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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

JULY, 1886.

ART. I.—THE SIX DAYS OF CREATION.

IT is altogether marvellous what a prodigious amount of weak and wild writing, from first to last, has been put forth, professing to have for its object the elucidation of the First Chapter of Genesis. The one point on which friend and foe alike are observed to be at one, is the assumption that they know a vast deal more about the matter than Moses can have possibly known. We are constrained to avow that on this head we entertain a widely different opinion. The latest interpretation of Gen. i. is from a friendly critic: claims to be the result of half a century of meditation on the subject; and professes to have been invented in order to set men's minds at rest, and especially to build up those "whose faith is put to trial" by the contents of that chapter. *How* an utterly unsupported, grossly improbable, and perfectly gratuitous conjecture, which represents the sacred narrative as a weak fabrication, destitute of one particle of truth,—how *this* is to "build up" unbelievers it is hard to imagine.

The way out of the supposed difficulty, according to Professor Pritchard,[1] is to suppose that at some remote period—"remote beyond our knowledge"—somebody "fell asleep, either in the gloom of evening or in the light of noonday," and dreamed a dream. On awaking, he "called his friends and his neighbours together; and sitting under his vine, or in the shade of his olive or his fig-tree"—(as if these circumstantial details could be of any manner of relevancy to the learned Professor's contention!)—"recounted his wonderful dream." The tale, "after the manner of the East, sped its rapid way from city to city, until at length the vision lost its name, and became a Tradition." "To me," proceeds Dr.

[1] In the *Guardian*, Feb. 10, 1886, p. 211.

Pritchard, "this interpretation wears the appearance of so much probability that I accept it as an approximate fact."

We venture to reply that an improbable conjecture unsupported by a particle of evidence, can *never* emerge out of the region of shadows. But, indeed, it so happens that the present hypothesis is contradicted by the known conditions of the problem. The story of the dream (we are invited to suppose) "*after the manner of the East*, sped its rapid way from city to city, until at last *it became a tradition.*" And yet (1st), This kind of rapid locomotion is after the manner of *the West* —not at all of the East. And next (2nd), There happens to be no such tradition elsewhere in existence of a great creative Week. It is absolutely confined to the author of the first page of the Bible, and of the Fourth Commandment. This discovery, to say the least, is inconvenient—if it be not fatal—to the learned Professor's hypothesis.

The expressions which occasion offence, and suggest this wild imagination as an escape from all difficulties, are such as those concerning the Sun and the Moon, which (it is assumed) are spoken of as "*created* on the fourth day." And yet, nothing whatever is said about their *creation.* Moses does but state that GOD caused the earth to bring forth the green herb—created the vegetable kingdom, in short—before He appointed "the greater light" to shine by day, "the lesser light" to shine by night.

We shall perhaps be asked, But Moses *seems* to say—does he not?—that the Sun and the Moon were both *created* on the fourth day. What then? We claim that "to *seem* to say" is one thing: actually "*to say*" (*i.e.*, to *mean*) is quite another. Every day of his life the Professor of Astronomy *seems* to say that the sun actually "rises," and actually "sets." But does he *mean* it? Ask him, and he will reply, "Do you suppose I am mad?" Why then is not the same indulgence to be extended to Moses which is freely allowed to Dr. Pritchard? The words of the Astronomer mislead nobody. They claim to be interpreted—they *must* be, and they *are* interpreted—by the known facts of the case. *That* sudden (and sublime) interjection (in ver. 16),—"the stars also," surely may not be strained into an announcement that all those myriad orbs of light which sow the midnight heavens were *the creation* of the fourth day. The Author of revelation, in the first chapter of Genesis, is bent on something of a loftier kind than teaching children the elements of Astronomy. Accordingly, since no one capable of formulating an objection to Scripture can possibly require to be told that, without the Sun, the Earth could not so much as retain its place in the universe for an instant, Almighty GOD evidently deemed it superfluous to guard His

meaning, when (speaking phenomenally) He caused the record of the fourth day of creation to contain the statement that "God *made two great lights.*" Elsewhere, we read that our SAVIOUR "made" (ἐποίησε) twelve Apostles (St. Mark iii. 14); but we have never heard it suggested that those words mean that He there and then created them, in the sense of *making them out of nothing.* "Let there be lights in the firmament of the heavens to divide the day from the night," is the record in verse 14. What else can it be but *a summoning into view* of the two great luminaries?—"And let them be for signs and for seasons, and for days, and years," proceeds the record. And what else is this but the assigning to Sun and Moon of *new functions?*

Yes, eclipses, which serve to mark the date of events, and whereby the timepiece of History is corrected: the periodical phases of the Moon, which regulate the months, and determined for GOD'S ancient people the commencement of their solemn seasons: sunrise and sunset, which enable men to distinguish day from day; and lastly, the punctual return of our planet to the self-same point in space from which it started just a year before, whereby the largest division of time is everywhere effectually reckoned off by the inhabitants of our globe—all these are functions of Sun and Moon which clearly can only be proclaimed with reference to *Man.* Until Man was made upon the earth, such things were not, nor in fact could be. So that, in brief, we are, as it were, led by the hand to discern in the very terms of Genesis i. 14-19, nothing more than the summoning into view of the greater and the lesser light, and the assigning to them a new office, with exclusive reference to *Man.*

To return then to Dr. Pritchard, and the objections which he brings against Genesis i. as an authentic narrative, we are constrained to point out that this eminent person, notwithstanding his great mathematical attainments, seems to have unaccountably lost sight of such elementary facts of Sacred Science as the following: (1) That the Author of Genesis (*and therefore, of course, of the first chapter of Genesis*) is a perfectly well-known person—a famous writer named "Moses." (2) That the authorship of the Pentateuch does not rest (like the authorship of the first two Gospels) on tradition, but is vouched for by our SAVIOUR Himself (St. John v. 46, 47). (3) That it happens to be a matter of express revelation that, although to His prophets GOD did sometimes make Himself known in a vision, or spoke to them in a dream, "the LORD spake unto Moses face to face, *as a man speaketh with his friend.*" "My servant Moses" (saith He) "not so. *With him will I speak mouth to mouth*" (Exod. xxxiii. 11; Num. xii.

6, 7, 8). (4) That when the ground is preoccupied in this way it may not lawfully be invaded as if it were unclaimed territory; in other words, that it is simply monstrous to treat the authorship of Genesis as if it were an open question.

And yet, notwithstanding all its wildness and inconsistency, the hypothesis before us has at least *this* convenience, that it furnishes us with common ground in any discussion with Professor Pritchard. The field of discussion is happily narrowed, inasmuch as we find ourselves agreed that the "Six Days" of Genesis i. *mean* six days, and no other thing.

I. But then it is certain that not a few eminent persons hold a widely different opinion. They choose to assume that in this place "Six Days" must mean six indefinitely long periods of Time. *Why* they take so extravagant a liberty with a statement which is quite intelligible as it stands, they have never condescended to explain. Their hypothesis certainly meets no admitted necessities of the problem which Genesis i. opens up. Thus, there is no reason for supposing that the first indefinitely long period of the history of our planet was one of aqueous vapour, irradiated by light;[1]—the second, a corresponding long period throughout which our present atmosphere was superimposed on a world of waters;[2]—the third, a corresponding long period during which the present configurations of moist and dry were established, and the vegetable kingdom had its beginning;[3]—the fourth, a corresponding long period during which Sun, Moon and Stars came to view.[4] And yet unless these are four *ascertained facts*, men are even without pretext for turning "days" into millions of years. If it is done out of consideration for the great Creator —to speak plainly, if men have invented the "long period" hypothesis in order to give ALMIGHTY GOD more time for the creation of plants, fishes, birds, etc.—they are respectfully assured that He requires no such indulgence at their hands. But, in fact, this assumption of theirs—for an assumption it is —is simply inadmissible, being inconsistent with the plain language of the record which it professes to explain or explode.

