunuchs, evidence, oaths, and land, they are only of antiquarian interest, as the people of India have learned to do very well without them. Nor would the article as to the position of women in Arabia have any possible bearings on the circumstances of women in India, which are so totally different.

Two long articles have been introduced into the book from the pens of two distinct authors, which it would have been better to have omitted, as they have added to the bulk of a work with which they have nothing in common. One is an essay on Arabic writing, by Dr. Steingass, an interesting subject no doubt, but not in the least connected with the Muhammadan tenets and customs. As a fact it existed in Arabia before the time of Muhammad, and is by rules of strict induction derived from

the old Phenician alphabet, of which the earliest monument is found in the Moabite Stone. This character is used by all the literary classes of Hindus in Northern India, and by the Christians in Syria and Egypt. It is by no means a sacred alphabet, nor is it one restricted to religious uses. Still more unnecessary and improper was the introduction of a long article on Sikhisim, by Mr. Pincott. The Sikhs are only Hindu sectarians, and it might as well be said that a Baptist was not a Christian as that a Sikh was not a Hindu. It has no practical value at all, and has not even the merit of being a correct representation of existing facts. The Sikhs hated the Muhammadans with a deadly hate, and, while they were in power in the Panjáb, desecrated their sacred buildings, confiscated their religious grants, and oppressed them in every possible way. Whatever fusion Nanak may have dreamt of, disappeared when Guru Govind commenced his career of vengeance upon his Muhammadan oppressors, whose dominion in India he helped to annihilate.

The articles upon Jesus Christ, the Jews, Jerusalem, the Koran, Tradition, Muhammad, and Muhammadanism, are of permanent value. So also are the notices of Scripture personages, such as Moses, Joseph, and others, from the Muhammadan point of view. The account of the great festivals, the Id-ul-Azhá, Id-ul-Fitr, and the Muharram, is satisfactory. There is nothing in the Koran to connect the first-named festival with Ishmael, but it is held by Muhammadans to have been instituted in commemoration of Abraham's willingness to offer up his son as a sacrifice, and the son thus offered was Ishmael, NOT ISAAC. The writer of this paper once ventured to remark to an excellent and worthy native judge, that Abraham was ready to offer up Isaac, NOT ISHMAEL. With a kind and pitying smile he corrected me, remarking that a Muhammadan only could know the truth of what Abraham, *who was himself a Muhammadan*, did. An entire absence of historical and geographical knowledge is an important factor in an inflexible faith in a false religion.

No one who has travelled in India and Turkey can have failed to remark how totally different the mosques of the two countries are. The mosque of Sultan Suleiman at Constantinople has no resemblance whatever to the Jama Masjid of Dehli, and still less to the famous mosque of Cordova in Spain. Mr. Hughes, in his article on Masjid, "the place of prostration in prayer," points out the necessary feature of a mosque, the Mihrab, which indicates the direction of Mekka, and therefore the direction pointed in Cordova is precisely the reverse of the one pointed at Dehli, and the Mimbah, or pulpit, from which the Khutbah, or Friday oration, is recited. In the Court there are conveniences for water for purposes of ceremonial ablution. The Imam leads the devotions, the Muazzin calls to prayers from the lofty gallery of a Minaret; there is great dignity and solemnity and lifting up of heart in the whole ceremony. The writer of this notice has stood by the side of the Muazzin in an oasis of the great Suhara, in the centre of crowded cities such as Constantinople, Damascus, Cairo, Banaras, and Dehli, as he sounded out over the houses far below, above the city's din, the cry that "God is great, and that there is no God but one God. Come to salvation." The long rows of kneeling figures in the interior is an imposing sight. The worshippers are terribly in earnest, and the object of their worship is the Supreme Creator of the universe, and the prayers, which are uttered in Arabic, though utterly unintelligible to the person praying, convey the noblest form of adoration clothed in the most majestic and sonorous phraseology.

Two more articles deserve notice, as they touch upon the relation of the religion of the Muhammadans to the Civil Governor. From the Mimbah in the Masjid the Khutbah, or Friday oration, is delivered.