II. That the word "Day" is sometimes employed in Scripture (as in the familiar speech of mankind) with metaphorical license, is undeniable[5]—but wholly beside the present contention. The question before us is but this, *Has the word "Day" been so employed in Genesis i.?* It has not, I answer;

---

[1] Gen. i. 2-5. [2] *Ibid.*, verses 6-8. [3] *Ibid.*, verses 9-13.
[4] *Ibid.*, verses 14-19.
[5] Consider Gen. ii. 4; St. John viii. 56; St. Luke xix. 42; 2 Cor. vi. 2, etc.

or rather, it cannot have been: and for the following considerations: (1) Immediately after what is told us concerning "the light" in verses 3 and 4, and in the same breath with the announcement that "the evening and the morning were *the first Day*," the memorable revelation is made that "GOD called the light—*Day*," and the darkness, "Night."[1] So that, in this chapter the continually recurring word "Day," cannot be intended to signify a vast tract of time, embracing an indefinite number of years; but must indicate the period comprised within a single revolution of the Earth on its axis. Note further (2), That in this same chapter, six successive days are introduced to our notice; and in order that there may be no mistake about the matter, each one of these "Days" comes before us furnished with its own "evening" and "morning." We do not ever, neither does the Bible ever, speak thus of long tracts of time; but we always *do* thus speak of ordinary days. We cannot, in fact, more clearly express our meaning. But above all (3), As if to make doubt *impossible*, the Fourth Commandment establishes the writer's intention in a manner which does not admit of evasion. To man, GOD says, "*Six days* shalt thou labour and do all thy work," but on "the seventh day . . . thou shalt not do any work." "FOR *in six days* the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day."[2] Here, the transactions in Genesis i. are not only declared to have been extended over an ordinary week of days, but the mysterious reason *why* they occupied a week of days emerges into prominence also. There is no ambiguity *here*. Neither is there room left for error or accident; in other words, "the human element" has been jealously excluded: for "the tables" whereon these words were written are declared to have been "the work of GOD; and *the writing was the writing of* GOD, *graven upon the tables*."[3] Now, for GOD to impose on Man the duty, after labouring for six days, of resting on the seventh day, *because* that He Himself on one memorable occasion did the like, were plainly unreasonable, if GOD did *not* do the thing which He is so declared to have done. Have those who take it for granted that the "*Six Days*" of Creation must be explained to mean something different—have these men duly considered that Genesis i. purports to be a pure revelation? and will they venture to deny that the Almighty *may* have seen fit to distribute His creative work over six days? Everyone must see more than one excellent reason why He *should have done* so. But it happens to be a revealed fact that He *did*. With what

[1] Gen. i. 5.
[2] Exod. xx. 9-11.
[3] Exod. xxii. 16. Compare xxxiv. 1.

show of reason, of decency rather, can it be pretended nowadays that the thing is incredible? A sufficient reason, we insist, is easily assignable *why* the present order of things should have been introduced to the notice of mankind in this particular way; namely, by the solemn enactment of the *Week* (with a view to the institution of *the Sabbath*), as a division of time.

Believe only (and we are constrained to believe) that the Sabbatical rest of every seventh day is, in the CREATOR'S account, a supreme necessity for Man; and there has been discovered a fully sufficient reason *why* the present order of things should be solemnly ushered in with such a narrative as that found in Genesis i. Years, months, days may be safely left to take care of themselves. The *weekly* account, not so! Whereas a single revolution of the Earth on its axis—a single revolution of the Moon round the Earth—a single revolution of the Earth round the Sun; whereas *these* establish the daily, the monthly, the yearly division of Time, far otherwise does it fare with the *Week*. The religious observance of one day in seven is a positive ordinance, and must be established by a grand decree of the CREATOR, which Man shall be evermore powerless to gainsay or to set aside. Behold, it is *proclaimed* by the Fourth Commandment (Exod. xx. 8-11); and behold, it is *authenticated* by the primæval record of Creation! Now, Genesis i. is very severe, very unadorned prose. It purports to be, and it undoubtedly is, history in the strictest sense: *revealed* history, and therefore *true* history. It claims to be, and it certainly is, the history of six ordinary *Days*.

III. But if we are right in our contention that the great Six Days spoken of in the first chapter of Genesis denote an actual Week of Days which happened nearly 6,000 years ago—then it follows inevitably that all those curious objections with which the Professors of Geological Science habitually assail the Mosaic record of Creation, fall to the ground. We are saying that all speculations as to whether the "nebular hypothesis," and an "incandescent Earth," and a certain "order of succession" in the præ-Adamic creatures, are reconcilable with this and that verse of Genesis i., become purely nugatory. An accomplished gentleman of celebrity, writing on this subject, "supposes it to be admitted on all hands that no perfectly comprehensive and complete correspondence can be established between the terms of the Mosaic text and modern discovery. No one, for instance," he adds, "could conclude from it *that* which appears to be generally recognised, that a great reptile-age would be revealed by the Mesozoic rocks."[1] No one

[1] The Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone in the *Nineteenth Century*, January, 1886, pp. 9, 10.

indeed. But then, is not the very expectation that anyone *could* so conclude, essentially unreasonable? *Who*, in his senses, looks for Cyclopean masonry in a cottage built by his grandfather? or speculates on the possibility of finding a crocodile of the Pharaohs in the ditch at the back of his garden?

IV. Let us be allowed briefly to explain what we conceive to be the attitude of the majority of well-informed Divines towards the department of knowledge indicated in the foregoing paragraph. So far from receiving with incredulity, much less treating with levity, the speculations of those naturalists who make Geology and Palæontology their profession, we listen to their teaching with the profoundest interest, and receive their lawful decrees with the most submissive deference. We regard the Professor of this department of knowledge as Nature's High Priest. It is his special function to enlighten mankind in a department of human knowledge concerning which, but for such help, men neither know, nor can expect to know, anything at all. Scripture reveals nothing concerning the Universe during the præ-historic period, except the fact that GOD was its Creator. The rest, the same GOD hath left, in His infinite wisdom, for the exercise of human intelligence, and in order to furnish His rational creatures with materials for observation and study.—Let us be further allowed, in briefest outline, to indicate the relation which the cosmogony of Genesis i. bears to the mysterious Past of his little globe which GOD hath given us to inhabit. It is a matter which seems to be marvellously little understood by the generality of readers, whether of the Book of Nature or of the Book of Life.

V. GOD hath revealed Himself to His rational creatures partly by His WORKS and partly by His WORD. These two are supplementary the one to the other. In order to acquaint reasoning Man with the nature of His doings on this Earth of ours throughout the unnumbered ages of remote præ-historic Time, He hath with prodigal liberality furnished him with the testimony of the rocks: in which, laid up as orderly as in the shelves of a cabinet, are to be surveyed countless specimens of His own creative skill. Those rocks, by their superposition and structure, witness to a degree of antiquity for our planet which entirely defies arithmetic, as well as to a history which almost baffles conjecture. But, from a diligent study of the extinct forms of vegetable and animal life thus deposited and preserved in the earth's crust, something has been confidently predicated—(*but only within the last hundred years*) —concerning the order and sequence of those remote cycles of Creation, as well as concerning the probable conditions of

our globe during the periods when those plants grew and those creatures lived upon its surface. "Hundreds of thousands of animal species, as distinct as those which now compose our water, land, and air populations, have come into existence and died out again, through the æons of Geological time which separate us from the lower Palæozoic epoch."[1] . . . And thus much for the revelation which GOD hath made to us concerning Himself in His WORKS. These, be it observed, are the special province of the Natural Philosopher. He is the historian of præhistoric Time—the interpreter of its obscure records.

VI. GOD'S WORD claims to be the articulate expression of His mind and will, as well as the inspired record of His providential dealings with His rational creatures from the day in which He "made Man on the earth" until now. THE BIBLE, (for that is the name by which we designate the other great instrument whereby GOD hath revealed Himself to mankind), commencing with the briefest possible recognition of the antecedent history of the Universe—(it is effected in the single oracular announcement, "IN THE BEGINNING GOD CREATED THE HEAVEN AND THE EARTH")—enters abruptly on the history of a Week of Days, on the sixth of which Man was created, and on the seventh of which GOD desisted from the work of Creation. As much as need be said has been offered already[2] concerning those days, and the recorded work of each. A pure Revelation—the narrative contained in Genesis i. lies altogether outside the province of the Palæontologist, for it purports to be the history of events which took place less than 6,000 years ago. To what extent the Author of Genesis—in describing the succession of the creatures in this, the latest cycle of Creation—shall be found to have described an order corresponding with that which Philosophers conjecture was also the order observed by the great Creator during the ages of the remote Past,[3] is a matter of little importance to the Natural Philosopher, and of none to the Divine. Such a coincidence, though it might reasonably have been expected, cannot by any means be claimed as necessary. But in one other far more important particular, the Geologist is invited to note that the accuracy of his own observations is strikingly confirmed by the record of Revelation: namely, with respect to the comparatively recent appearance of Man upon the earth. Man is never found in a fossil state in any of the

---

[1] Professor Huxley in the *N. C.*, December, 1885, p. 857.

[2] See above, p. 245 to p. 247.

[3] This irrelevant discussion fills many pages in recent numbers of the *N. C.* As, in the December number for 1885, and the January number for 1886.

Earth's earlier strata. In this way, be it remarked in passing, GOD'S WORD and GOD'S WORKS not only illustrate, but sometimes even mutually supplement, one another. That either should ever contradict the other, we hold to be a thing incredible, seeing that they both alike proceed from Him Who is the very Truth itself.[1] It remains to point out that as the interpretation of GOD'S WORKS is held to be the special province of the Philosopher, so is GOD'S WORD, and the interpretation thereof, held to be the special province of the Divine.

VII. Speaking therefore as a Divine, let the present writer be permitted to declare that never, since he seriously gave himself up to these studies, has he been able to see any special difficulty in this, the first chapter of the Bible. As he reads the record, it bears the impress of GOD'S finger in every part: overflows with divinest teaching; is big to bursting with mysterious significance and beauty. It is greatly *in advance* of the old world's knowledge, instead of lagging behind it. Nay, as *he* reads the record, it is as much in advance of the wisdom of the new world as of the old: for, what else but one perpetual rebuke to "Darwinism" is *that* constantly recurring declaration of the SPIRIT, that GOD made every creature "*after his kind*"? . . . . Those two great "lights" of which Moses speaks are here called "light-holders" rather, "luminaries" in short: a word plainly teaching that Sun and Moon are "receptacles" only, not original *sources* of Light. St. Paul actually designates saintly persons by the same name (φωστῆρες, Philippians ii. 15), because they shine with lustre derived wholly from Him Who is the fountain of Light.—By causing the earth to bring forth grass, herb, fruit-trees on the third day, and reserving for the fourth the manifestation of "the greater light," a sublime and most concerning truth is inculcated in this first chapter of Genesis: viz., that the fecundity of "Nature" does not depend on any generative power in the Sun, but is altogether the result of the decree of the great Creator.—On the other hand, "Light" is declared to have been the work—or rather the wonder—of "the first day," for a reason which will be apparent to anyone who will recite to himself Genesis i. 3, 4, 5, and (in close succession with these verses) St. John i. 4, 5, 7, 8, 9; xii. 35, 36, 46. "*That was the true* light," says the beloved disciple (speaking of our SAVIOUR) "which lighteneth every man that cometh into the world." "*Very*" or "*real*" (ἀληθινός) is the epithet he bestows upon Him.—And what else, do men suppose, is pro-

[1] St. John xiv. 6. They are the words of the great Creator: for consider St. John i. 1-3. Hebr. i. 2, etc.

phetically referred to, and mysteriously anticipated, by Genesis i. 3, 4, 6, but the Resurrection "on the first day of the week"—(*τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων*, note the idiom!)—of Him Who habitually discoursed of Himself as "*the Light of the World*"? Will it not be His awful prerogative, at the Last Day, "to divide the light from the darkness"—as on the First Day of Creation? And is it not because the Incarnate Word ("the *true* Light," as we have heard His Apostle call Him) was very Goodness, that "light" is singled out from all the other creatures for that solemn sentence of approval, "And GOD saw the light that it was *good*"? . . . It was on the sixth day that the First Man was created—a prophetic anticipation that on that same day of the week "the Second Man" would taste of death, and thereby become "the beginning of the Creation of GOD" (Rev. iii. 14).—Then further, What more significant than the threefold cadence of the announcement (in ver. 27) of Man's Creation? ("So GOD created Man in His own image. In the image of GOD created He him. Male and female created He them.") Was it not a Divine anticipation of the threefold chime of the angelic hymn (St. Luke ii. 14) on the night that CHRIST was born? . . . *What*, lastly, more clearly prophetical than the Sabbatical rest from the work of Creation on that very day in which our SAVIOUR rested in the grave from the work of Redemption?—And let it be carefully noted how significantly from the record of that seventh day is withheld the statement with which every other of the six days is dismissed (namely, that "the evening and the morning" made up the day), in token that it is a faint adumbration of the "rest" (the *σαββατισμός*, as St. Paul phrases it, in Heb. iv. 9) which "remaineth for the people of GOD;" seeing that (according to the strong asseveration of St. John the Divine) "there shall be *no night* there" (Rev. xxi. 25; xxii. 5).—Nay, refer back to the opening statement in verse 2, viz., that preliminary to the work of Creation, "the SPIRIT of GOD moved" (*brooded*, that is, *like a dove*) "on the face of the waters." How exquisite was the fulfilment of that typical "brooding," when, at the Baptism of Him Who was to "make all things new" (Rev. xxi. 5), to "create new Heavens and a new Earth" (Isa. lxv. 17; 2 Pet. iii. 13; Rev. xxi. 1), "the HOLY GHOST descended in a bodily shape *like a dove* upon Him" (St. Luke iii. 22) as He stood in Jordan! And when "the old world" (2 Pet. ii. 5) had been submerged by a "flood of waters," and a fresh beginning had to be made, does not *the dove* again come to view? Such persistency of imagery is surely a striking note of fixedness in the Divine purpose; and surely it was *meant* to be significant also! . . . Shall the present writer be deemed wanting in intelligence if he solemnly

insists that the Mosaic record of Creation seems to him full to overflowing of the sublimest Gospel teaching? But (as was shown above) it is full of the best philosophy as well; aye, and of sound moral guidance also. By withholding the sentence of approval from the second day till the middle of the third, *what* is so plainly inculcated as the lesson that, in GOD'S sight, no unfinished, no incomplete work, is "*good*"?

VIII. Now, it is absolutely *nihil ad rem* that, in reply to what goes before, we should be told by the Geologist, "I really do not see it. You talk unintelligibly to me. I deny every word of your exposition of Genesis i." "Very likely," is our rejoinder. "*That* is because you, who have never studied Divinity, know absolutely nothing at all about the matter." It ought not to require in fact to be formally stated, that it is in the highest degree desirable throughout the present discussion that the Divine and the Philosopher should keep within their own respective provinces; that either of them (to speak plainly) should be supremely careful *to mind his own business*. It is not for the Divine to dispute with the Palæontologist about the records of the præ-historic ages, or to deny any of the well-ascertained facts of Geological observation. He does but render himself ridiculous if he pretends to dogmatize in a province where he is *plane hospes*—a province which is wholly external to his own. And what is to be said of the Philosopher who invades the mysterious province of the Divine? We venture to warn him that he will inevitably talk nonsense, if he does. . . Let us proceed, however.

IX. The use which Man has made of the liberal provision thus devised by the great Creator for his edification and delight is suggestive, certainly. Whether it be calculated to furnish "*Homo sapiens*" (for so, we observe, Dr. Huxley styles Man, to distinguish him, we presume, from some other "*Homo*" unknown to such ill-informed mortals as the present writer) with any grounds for self-congratulation, let "*Homo sapiens*" himself declare. Throughout upwards of *fifty-seven* centuries the Book of Nature, though always lying wide open before his eyes, had been by him surveyed to so little purpose that its contents, in more than one important department, had been overlooked completely. Within the last hundred years, as if awaking out of sleep, he has suddenly become aware of his own incredible blindness, and of his own consequent grievous loss. The Truth has at last dawned, rather has flashed upon him, that in respect of that part of the Book of Nature which relates to the Earth's crust, realms of surprising interest and wonder have been freely submitted to his ken, of which, until yesterday, he did not so much as suspect the existence. We are assured, on competent authority, that since the year 1832,

"not only a new world, but new worlds of ancient life have been discovered;"[1] discovered somewhat as poker and tongs are discovered before the fire. Man learns that he has but to use his eyes, multiply his observations, accumulate the evidence which universal Nature furnishes, and he may acquaint himself with many a bygone world; may become as familiar with their strange furniture and uncouth occupants as with the plants and reptiles in his garden, the fishes and birds on his table, the animals in his farmyard. Now, that until yesterday this page of the wide-open Book of Nature should have been to Man as a history written in an unknown tongue, is quite strange enough; yet is it *as nothing* compared with the strangeness of what has next to be related.

X. For surely it were obvious to go on to inquire concerning Man—Has he then been rendered humble by the discovery of his own blindness through so many centuries of years? Has any public acknowledgment been made of a dulness of apprehension which to himself may well be inexplicable? And his words concerning Human knowledge, have they ever since been "wary and few"? . . . On the contrary. The Natural Philosopher so plumes himself on his recently acquired lore, that he will scarce tolerate that Knowledge of some sort shall exist in any other quarter. He arrogates to himself "Science" as his own exclusive province; and informs the world that outside this province all is "imagination, hope, ignorance."[2] To read his remarks about "*Science* and Religion," "*Science* and Faith,"[3] and the like, one would really suppose that, besides sublimely ignoring that Mathematics, Astronomy, Geometry, Chemistry, Music, Metaphysics, Language, are "Sciences" likewise, the Natural Philosopher had forgotten that there is such a thing as "*Sacred* Science" as well—a Science which, inasmuch as it concerns itself chiefly with the written Revelation which GOD hath made to us concerning Himself, must of necessity be accounted the "Scientia scientiarum;" must perforce be recognised as the very Empress of all the Sciences. As for "*Religion*," does he not know that it is but Divinity viewed on its practical side? The term may not be used to cover the several branches of Sacred Science, of which the loftiest is "Theology." This, however, by the way. We had a supremely strange thing to relate, and it follows.