Tradition hands down that Muhammad used frequently to deliver a Khutbah, fresh and new, and not the studied and formal oration which has now become the practice. It is the old story. In the beginning there were men gifted with the power of speech, and they spoke the living thoughts that coined themselves into golden words as they rose from the heart to the lips. A generation followed, less spiritual and less vivid, who read their own written sermons. To them succeeded a generation still more lazy and stolid, who read the stereotyped words of others, but not necessarily the same formula. Mr. Hughes gives two or three selected Khutbah, and if only the hearers could understand them, they would be profitable for instruction and reproof; but it is doubtful, whether they are intelligible in countries, where Arabic is still the vernacular in a somewhat modernized dialect and pronunciation, and are totally useless in other countries. Besides the great sin of ritual accompanies them, in that they are chanted in non-natural and sing-song tones, and the best Khatib was he who whined and intoned the best. The Prophet himself, with an astuteness which marks that superior intellect which he no doubt possessed, has left on record that "the length of a man's prayer and the shortness of his sermons are the signs of a man's common-sense."

According to the best traditions, the name of the reigning Khalifah ought to be recited in the Khutbah, and this gives an interest to the article on that word. As the Pope of Rome and the Lama of Tibet, so also the Khalifah claims to be vicegerent of God by spiritual succession; but the question arises, "Who is the Khalifah?" The lineal descendants of the Prophet and the line of the Koreish were soon exhausted, and the fact that in Muhammadan countries the name of the Sultan, or Amir, or Shah is substituted for the Khalifah has a deep significance. In British India the expression "Ruler of the Age" has been substituted by loyal Muhammadans. The claims put forth by the Sultan of Turkey to the spiritual headship of Islam, beyond his own dominions, is shadowy in the extreme, and may be puffed away. The Sultan is by the male line a Turk from the regions north of the Oxus; by the female line he is a Circassian of the regions of the Caucasus. His ancestor, Bajazet, was defeated at the battle of Angora, and carried captive in an iron cage by Timúr the Lame, the ancestor of the great dynasty of the Great Mogul of Dehli, which came to an end only in the year 1857 in the furnace of the Indian mutinies. The mighty monarchs who ruled over India would have laughed at the idea of any Imam in the Masjids of their kingdoms praying for anybody but themselves. Mr. Hughes sets out the absurdity of the claim of the Sultan of Turkey very clearly and very accurately. The assumption of the title by anyone not of the Arab Koreish tribe is undoubtedly illegal and heretical, and is a mere gasconade of the irrepressible Turk.

One incidental advantage of the publication of such books as this, and the valuable works of Sir W. Muir, and the German and French authors, is that the attention of the champions of the Christian faith should be called to the phenomena presented by this great Antichrist. It is not judicious to paint Muhammadanism and its followers with colours that are not true. They are by precept and practice total abstainers, and so far on a higher platform than the average Christians. Polygamy is the exception. The present Sultan of Turkey and the Khedive of Egypt present an example of monogamy in high places. Slavery was the disgrace of Christians in the time of many of us still alive, and it will die out in Muhammadan countries before the present generation has passed away. Toleration of other religions was ever the rule of Islam, whatever may be said to the contrary, as is evidenced by the existence of the fallen

Churches in Western Asia, and North Africa, and by the great Hindu nation in India. The present century will possibly see the extinction of the last Muhammadan independent kingdom; at any rate their claws have been cut, and they supply good subjects, and excellent public servants, and respectable members of society in India. The important point is that just as Paganism, and Nature worship, and the Brahmanical religion, and the Buddhist must and do fade away under the scorching light of education and contact with other nations, Muhammadanism, on the contrary, becomes stronger and more refined. It has nothing to fear in its essentials from science; it never claimed miracles; it appeals to a book, the most wonderful uninspired literary monograph that the world ever saw, and the everlasting truths which, intermixed with much irrelevant and incoherent matter, that book contains. As the Christian writers, inspired by God, drew freely upon the contents of the Jewish books, so Muhammad was audacious enough to pervert both Christian and Jewish books to his own false purposes, giving a new colour and interpretation to the composite amalgam. A "Comforter" was promised (John xiv. 16) under the term παρακλητος. The Muhammadan would read παρακλυτος, which being interpreted is "Muhammad"—"the one that is praised." The names of Abraham, the Friend of God; Moses, the Word of God; Jesus, the Spirit of God, are coupled with terms of deep respect with the name of Muhammad, the Prophet of God. In Isaiah xxi. 7, the prophet sees in his vision "a troop of asses and of camels." The Muhammadan interprets this as a prediction of Jesus, who came riding on an ass, and Muhammad on a camel. The name of our Lord is never uttered or written without expressions of respect. Once purged of the dross of ignorance and spiritual deadness, and set free from the defilement of Paganism, which clings to the skirt of its clothing, refined by such men as the Wahhábi revivalists, who, as Mr. Hughes justly says in his article on that subject, are the Protestants of Islam, it will stand out as the religion of pure and elevated Monotheism, with a code of the strictest morality, not ignoring but overshadowing the tenets and books of the Jews and the Christians; and in the next generation men of the stamp of Saiyed Ahmed, of Alygarh, will be sent out as missionaries of Islam all over the world. It is well, therefore, that the leaders of the Christian world should understand with what a power they may have to cope in the twentieth century—one more dangerous than Agnosticism, Atheism, and Indifferentism, because it simulates the truth, and is severely Propagandist.

The good Muhammadan so many times a day prostrates himself, and coldly and proudly bandies words with his Creator, with a perfect belief of a future state. He feels no sense of his own sinfulness, or any need of a mediator, because, as far as he understands the law of his Prophet, he has fulfilled it. He has abstained from liquor and swine's flesh; he has not violated the sanctity of his neighbour's family; he has repeated the prescribed prayers and kept the prescribed fasts; he has cursed the infidels and idolaters, and is satisfied. In India he is on excellent terms with the Hindu idolater, and in Turkey on equally good terms with the Jews and the Christian idolaters, for he justly considers that the worship of images and pictures in the Roman and Greek Churches is in fact the εἰδωλολατρεία which is forbidden by the Torah, and the Anjil, and the Koran; by Moses, Jesus, and Muhammad. It might be thought by sincere Christians that such a bending or broken staff of faith and hope would fail him miserably at the last moment of his life, but it is not so. He goes to his death with an assurance of Paradise, whether that death is peaceful or violent, for he is quite sure of his inheritance, having taken his Prophet at his word. Innumerable instances have occurred of this grand and dignified submission to fate. The disgraced Pasha accepts the bow-string without a

murmur ; the mutinous soldier proudly looks his last unquailing look as he stands under the gallows ; the Cadi, detected by his sovereign in the practice of the very vices which he was commissioned to prevent in others, and condemned to death, made no palliation, and asked for no mercy, but told the bystanders to throw open the shutters and tell him from what quarter of the heaven the sun is rising, and bowing his head to the sabre, he said, "The Prophet has written that so long as the sun rises from the east, so long God will have mercy on His creatures." It is the same in ordinary private life. The writer of this notice one day missed in his audience-chamber a much-respected Muhammadan official, wise and gentle, well-informed and faithful. At evening his son came, and reported the death of his father ; and described simply how, when he felt his end near (and it came suddenly), he asked to have a copy of the Koran placed in his hands, and then covering his head with a sheet he calmly awaited the coming of the angel of death, Azrail. Now, if all Muhammadans were of this type, their conversion would be impossible. Under any circumstances, the progress must be slow, and so it has proved. Whole islands of degraded Nature-worshippers may be gathered in, while one Muhammadan is being converted. The study of the sacred books of the Book-Religions of the world, which are now revealed to us, may convince us how serious the task is that lies before us, but none the less is it our duty to grapple with it. Poor weak men must sow the seed ; it is the Lord alone that gives the increase. We accept His great commission. We believe in the promise that accompanied it.