XI. The last impertinence of which the youngest of the Sciences has been guilty is certainly the strangest of any. She has taken it into her head that it is her function to invade

[1] *N. C.*, December, 1885, p. 850.
[2] *N. C.*, December, 1885, p. 859.
[3] As in the *N. C.*, December, 1885, pp. 850, 859.

the province of Divinity, and to assail—*the Bible.* Her plea is that certain of its statements have reference to physical phenomena, of which (she assumes) its Authors can have known nothing. Does she consider that the CREATOR of universal Nature, that GOD Himself, is held to be the true Author of Scripture,—that the Bible claims to be a Revelation made to Man by GOD? "The Bible" (she asserts) "was not meant to teach Physical Science." Has then the Professor of that Science been at the pains to acquaint himself with the marvellous structure, history, contents, of the Book of which he speaks so confidently? How, I venture to ask, does he *know* what "the Bible was meant to teach"? Surely, whatever things the Bible *actually teaches*, it is reasonable to assume that the same Bible was *meant* to teach! . . . I proceed to offer a few words on this great subject which shall be explanatory, and (it is hoped) will be found useful by those who sincerely desire to learn.

XII. That it is not *the primary object* or *special purpose* of the Bible to instruct mankind in Physical Science is, I suppose, universally admitted. *That* is precisely the reason why its language concerning natural objects is popular, general, phenomenal. Such expressions as "the heavens and the earth," "the herb yielding seed," "luminaries in the firmament of the heavens," "every winged fowl after his kind,"—show plainly enough that He who employs them is *not aiming* at what (by Natural Philosophers in the nineteenth century) is styled "scientific" precision. In the meantime, this method of handling things natural affords no pretext for *disbelieving* what is delivered concerning them. It does not follow that a physical fact may be lawfully disputed *because* it is discoursed of in a book of which the special purpose and primary intention is not to teach "Physical Science."

XIII. In all fairness let two admissions be loyally made with reference to this subject. The first (1), That the points at which the respective domains of Sacred and Physical Science interfere with one another are few. The second (2), That wherever extraordinary Scriptural statements are made concerning things natural, those statements are of the nature of *revelations:* by which I mean that the wonders discoursed of must have remained unknown to mankind for ever, but for what is found related in the Word of GOD. The "Six Days" of Creation furnish an apt illustration of what is intended. It is a marvel concerning which, of necessity, mankind must have been ignorant for ever, had not the mystery been categorically revealed.

XIV. One other colossal and most concerning *Physical* fact there is, about which, apart from Revelation, the world could

never have known anything at all; but concerning which, in His Word, GOD hath seen fit to be singularly communicative—to be minute and particular in a high degree. I allude to the Creation of MAN; and of Woman out of Man (Gen. ii. 21, 22). The deliberation with which Man was created, of which a solemn record is preserved in the first page of the inspired Word (i. 26):—the intention of the Creator therein, namely, to make Man in *His own image* after *His own likeness*:—the gift of dominion over all creatures at once solemnly conveyed to Man:—the fact that the Protoplast was "formed of the dust of the ground;" and that, in order to his "becoming a living soul," GOD "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life" (ii. 7):—nothing, I say, of all this was to have been so much as suspected, apart from the particular record contained in Scripture. Add, the prophetic oracle which Adam pronounced at sight of his spouse (ii. 23, 24),—words which were solemnly re-syllabled by the Author of Creation when He "was made flesh and dwelt among us" (St. John i. 3 and 14); and by Him were made the ground of the sanctity of the marriage tie (St. Matthew xix. 5; St. Mark x. 7, 8);—and we seem to have reached the very height of wonder. But it is not so. This is not nearly all. The LORD GOD having formed out of the ground "every beast of the field and every fowl of the air, brought them unto Adam *to see what he would call them.*" It follows—"And whatsoever Adam called every living creature, *that was the name thereof.*" The lecture, therefore, in Natural History which the Protoplast then and there delivered was such an one as the world hath never listened to since—no, nor will ever listen to again. That there may be no mistake about this matter, the record is repeated: "And Adam *gave names to all cattle*, and to *the fowl of the air*, and to *every beast of the field*" (Gen. ii. 19, 20). Adam, therefore, came into the world a Philosopher. Inspired was he at his creation with more than human wisdom. He recognised the natures of the creatures when he saw them, and described their natures in their names,—as when he "called his wife's name *Chavvah*" (that is *life-giver*), "because she was the Mother of all living" (iii. 20). Completely furnished Philosopher as well as divinely inspired Prophet—created in the image, and after the likeness, of GOD (i. 26; v. 1.)—our first father Adam is in himself the gravest rebuke imaginable to our modern Professor. In the words of a witty Doctor of our Church—"An Aristotle was but the rubbish of an Adam, and Athens but the rudiments of Paradise."[1]

XV. Now, the Bible—beginning as it does by describing

[1] South's *Sermon* ii. ("Man created in God's Image"), i. 55.

particularly the Creation, and immediately afterwards the Fall of Man—is only to be comprehended by one who will be at the pains to bear steadily in mind that the two sets of writings of which it is composed relate respectively to the ruin of our Nature in the person of Adam, and to its restoration in the person of CHRIST. St. Paul puts this briefly when he proclaims that "as in Adam all die, even so in CHRIST shall all be made alive" (1 Cor. xv. 22). Hence again that saying of his, "*The First Man* is of the earth, earthy; *the Second Man* is the LORD from Heaven" (ver. 47). In other words, "Adam and CHRIST are *the two roots of Mankind:* Adam as in a state of Nature, and CHRIST as in a state of Grace."[1] The earlier set of writings presupposes the latter; the latter set exclusively recognises the earlier. They may not be severed. Their unity is complete. Let it further be noted that Genesis itself may not be dismembered or disintegrated. Every subsequent page of the Book pledges itself to the authentic character of its earliest chapters. A first and a second decade of Patriarchs establish the world's Chronology from the creation of the Protoplast until the birth of Abraham (Gen. v. and xi.). After which, as curious a piece of network as is anywhere to be found in History, carries our exact knowledge of dates down to the death of Joseph (Gen. l. 26). The narrative so coheres, that to establish a breach in it anywhere is impossible. The primæval oracle (that One born of Woman should bruise the Tempter's head) takes the span of all the succeeding ages. Prophecy—brightening as it advances, until at last it actually names the place[2] and fixes the year of the Redeemer's birth,[3] describes His person and narrates His sufferings, Death and Resurrection[4]—Prophecy, I say, proves to be nothing else but *a preparation for Christ.* And yet, the Author of Scripture, foreseeing that unbelief would cavil at particular predictions, and seek to resolve the Divine Foreknowledge into ordinary human "Forecast," hath caused that the very texture of the Book shall be prophetical likewise: hath procured that prophetic outlines of the Redeemer's person, work, and office shall everywhere be woven into the very warp and woof of the narrative: hath so wonderfully interfered, that as well in its Ordinances as in its Histories, the Old Testament shall adumbrate the coming SAVIOUR in every part. In consequence of which—"*beginning at Moses and all the prophets*" (*i.e.*, explaining Joshua and Judges as well as Genesis and Isaiah)

[1] Sanderson's *Works*, vol. i., p. 69.
[2] Micah v. 2. Compare St. Matth. ii., 4-6. St. John vii. 42.
[3] Dan. ix. 25-27.
[4] Isaiah liii. Psalms xxii: xvi. (Cf. Acts ii. 24-31.).

—He was able, when He came into the world, "to expound" to His Disciples, "in all the Scriptures *the things concerning Himself*" (St. Luke xxiv. 27). Now, this constitutes a kind and a body of evidence which no hardihood of unbelief will ever be able to explain away or evacuate. Particular types may be denied or doubted; but the Exodus of Israel from Egypt, the crossing of the Red Sea, and the settlement in Canaan, make up together an emblematic picture of Redemption, which no one may presume to treat with unconcern. The Divine Harmony and correspondence which in this way subsists between the Old Testament and the New (two sets of writings written at different dates, by different men, and sundered the one from the other by half a thousand years) is a marvel unapproached by anything of which the world has elsewhere had experience. Those several books must stand, or they must fall, together. And *all* must stand of both Testaments, or none may stand of either . . . . The Bible ends with a promise of "a new Heaven and a new Earth" (2 St. Pet. iii. 13; Rev. xxi. 1); and CHRIST is spoken of as the beginning of a new Creation (Rev. iii. 15). "Behold," (saith He) "I make all things new" (Rev. xxi. 5).