ROBERT CUST.

March 31, 1886.

The Endowments and Establishment of the Church of England. By the late J. S. BREWER, M.A., etc., etc. Third Edition, revised. Edited by LEWIS T. DIBDIN, M.A., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law. London : Murray, 1886.

This third edition does not seem perceptibly to differ from the second of 1885, in which the slight but valuable additions of the editor appear. Mr. Dibdin, in the preface, makes due acknowledgment to the Principal of King's College, London, which Professor Brewer adorned while living, and to the Bishop of Chester, for "helping him through more than one difficulty." As a considerable memorial of one who was very chary of his published writings, the work of Professor Brewer has a special value. His lectures dwell no doubt in the memory of his pupils, and his personal influence in their characters. The present writer was one of a small society of London curates many years ago, which met statedly at King's College, and not seldom enjoyed the benefit of his lucid guidance in Church history and kindred subjects. The present historical *résumé* of the growth, adventurous existence, and survival to this day of the Endowments of the Church is the freshest and most vigorous reading one will easily meet with on the subject, It touches incidentally many larger subjects of national character or social usage with a light hand, thus relieving dryer matter, as in the following :

The Anglo-Saxons were careless and slovenly ; their whole system of government, judicature, and defence uncertain, slow, and unwieldy. Never prepared to meet their enemies, they were easily conquered, and easily disconcerted, notwithstanding their personal bravery, when opposed to a nimble and active adversary. On the other hand, the Normans, systematic and precise, decisive in their movements, costly in their dress, nice in their food, sumptuous in their buildings, carried the same love of order and the same discipline into all the relations of life. The face of the nation was as rapidly changed as a country lout, under the hands of a recruiting sergeant, with some trouble and grumbling, is transformed into a smart,

clean-shaven, and orderly soldier. The whole country became like a great garrison. The Church itself could not escape from the same influence, and was not allowed, if it could.

The miserable pittances on which most of the clergy have always subsisted has been the disgrace of the parochial system, and is so at this day. Another abiding blot is the extortion to which they are subjected in parochial rates. The average clerical income is put somewhere in this volume at about £300 a year. If that is meant to be the spendable net balance, it is probably far too great, and £200 would be nearer the mark. Repeated notices of attention called to the degradation and humiliation to which they are exposed in consequence are recorded in these pages. In tracing the origin of endowments two main sources are carefully distinguished, the central and the local. The former lay in the Bishop and his attendant society of monks or clergy, or both, who gradually acquired by donation and bequest an amount of property variable in value as time went on; the other lay in the owner of the soil, who, as no endowment could be permanently made for the support of the clergy save from the land or its produce, was naturally the pillar of the social system. The bishop might cause a church to be built, and attach property to it, and appoint a priest to serve it. The feudal system had not in England yet come in, but the current of events was working towards it, and nearly all social influences were in sympathy with it. Thus the bishop might carve a *beneficium*—analogous to a feudal estate, and thus going under the same Latin name (whence our modern "benefice")—out of the estates which were at his disposal, and attach it to a church, with duties, not, as in the feudal parallel, of military, but spiritual service. Or the local owner might make his own arrangements, perhaps with a monastery, to send one of its clerical members as its vicar, itinerant or resident; perhaps (and more frequently as the monastic houses were wrecked by the Danes after 787), as the founder of a parish church with local endowment on his own domain, with which the parish would then be conterminous. For these purposes the heptarchical king, or even the "Bretwalda," seems to have counted as a private founder only; and thus the famous "donation of Ethelwulf" is briefly dismissed as having no bearing on the question of tithe in its general aspect.

Curiously, as *we* might think, yet under the social conditions very naturally, the right of sepulture is reckoned as one constant source of revenue and endowment. Not only "mortuary fees" but "bequests of land and other property" followed consecrated ground, and the church "with cemetery annexed" is, in Canute's laws, distinguished from that not so provided.

The earlier chapters of this book are invaluable, for their historic range and pithy conciseness, to the defender of Church endowments as the Church's own; not given *by* the nation, not given *to* the nation, and therefore in no practical sense "national" property. A brief note on p. 79 sums up this part of the argument thus:

> So far from the nation having built or endowed churches in its corporate capacity, the people of England generally contributed neither to one nor the other. They enjoy the use of churches built for them either by the Bishops or the lay patrons, to which they have not been called upon to make any contribution in the way of tithes or endowments.[1]

As regards the question "How the Christian religion was taught?" *i.e.*, to Englishmen (chap. iii.). It is almost amusing at the present

[1] See also a qualifying note on p. 121; in which a mention of the London churches rebuilt after the Great Fire, by a duty on coals, statutably legalized, might also properly have found place.

day to find Augustine's mission monopolizing the entire area of view, and Canterbury as the sole centre mentioned. Iona and Lindisfarne are as though they were not. This is true to the old-fashioned standpoint. In the days when Professor Brewer read occasional papers to the London curates, none of us (I can answer for one) knew or heard of anything of St. Columba, St. Aidan, or St. Kentigern, on whose labours in the northern group of counties so much light has of late been thrown. As regards Mr. Dibdin's notes, he might have been less sparing. Some of us would like to have known what light he, as a lawyer, could throw on the origin of legal "corporations sole." Of his two annotations on this part of the volume that on tripartite or quadripartite tithe, in which he corrects a venerable error into which Professor Brewer had fallen on page 135, is perhaps the most valuable. The question how the bishops obtained their seats in the House of Lords (really in the Great Council of the nation) was also, perhaps, worth, in the second part, a brief annotation. We are merely told that they sit "as bishops," *not* "as barons," which reminds us of a question in the famous "Pickwick Papers": "Sir, do you see anything to object to in these stockings, *as stockings?* But the question is perhaps soluble on the same grounds as that other famous one *in foro domestico*, how the apple of a dumpling "got inside" the crust.

As regards the "Establishment," Professor Brewer is quite sure that it dates from the Reformation, *i.e.*, the period from Henry VIII. to Elizabeth, and his editor thinks there is "little doubt that" his view is historically unassailable. Strange, rather, it might seem that in order to "establish" a thing we must "reform" it. To ordinary minds this involves the position of the cart before the horse. But the word "establish," *e.g.*, "stablish," has changed its meaning in popular usage since James I.'s time, when (see the Canons of 1604) it seems to have been first applied to the Church. Its then force is precisely represented in the text of the Authorized Version (1 Peter v. 10), "stablish, strengthen, settle you," where it represents closely the Greek στηρίξαι = "make solid or stedfast." And the notion in that first usage undoubtedly was that of giving power of resistance against "exterior persons" (King Henry's own phrase), by whose agency it had been much harassed and disturbed before (see p. 190). It had previously possessed that power in a degree, witness the many examples of resistance to Papal aggression before and after, and notably *at* the Conquest. Thus far we are in close accord with the Professor and his editor. But he seems to place the essence of "establishment" in "control" (p. 283), and goes on further to specify "control" by "the State," gliding thus imperceptibly through the force of language to a later notion, viz., "the *State*," and educing a theory of State supremacy. Now the universal language of the older Reformation Statutes is "the King," and even down to Elizabeth's time there was no authority of the State, nor was the term even distinctly applied to the civil or secular power. This is plain from the title itself of Elizabeth's Act of Supremacy "restoring to the Crowne thaūcyent jurisdiction over the State Ecclesiasticall and Spuall, and abolyshing all Forreine," etc. Thus "the State," so far from appearing as a distinct power, is here used for the Church itself, with distinguishing epithets. This brings us to the point that "control" always implies the reciprocal duty of protection. And this forms, on the Professor's view, a grave difficulty. For protection, save the equal protection of law which all sects enjoy, is absolutely gone; they, therefore, who rest the essential or chief part of "establishment" on "control," have to show cause why the same amount of control—nay, a greater amount, or at any rate an *arbitrary* amount (resting for its *quantum* on the sole discretion of the civil power), should be kept up now

that its correlative of protection is gone. Queen Elizabeth would send a warning to her faithful Commons, that "no bills concerning religion shall be . . . received . . . unless the same should be first considered and liked by the clergy" (D'Ewes' Journal, May 22nd, 1572). But *nous avons changé tout cela*. Let Mr. Brewer speak :—