XVI. We have entered somewhat largely into this subject not without a purpose. Some "reason of the hope that is in us" (1 St. Pet. iii. 15) has been incidentally assigned; from which, on the one hand, it will be clearly seen that no grotesque uncertainty as to the "order of succession" of "flying vertebrates" in the abyss of præ-Adamic Time, occasions us any degree of perplexity or distress. Such matters lie altogether outside the province of Sacred Science.

On the other hand, when the Natural Philosopher claims that MAN shall be held to be the product of EVOLUTION, and to be descended from an ape,—we trust that it has been made plain why we are constrained to reject his hypothesis with derision. It is plainly irreconcilable with the fundamental revelations of Scripture. Whether the hypothesis be not in itself *unscientific*, nor to say essentially *absurd*, we forbear to inquire. It may not, at all events, be pretended that "*the interpreters of Genesis and the interpreters of Nature*" are here in conflict; as if this were at all a question of "Interpretation." An appeal is made on the one side to a plain fact of Sacred Science; *so* fundamental in its character that, by its removal, the entire superstructure would crumble to its base, and become a shapeless ruin. On the other, an hypothesis is gratuitously put forth utterly destitute of scientific proof, contradicted by reason and experience, and flouted by such a first-rate Naturalist as Sir Richard Owen.

XVII. Yes, it cannot be too plainly stated that THE CREA-

TION,—THE TEMPTATION,—THE FALL of Man, are three fundamental verities; points essential to the existence of Christianity as a system; and therefore at all hazards to be guarded inviolate. The pretence that the earliest chapters of Genesis may with safety be regarded as allegory, fiction, fable, can only proceed from one who is either utterly unacquainted with the very rudiments of Divinity, or else is an enemy of GOD'S Truth. It is not merely that, without those first three chapters, the whole Scheme of Salvation, as revealed in the New Testament, becomes irrational and meaningless. Rather is the system observed to collapse entirely without them; reminding one of what would be the fate of yonder cathedral pile in the morning, if, "while men slept," its foundations were to be withdrawn.

And thus it becomes plain why we so earnestly deprecate any playing of tricks with the "Six days of Creation." Whether the citadel could be retained when the enemy had once been admitted within the walls of the city, we forbear to inquire. We decline to let him in. We take our stand before the gate; and if we must be slain, we elect to be slain *there*.

XVIII. Professor Huxley, the most recent assailant of Genesis, does not improve his position as a controversialist when he remarks concerning the first chapter:

> My belief, on the contrary, is, and long has been, that the Pentateuchal story of the Creation is simply a myth. I suppose it to be an hypothesis respecting the origin of the Universe which some ancient thinker found himself able to reconcile with his knowledge, or what he thought was knowledge, of the nature of things; and therefore assumed to be true.—(*N. C.*, February, 1886, p. 198.)

The same distinguished Philosopher informs us that

> "Creation"—signifies a gradual Evolution of one species from another, extending through immeasurable time.—(*Ibid.*, December, 1885, p. 857.)

Elsewhere, he virtually denies that the Universe can have had any Creator at all. He says:

> Omnipotence itself can surely no more make something "out of" nothing than it can make a triangular circle.—(*Ibid.*, p. 201.)

More recently still, the same writer has used expressions with regard to ALMIGHTY GOD which are little short of blasphemous. We forbear to quote them. Christianity he seems to regard as "Hellenized Judaism;" and the GOD of Christian men as (to say the least) a very imperfect character indeed (*Ibid.* p. 860). We read such things with sincere commiseration, but with even more surprise. We have ever supposed that the true Man of Science is supremely careful not to dogmatize in any department of Learning which he has never studied, and which he clearly does not understand. But the arrogance of Professor Huxley knows no bounds. "Tho

assured results of modern Biblical Criticism," he informs us (*Ibid.* p. 193), are fatal to the "Mosaic" authorship of the Pentateuch. We take leave to apprize him that he has been hoaxed. Is he aware that the Incarnate WORD meets him with a clear counterstatement—"*Moses wrote of Me*" John v. 46, 47)? His "thinkings" on Micah vi. 8 ("And what doth the LORD require of thee, but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God"), are quite a curiosity:

> If any so-called Religion takes away from this great saying of Micah, I think it wantonly mutilates, while, if it adds thereto, I think it obscures, the perfect ideal of religion.—(*Ibid.*, p. 860.)

XIX. There is a time for all things—a time for bandying compliments, and a time for speaking plainly. We must be allowed to designate all that precedes by its proper name—*impertinence*. We recommend the concluding clause of what Professor Huxley regards as the Cyclopædia of Divinity to his own special consideration. Let him learn to "walk humbly" with his Maker. And since the Philosopher is so fond of straying out of his own province into that of the Divine, he is respectfully assured that it is one of the fundamental truths of Sacred Science that "*the fear of the LORD* is the beginning of wisdom." He is also reminded that it was "*the Fool*" who "said in his heart," (because he was ashamed to say it with his lips), "there is no GOD."

XX. Why need I withhold the frank avowal that what is sometimes dignified with the name of "Scientific doubt" excites in me nothing so much as astonishment and ridicule? Astonishment, at its pitiful imbecility; ridicule, at its utterly unscientific character. The so-called philosophers who from time to time favour the world with their silly cogitations on Sacred Science—their weak objections, their impossible hypotheses, their crude difficulties—remind me of nothing so much as little children, crying because they find themselves left out in the dark.

JOHN W. BURGON.

ART. II.—NONCONFORMITY IN POOR PARISHES.

IT is not the design of this paper to expose or magnify the shortcomings of Nonconformity, but to aid in vindicating the right of the Church of England to be regarded as the Church of the poor, and to show the unrighteousness of those who, mainly for political ends, persistently assert that

the Church of England is the "privileged and State-aided Church of the wealthy;" that it has "done much to alienate the people from religion, and to drive them into indifference, if not into unbelief"; and that its clergy "oppose all efforts made for promoting national good."[1]

We disclaim any intention of speaking disparagingly of much solid and self-denying Christian work carried on by Nonconformists; to their agencies the nation is much indebted. The circumstances which at the close of the last century compelled such noble workers as Wesley and Whitfield to leave the Church, have often been lamented by Churchmen; still all has not been loss. Most heartily would we emphasize a recent utterance of Bishop Maclagan: "We must cease to look upon all Nonconformists as the natural enemies of the Church. There are, of course, political dissenters who feel bound by the dictates of their ill-informed conscience to pull us down, if they can, from our vantage-ground, and to strip us of our inherited possessions. But there are thousands of chapel-goers who have no enmity against the Church, and to these we ought, as far as possible, to hold out a loving hand."

It is sadly true that, notwithstanding the earnest and combined efforts of Churchmen and Nonconformists, vast numbers in our large towns appear to be altogether indifferent to the claims of God. The rapid increase of the population, the constant influx from the rural districts, the workers massed together by hundreds and thousands in our large manufactories, the lack of sympathy between masters and workmen owing to the rapid extension of "Limited" Companies, the conflicts between capital and labour, the unhappy and apparently widening distinction between class and class, the political animosities of the day, the disgraceful condition of vast numbers of the dwellings of the poor, the large number of public-houses in our town parishes—all these, with other matters, render religious work in our poor and crowded districts no easy task.

It is sorrowfully admitted that there have been, both in town and village, clergymen who have closed their eyes to the responsibilities and duties of their office, and left undone what they ought to have done. No institution on earth is faultless; no Church is free from the reproach of unworthy ministers, and the hindrance of inconsistent members.

Still the truth remains, a truth supported by evidence from all quarters, that the Church of England has been and is to-day the Church of the poor—the friend of the people. It may be asserted by some, either in ignorance or in prejudice,

[1] See "Case for Disestablishment," page 13, and letter of Mr. Handel Cossham, M.P., in *Christian World*, Jan. 21st, 1886.

that she is the "Church of the upper classes," and not of the poor; but any such charge falls to the ground in the face of the unmistakable facts of the Church's work in the poorest districts. Indeed, it may safely be said that to-day the one great bridge which reaches over the widening gulf between rich and poor is the National Church. Nonconformist ministers, not a few, have uttered words confirmatory of Mr. Gladstone's declaration, that, were it not for the "beneficent agency" of the National Church, "crowds of persons would remain utterly remote from the sights and sounds of worship."

More than twenty years ago the late Dr. Hume wrote a tractate entitled "The Church of England, the Home Missionary to the Poor," in which he gave several examples of migrations of Nonconformist congregations in Liverpool from poor to well-to-do districts. The old chapels were sold, some being purchased by Churchmen and turned into churches or schools, whilst others were used as warehouses, shops, cottages, public-houses, etc. Some years earlier the Rev. W. F. (now Dr.) Taylor had drawn attention to the subject in a pamphlet on "The Church and the State," in which he gave the following examples:

(1) There was a Methodist chapel once in Leeds Street, Liverpool, but as the neighbourhood deteriorated it was abandoned; another built in Everton, Great Homer Street, the dead disinterred, and the congregation removed to the more respectable locality. (2) There was a Socinian chapel in Paradise Street, but as the locality sank down in respectability, the meeting-house was abandoned, a new chapel in the strictest style of ecclesiastical architecture erected in Hope Street, a fashionable part of the town. The old building was sold, and used as a theatre! (3) An Independent chapel once stood in Lime Street. It was taken down for the sake of local improvements; but instead of seeking another site in the vicinity, or lower down in the town, where the ministrations of the gospel are urgently required, a splendid chapel was built, far from the crowded haunts of poverty and vice, in Myrtle Street, and thither, accordingly, the congregation removed.

Does not this go to show that Nonconformity has often failed to hold its own in poor districts? Whether we consult the *Congregational* and *Baptist Year Books*, or read the proceedings of the District Unions of these and other bodies, we are compelled to admit that the purely voluntary system has not sufficed to meet one of the great requirements of the times. In town and village alike there have been repeated failures. One aspect of the case is put forth by the *English Independent*, which laments "the unnecessary and injurious multiplication of chapels in thinly populated districts . . . A chapel is built, partly paid for, and the remainder mortgaged; and then the great spiritual work of attracting members from other religious communities begins. A spirit of wicked rivalry fills the place, and envying and strife of the bitterest character

ensue." As a result of this schismatic spirit, many dissenting churches are without pastors, and many pastors without churches. But there is another view still more suggestive. The *Baptist Handbook* for 1878 states that "forty-one towns in Lancashire and seventy-five in Yorkshire have not a single Baptist Church." The same publication for 1879 tells us that in Northumberland there are more than 200 places without any Nonconformist chapel; that in Surrey there are ninety-eight places (or two-thirds of all the parishes) where there is no place for Nonconformist worship; that in Hampshire there are 101 villages (with, in some places, a population of 2,000 souls) without any Nonconformist place of worship; that in Buckinghamshire there are sixty-seven villages (or nearly one-third of the whole) without a chapel, and that of the numerous Baptist churches not one-half are able to support a pastor. The *Congregational Year Book* for 1885 says, "Our country churches have to maintain a hard fight for existence—a fight, the severity of which is likely to increase rather than diminish." At a meeting of the Hull District of the Yorkshire Congregational Union, in February, 1886, it was reported that of the twenty-four churches in the district, seven were aided by grants. Without this assistance it was most probable that the whole of the aided churches would collapse. Three of the chapels, which were endowed, had no churches. The chairman observed that "evidently they were at a stand-still, or going backward in proportion to the relative increase of the population," and confessed that he "did not see any great likelihood of Congregationalism making a deep impression on the working classes." "The serious problem," says the *Baptist Handbook* for 1878, "is how to save our village churches from extinction." "The Difficulties of our Village Churches," was a leading topic for discussion at this year's Annual Meeting of the Baptist Union of Great Britain.

Is it a matter for surprise that, confronted with facts like these, Churchmen should not be enamoured with a system which, however plausible in theory, manifestly fails to bring about the desired results, a system which may flourish among the well-to-do, but which sickens and withers away in poor districts?

Be it remembered that the removal of many Nonconformist chapels in our towns has taken place, not because the population has diminished, but because it changed in character and became poorer. The Rev. Marmaduke Miller, of the United Methodist Free Church, speaking of the Voluntary system, admitted that "in some cases chapels have been removed, not because there was no population, but because it has been deemed, after a long and a fair trial, that the locality was not

the most suitable for a place of worship." If the population was there, what, we ask, made the locality unsuitable for a place of worship? The real answer would doubtless be that there was not that adequate pecuniary return almost indispensable to the keeping up of a Nonconformist chapel. In other words, the districts were *too poor*. The conditions under which Nonconformity works render it necessary that its chapels should be easily accessible to its supporters. Thus, as the *Newcastle Journal* recently remarked, "There is no obligation upon any of them to remain in degenerated neighbourhoods, especially when their leading members and contributors have removed their residences to more auspicious quarters." On the other hand, the Church of England with the present voluntary contributions of her children, backed up by the endowments which she has inherited from former generations, can and does make *permanent* provision for the spiritual, educational, and social welfare of those living in the poorest localities.

Eminent Nonconformists admit and lament that whilst special attention has been given to well-to-do suburban districts, the crowded masses of poor have, to a large extent, been overlooked or neglected. The aggressive work of the Wesleyan Methodists is well known, and yet the Rev. John Bond, in the *Methodist Times* (January 28, 1886), says that, notwithstanding all that has been done, "there are no fewer than fifty-five large towns in Inner London, some of them containing more than 50,000 souls, without the twinkle of even the smallest Methodist taper-light." In the *Pall Mall Gazette* of March 3, 1886, the Rev. H. Price Hughes confesses that the Wesleyans "have in the heart of London a number of large chapels which were once flourishing centres of work, but are now half empty, because we have failed to adapt the services to the changed necessities of the districts, the population having migrated to the suburbs." The *Christian World* ever and anon re-echoes the lament made by John Angell James more than thirty years ago — "hundreds of chapels without pastors, and hundreds of pastors without congregations." Add to this the complaints concerning chapels overburdened with debt, of colleges with heavy deficits, and of poor pastors "whose incomes are not sufficient to feed their families," and it is difficult to conceive that any section of Nonconformists should be found willing to subscribe their tens of thousands to a society which seems to aim at breaking up the parochial system, and impeding the Church's work amongst the poor; a society whose scheme "assumes that the disestablished Church will divide itself into an indefinite number of groups" (*Radical Programme*, p. 169).

We have said that thoughtful Nonconformists have themselves admitted that they have too often overlooked the claims of the poorer districts. And yet it is confessedly true that in hundreds of places costly chapels have been built in well-to-do districts from the proceeds of the sale of buildings in the poorer quarters. Indeed, in not a few cases, the endowment in aid of the minister's stipend has been taken from the poor locality to the thriving neighbourhood. The *Christian World* of May 27th, 1886, in a leading article, candidly says: "We cannot be insensible to the fact that not only the Methodists, but Nonconformists of all bodies, have, as they have become wealthy and found adherents among people of social position, built churches, and adopted modes of worship which, accompanied by social distinctions in the allotment of sittings and so forth, have not attracted, but rather alienated the artizan class."

There is before us an *Abstract of the Evidence on the Church Rates Question*, given before a Select Committee of the House of Lords in 1859. The following passages are of interest. Dr. Hume said:

In Liverpool several dissenting chapels have been closed for want of support, or sold, or abandoned, when their resources diminished. When a district becomes poor, the dissenting congregation generally migrates: the chapel is given up, and replaced in a better district of the town. Nine dissenting chapels have occupied twenty-six sites. There have been seventeen migrations; whereas a church is a permanent building for various grades of the population.

The Rev. George Osborn (Wesleyan Methodist) said:

The extinction of the National Church is to be deplored as one of the greatest calamities which could befall our native country. . . . The Established Church is the greatest Home Missionary Society of which we have cognizance. . . . *The tendency of dissent is to deal with the middle classes, and when they forsake a particular neighbourhood the chapel is removed; and were there not some other description of provision made, the neighbourhood would be left without any.*

Mr. Spurgeon does more than admit that some badly situated chapels have been removed. In May, 1861, he said:

There is growing up, even in our dissenting churches, an evil which I greatly deplore—a despising of the poor. I frequently hear in conversation such remarks as this: "Oh! it is no use trying in such a place as this; you could never raise a self-supporting cause. There are none but poor living in the neighbourhood." If there is a site to be chosen for a chapel it is said: "Well, there is such a lot of poor people round about, you would never be able to keep a minister. It is no use trying, they are all poor. You know that in the city of London itself there is now scarce a dissenting place of worship. The reason for giving most of them up, and moving them into the suburbs, is that all the respectable people live out of town, and of course they are the people to look after. They will not stop in London. They will go out and take villas, and live in the suburbs; and, therefore, the best thing is to take the endowment which belonged to

the old chapel, and go and build a new chapel somewhere in the suburbs where it may be maintained.