> It [the State] always has been supremely indifferent to the interests of the Church itself, so far as any active aid, support, or pecuniary assistance was concerned. Denunciations of the Church may be heard on all sides in the House of Commons; bitter reproofs of real or supposed transgressions or neglect of its duties; trenchant exposures of its weakness and shortcomings; but aid, encouragement, and support, never.

And presently, after dwelling on the task which evergrowing multitudes impose, and which "outstrips the resources and machinery of the Church," he adds :

> But the nation, as such, has never touched the burden with so much as its little finger. It has left the Church, alone and unaided, to struggle with the rising flood of immorality, atheism, and discontent. Yet but for these efforts Government would have been paralyzed, and commerce engulphed in revolution. Establishment, then, is *wholly a benefit on one side*, and that on the side of the nation, not of the Church.

The words which we italicize need no comment, and make counter-argument superfluous.

One is a little surprised to see the title "Head of the Church," expressly renounced by proclamation and abrogated by statute over three centuries ago, resumed on p 219. One odd thing which strikes a reader of Part II. is, that Mr. Brewer never seems to contemplate the case of Scotland, where the maximum of "Establishment" is combined with such an absolute minimum of "control" as to be wholly evanescent. He had only to look across the Border to find grave reason for doubting the soundness of his theory. His editor, p. 289, remarks that "Establishment in Scotland is not the same as Establishment in England," but does not pursue the subject further, and startles us by announcing, p. 294, that "the Constitutions of Clarendon affirm" an "appeal in every case from the Ecclesiastical Courts to the Crown." This seems either to go against the text of the cited authority, or else to use it in a wholly novel sense. That text is, "From the Archdeacon process must be had to the Bishop; from the Bishop to the Archbishop; and if the Archbishop should be slack in doing justice, *recourse* must be had to the King, by whose order the controversy is to be settled *in the Archbishop's court*" (Matt. Paris, *sub ann.* 1164, Concil. M. Britt., i. 435). Surely he must read "appeal" into "recourse."

Mr. Dibdin has some very sensible remarks on p. 289 on the "indefinite number of intermediate positions" between "Establishment" and "Disestablishment," until it seems "impossible to discern the difference." Through many of these "intermediate" points our Church seems to have passed, and some might think her three parts or more "disestablished" already. Such were the repeal of the Test Act, the abolition of Church Rates, the diverting from the Church the care of educating the nation (most important, although least formally obvious, of all), and, before all these, the reducing "the King" to a chiefly ornamental position in the commonwealth, instead of that robust personality which filled the Crown at the time of the Reformation settlement, and in which the Church vested that supremacy which alone she acknowledges. These considerations open questions too lengthy for discussion here.

HENRY HAYMAN.

In the *National Review* appear two very interesting papers, "Canvassing Experiences," by CLARA, Lady RAYLEIGH, and "An Irish Churchman's View of the Rights of the Laity," by Dr. JELLETT, Archdeacon of Cloyne. We shall return to the latter.

Church Reform, by the Rev. ALFRED OATES, Vicar of Christ Church, Ware, is a vigorous and timely little pamphlet.

Thoughts for Holy Week, by Bishop OXENDEN (Hatchards), is an excellent little volume.

In *Blackwood*, a good number, Mrs. Oliphant's article on the late Professor Tulloch—including, as it does, two letters from the Queen—will be read with much interest.

In the *Monthly Interpreter* (T. and T. Clark), Canon Rawlinson continues his valuable "Introduction to the Book of Isaiah."