Bishop Lightfoot's attention has been drawn to this question in a very direct way. Speaking in June, 1885, he said:

If the Church of England is not the Church of the lowliest poor and the outcast in this kingdom, then certainly no other body is. This position she owes to the fact of her parochial organization. In the largest town of my diocese, the Borough of Sunderland, during the six years of my episcopate, no less than five dissenting chapels have been purchased by the Church, and are now used for her missionary services. Now, I don't blame the Nonconformist bodies. It was the necessity of their position which forced them to the sale. They were congregational, if not in name, at least in fact. As the neighbourhood deteriorated, the congregation migrated to the more respectable localities, and the chapel was obliged to migrate also.

That the testimony of Bishop Lightfoot and Mr. Spurgeon may be applied to almost every large town in England is confirmed by carefully ascertained facts. We will not speak in detail of the Nonconformist chapels in poor neighbourhoods now used by the Roman Catholics. As examples we may name an Independent chapel in Lee Croft, Sheffield, sold to the Roman Catholics in 1863. With the proceeds of this chapel (which was endowed) a handsome tabernacle was built in a prosperous suburb. Birmingham supplies another case: In 1792 King George III., in response to an appeal from the trustees, issued his royal warrant to the Treasury for the payment of £2,000. This sum was duly paid, and applied towards the re-erection of the chapel in Moor Street, which had been burnt down during the Priestley riots. In 1862 the congregation having grown fashionable, built the handsome Unitarian church now standing in Broad Street, and sold the old chapel in the poor neighbourhood to the Roman Catholics. The Salvation Army has acquired a considerable number of Nonconformist chapels in poor neighbourhoods. A recent list of eighty-three buildings in the Lancashire District regularly used by the Army included nine such chapels. Time would fail to enumerate the very large number of cases of buildings once dissenting chapels, but now used as workshops, cottages, and even theatres. If it were possible to compile a perfect list of deserted chapels in poor districts, the result would be painfully surprising. It is only just to add that in many of the cases a new building has been erected, but usually, as Mr. Spurgeon has said, "somewhere in the suburbs, where it may be maintained."

Archdeacon Birch, the Vicar of Blackburn, when Rector of St. Saviour's, Chorlton, Manchester, stated in a pamphlet referring to church and chapel building in his parish, that "A considerable number of the more recently erected chapels in Chorlton have been but removed from the middle of the

city for the convenience of their richer members, who have migrated suburb-wards, the poor and fixed population being thus left worse off than before!"

Here is seen one of the great weaknesses of Nonconformity. The provision of a stipend for the minister, and the keeping up of a chapel can be managed without much difficulty in prosperous middle-class localities, but in a poor district the matter assumes quite another aspect. Often the chapel struggles on for a time; the minister is starved out, until at last the trustees are compelled to remove to a "respectable" locality, in order to ensure the continuance of their cause. How different the case of a church and its minister! He is not compelled by the poverty of a neighbourhood to retire, but, as the *Record* said not long ago, "he can hold his ground amongst the very poorest and most degraded of the population."

We will now adduce additional facts in further confirmation and illustration of the statement that Nonconformity has often proved a failure in poor districts, and has had to remove near the dwellings of the middle and well-to-do classes, whilst the Church has made it a special feature to carry on regular pastoral and mission work amongst the very poorest. There is before us a list of one hundred and four buildings—once dissenting chapels—almost all in poor districts, not merely given up by Nonconformists, *but purchased by Churchmen, and now used for Church purposes.*[1]

This list of buildings, which is by no means exhaustive, includes twenty-four London chapels; eight in Liverpool, seven in Sunderland and Monkwearmouth, three each in Nottingham and Preston, and two each in Brighton, Bolton, Leeds, Sheffield, Plymouth, etc. Not a few of these one hundred and four buildings have been re-arranged and enlarged, and are now used as parish churches, *e.g.*, St. Luke's, Holloway; St. Barnabas's, Bethnal Green; St. Thomas's, Nottingham; St. Simon's, Sheffield; St. Cuthbert's, Monkwearmouth, etc., etc. In other cases the old chapels have been pulled down and new parish churches built, *e.g.*, St. Paul's, Bolton; St. Saviour's, Preston; St. Luke's, Darlington, etc. In the remaining cases the buildings are used as mission churches, Sunday-schools, and for other Church agencies.

The work carried on in the places from which Nonconformity has retired is full of interest and encouragement. When Canon Cadman was Vicar of St. George's, Southwark, he reported that he had established Church services in three chapels

[1] The writer gave particulars of seventy-four of these chapels in the *Record* of October 2nd, 1885. (Those numbered 14 and 31 respectively should be omitted.)

which had been deserted by the Wesleyans and Independents, with the result that the congregations had risen from almost literally nothing to 90, to 180, and 400 respectively.

Here are a few other typical examples taken from recent reports kindly supplied to me by clerical correspondents:

St. Paul's, Walworth; population poor; 13,000. In 1881 a chapel belonging to Primitive Methodists, accommodating 550, with schoolrooms accommodating 200 besides, was bought for Church of England purposes. For £1,500 we bought, readjusted, and refurnished the whole; and for four years have used it some ten or a dozen times weekly for mission services, clubs, Sunday-schools, etc. The buildings are now an active centre of spiritual and charitable agencies in a poor part of South London.

Sunderland. Forty or fifty years ago Flag Lane Chapel was the cathedral of the Primitive Methodists. It is the old story once again of the neighbourhood going down, and dissenters migrating to a better part of the town. The old chapel and schools were shut up. The pile was put up for sale in April, 1884, and bought by the Rector of Sunderland for £700. £300 have been spent in repairs, etc., and a good work is now going on, a Sunday-school, mothers' meetings, services on Sunday and weekdays, temperance gatherings, etc.

Monkwearmouth, Sunderland. Two chapels, formerly dissenting chapels, are now used in the parish of the Venerable Bede, for mission work amongst the poor. (*a*) Roker Avenue, originally an Independent chapel, in a neighbourhood once respectable, now exceedingly poor; seats 500; cost in alterations, etc., £600. (*b*) Brook Street Chapel, built seventeen years ago by the Methodist Free Church; seats 300; bought for £350; other £350 spent on alterations, etc. Both the chapels, worked by the Church agencies, are complete successes, and largely attended by the poor.

Again, in Birmingham we read of a chapel in a poor part purchased by the vicar, who put a layman in charge. Now on Sunday evenings the room is crowded, and a good work is going on all the week. In Stoke-upon-Trent we hear of Queen Street Chapel, in the centre of a populous district, purchased by the rector, now forming one of five mission-rooms planted for the purpose of gathering in the masses. Here is a case at Sheffield:

Baptist Chapel in Eyre Street—the only chapel in a district of 6,200 poor—purchased by Churchmen for £2,200 (which sum the Baptists applied towards the building of a chapel in the suburbs). The old chapel, enlarged and remodelled at an additional cost of £2,000, was consecrated in 1865 as St. Simon's Church, since which time it has been a centre of active Church work in almost every department. Convenient schools and also an iron mission-room have been built. The 800 sittings of the church are all free. The day-schools are self-supporting. The offertories and subscriptions for home and foreign missions and local and parochial objects average from £350 to £400 per annum. During 1885 about £60 was given in aid of the sick and poor. The yearly circulation of the parish magazine is about 5,000. During 1885 £990 were deposited in the penny bank in 12,539 sums, and nearly £70 paid by small sums into the Mother's meetings.

Many other examples of work for God carried on by Churchmen amongst the very poor in buildings once occupied by Nonconformists, and in districts from which they have

retired might be given if needful. Sufficient however has been said to prove the insufficiency of voluntaryism, and to show the benefits the poor derive from the parochial system and an endowed Church.

The Reports of the various Church Extension and Scripture Readers' Societies in every diocese, and the fact that the church accommodation is supplemented by more than 5,000 mission-rooms, is evidence that the National Church has a special regard for the welfare of the masses in our crowded centres. Add to this the work done during the last fifty years by our two great Home Missionary Societies, the Church Pastoral Aid Society and the Additional Curates' Society; also that accomplished during the last twenty-three years by the Bishop of London's Fund, and some faint idea may be formed of the aggressive work of the Church amongst the poor of our land.

The *Church Pastoral Aid Society*, which seeks to send living agents to labour in the crowded parishes of our large towns, has, in the fifty years of its existence, aided 1,827 poor districts, by grants amounting altogether to £2,019,677, to meet which £606,554 have been locally raised. *The Additional Curates' Society*, kindred in aim, has, since its formation in 1837, granted £994,771, which has been supplemented by £1,024,937, raised by the aided parishes. *The Bishop of London's Fund* expended from 1863 to 1884 no less a sum than £717,909 in seeking to further the work of Christ in the crowded districts of the great metropolis. In addition to the large sums expended in providing mission-rooms, Schools, and missionary clergy, and lay agents, it has aided the erection of 135 permanent churches. These facts are eloquent, and clearly indicate that the Church has laboured long and earnestly in seeking to grapple with sin, and raising the poor socially, morally, and spiritually by the living power of the Gospel.