The April number of the *National Church* has its usual share of articles and intelligence. We may be pardoned for quoting a portion of one of its review-notices:

The Churchman, Volume XIII. (Elliot Stock), is before us. It contains a remarkable number of high-class papers, among which may be specially mentioned those by Chancellor Espin on Church Reform, by Mr. John Shelley on Free Education, and by Mr. Gilbert Venables on Church Defence. . . . The record of "The Month" in each number is remarkably well done. . . . There is at once a vigour and a reasonableness about *The Churchman* which should make it acceptable and useful to all classes of Church readers.

THE MONTH.

MR. GLADSTONE'S Home Rule project has at length been disclosed. It is very generally discredited, in the House and in the country, and, we are happy to believe, is doomed. Lord Hartington and Mr. Goschen, agreeing with Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Trevelyan, protested against it. The most influential newspapers have sharply criticized it, and, as a rule, condemned it.[1]

The protest of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland, against Home Rule, is most remarkable.[2] The Presbyterians have protested with equal warmth.

[1] To-day (the 12th) the *Times* says: "Happily there is no longer any room for doubt as to the judgment of the country on a project which if the Prime Minister were not habitually secluded from contact with the wholesome air of public criticism, and if he had not separated himself from all his former colleagues except those consenting to be puppets of his will, could never have been laid before Parliament. The central characteristic of the scheme—the establishment of an Irish Parliament with entire control over administration, legislation, and taxation—is now thoroughly understood. The apparent limitations are seen to be illusory."

[2] The Bishop of Limerick moved the first resolution as follows:—"That we, the Bishops, clergy, and laity of the Church of Ireland assembled in this general Synod from all parts of Ireland, and representing more than 600,000 of the Irish people, consider it a duty at the present crisis to affirm our constant allegiance to the Throne, and our unswerving attachment to the legislative union now subsisting between

The communications from the beneficed clergy in Munster, Leinster, and Connaught, published in the *Record* on March 19th, have been discussed in newspapers throughout the country, and have done good service.

The death of Mr. Forster, it is well said, has deprived us of a statesman of rare gifts just at the moment when they were most wanted. He knew well what "Home Rule" meant.

The Bills dealing with Tithe have been referred to a Select Committee. Some just and wise method of putting an end to the extraordinary-tithe "scandals" will, we trust, be found.

Mr. Leatham's Patronage Bill was read a second time, we gladly note, without a division. The Hon. Member's speech was admirable; and the debate, on the whole, was encouraging. There seems to be a growing opinion that as regards the abolition of the sale of next presentations and the restriction of the sale of advowsons, to say the least, something will be done this session.

The death of Archbishop Trench has been followed by many interesting tributes of respect. The Rev. Francis Chenevix Trench survived his younger brother, the Archbishop, a week.

With sincere pleasure we record the appointment of the Rev. J. F. Kitto to the important living of St. Martin-in-the-Fields, made vacant by the death of Prebendary Humphry.

The rejection of Mr. Finlay's Bill concerning the constitution of the Scottish Kirk, by the Parnellite vote in alliance with the Government, called forth a letter to the *Times* from the Duke of Argyll. "'Real and genuine independence,'" says his Grace, ". . . we have got it, and we mean to keep it, and to defend it from Parnellites, from Secularists, from English Nonconformists, and from Anglican Erastians."

The protocol appointing the Prince of Bulgaria Governor of Eastern Roumelia for five years was signed at Constantinople on the 5th. Against the domineering influence of Russia, and the jealousy of neighbouring States, Prince Alexander has contended with spirit, ability, and no small measure of success.

In France the Senate has consented to the banishment of religious teachers from elementary schools.

The Germans celebrated the ninetieth birthday of their revered Emperor with suitable rejoicings.

Great Britain and Ireland. And we make this declaration not as adherents of a party, or on behalf of a class, but as a body of Irishmen holding various political opinions, following different callings, representing many separate interests, and sharing at the same time a common desire for the honour and welfare of our native land."—Sir Frederick Heygate seconded.