In January, 1861, the late Canon Stowell appealed to a crowded meeting of working-men in the Free Trade Hall, Manchester, in defence of the National Church. "Working-men," he said:

> You are become too well informed, have too much common-sense, are men having your eyes too much awake and observant, to be any longer imposed upon with the cry that the clergy are not your friends, and that the Church is your oppressor. Where are the chapels?—in the darkest, poorest neighbourhoods? Where are the dissenting ministers?—ever up and down amongst the poor? What is the place to which the poor go for the comforts, the consolations, the sympathies, and the ministrations of religion? They go to the parsonage, the vicarage, the rectory! I do not blame the dissenters for this. They are congregationalists; they have no parochial charge. The voluntary principle goes far, but it does not go far enough. It stops just where it is the most wanted. It stops when it reaches the poor.

Are there not hundreds of clergy working amid our crowded and poor populations, whose experience fully confirms this statement? Is it not true that the greater part of the Nonconformist ministers do not profess to visit unless sent for? We heard not long ago of a gentleman who accepted a pastorate with a salary of £750 per annum, on the understanding that he was not to be expected to visit. In the Annual Statement of a Baptist Chapel well known to us, is an intimation that in cases of sickness or affliction, friends "will be kind enough not to expect a visit" until word has been sent to a church officer or to the pastor. An "American Pastor," in giving to the *Christian World* his impressions of religious matters in England, says of London pastors that they "do not visit much unless specially sent for, even in a case of sickness, but send the church officers to inquire." In March, 1886, "Candour" writes thus to the *Christian World*, concerning the "average" Nonconformist minister:

> He absolutely neglects pastoral work, except that he tries to pay a visit when specially asked. He seems to have no perception of the fact that in a sick house a spontaneous, and not a formal call, affords the balm that helps the sick and cheers the watchers. I am a strong advocate for Disestablishment, but I must admit that the Church puts the Chapel to shame in the matter of visiting.

Nonconformists do not, as a rule, visit amongst the poor. House-to-house visitation is no part of their system. Not a few of the clergy who labour amid the crowded masses of our great towns, and whose constant rounds have rendered every court, and the interior of almost every house, familiar, and who are earnestly and loyally helped by the great army of voluntary lay-workers, can testify that (with perhaps the exception of a Roman Catholic priest visiting a member of his flock) a Nonconformist minister is seldom if ever met with. The vicar of St. John's, Paddington (Rev. Sir Emilius Bayley), in a recent speech said that during the eighteen years that he was rector of St. George's, Bloomsbury, where half the population were poor, he never once met a Nonconformist minister working amongst them.

How different this from the work fostered by the parochial system! The church and schools once built, and the district assigned, the clergy with the staff of workers, all remain, amid varied changes, as beacon-lights amid surrounding gloom. The widow, the sick, and the dying are visited, the distressed relieved, the fallen raised, the young educated, the intemperate warned and reclaimed, habits of cleanliness and thrift inculcated; and above all, the poor have the Gospel preached to them. Amid any deterioration which may happen to the neighbourhood, the church buildings, organizations, and clergy remain

permanent for the social, moral, and spiritual welfare of the inhabitants for the time being.

It must be admitted that the present condition of the masses and the spirit of unrest which pervades them, tend to create much anxious thought. The "bitter cry" which rises from our poor and crowded centres calls for the earnest and united practical sympathy of all who profess and call themselves Christians. It is acknowledged that as yet the combined efforts of Churchmen and Nonconformists have not sufficed to evangelize the people. Disclaiming all boasting, and without deprecating other Christian effort, it may be asserted that the Church of England has been and is to-day the great Home Missionary agency amongst the poor. In districts, not a few, abandoned by Nonconformity as "too poor" for a "successful" cause the Church has, amid many difficulties, held her ground and wrought a noble work for God and truth. Her clergy have proved that they were pastors as well as preachers; friends and helpers of their parishioners, as well as teachers of their congregations.

Should Disestablishment ever take place the parochial system, if it be not shattered, would undoubtedly receive a very severe shock. If it be destroyed, what is to take its place? The poor would be the greatest losers, the keenest sufferers by any scheme which would weaken the Church by depriving her of her rightful heritage, the means which enable her to carry on her work in the most poverty-stricken quarters.

"Were the parochial system broken up," says Dr. Osborn, (Wesleyan) "all the voluntary efforts which might be put forward, either by separate classes of Nonconformists or by the joint labours of Churchmen and Nonconformists, would never suffice to compensate for its overthrow, which would be very injurious to religion and to the welfare of the country as dependent on religion."

"Wealth maketh many friends. but the poor is separated from his neighbour." How sadly suggestive are the inspired words! The selfishness of too many of the rich, and the social. isolation of the poor, are matters fraught with danger to the commonwealth. Persons are too often honoured for what they possess rather than for what they really are.

"The poor ye have always with you." Care for the poor is an essential obligation of Christianity as it was of the previous dispensation. Our Lord emphasized this duty both in precept and practice. "Distribute to the poor." "The poor have the Gospel preached to them." The history of the Church of England is proof that her members have not been indifferent to this obligation. The clergy, from the Archbishops to the humblest curate, have devoted special attention to the claims

and needs of the poor both in crowded city and scattered hamlet. The *Official Year Book of the Church of England* indicates the nature and variety of Church organizations which are actively engaged in raising the social, educational, and religious condition of the people.

The intention and work of the Church of England may at times be misrepresented by opponents and misjudged by friends. This seems to be an inevitable condition of all righteous effort. Nevertheless, the Church, conscious of her integrity, faithful to duty, and speaking the truth in love, shall go on increasing in power; and, amid labour and warfare, evil report and good report, shall not be ashamed to meet her enemies in the gate with the words of the patriarch—"When the ear heard me, then it blessed me; and when the eye saw me, it gave witness to me; because I delivered the poor that cried, and the fatherless, and him that had none to help him: the blessing of him that was ready to perish came upon me; and I caused the widow's heart to sing for joy" (Job xxix. 11-13).

WILLIAM ODOM.

St. Simon's, Sheffield.
May, 1886.

ART. III.—REMARKS ON SOME OF THE MESSIANIC PROPHECIES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT AS AFFECTED BY THE REVISION.

I PROPOSE in this paper to consider some of the changes which have been introduced by the recent Revision in a few of the more prominent of the Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament. In doing this I shall refer where it seems necessary to objections which have been urged against those changes, or against the marginal notes on such prophecies. But I shall not deal only with objections. I shall also direct attention to one passage against which, so far as I am aware, no objection has been urged. I shall do this, because I think that the positive excellences of the Revision have been too much overlooked. The critics have been busy with what they deem to be its errors and its defects; they have too often been grudging in their acknowledgement of its merits.[1]

I have already replied elsewhere,[2] at some length, to the charges brought by the *Quarterly* Reviewer against the

[1] An exception, however, must be made as regards Canon Girdlestone's excellent articles which have appeared in the CHURCHMAN.

[2] In the *Contemporary Review* for April and May of the present year.

Revision. I trust I have shown conclusively that the Revisers were amply justified in introducing the changes to which he objects into the text, and not less justified in the marginal notes, by which they have honestly indicated the uncertainty which attaches either to the textual reading or to the rendering of many passages. But another Reviewer has appeared on the scene. The *Edinburgh*, strange to say, has made common cause with the *Quarterly*. In some instances the objections of the two Reviewers are of the same kind. In particular both have selected the same Messianic passages for animadversion, and both are very severe on the Revised margin. So far as they cover the same ground, I can add but little to what I have already said in reply to the *Quarterly*; but there are some objections peculiar to the *Edinburgh* Reviewer,[1] and I shall say a word or two on these.

I. The first passage on which I shall make some observations is the celebrated passage, Job xix. 25, 26, of which the *Edinburgh* Reviewer says that, "without entering on the question whether or not the Massoretic reading is correct, the new rendering robs it not only of beauty, but almost of sense."

I do not know how the Reviewer would propose to amend the existing text. The LXX. either had a different reading, or more probably introduced an arbitrary alteration, as they combine the latter clause of verse 25 with the first part of verse 26, and render ἀναστήσει δέ μου τὸ σῶμα τὸ ἀνανταλοῦν μοι ταῦτα. The old Latin had "Super terram resurget cutis mea," and the Vulgate pushed alteration and interpretation yet further by rendering the two verses: "Scio enim quod redemptor meus vivit, et in novissimo die de terra surrecturus sum: et rursum circumdabor pelle mea, et in carne mea videbo Deum meum." But I am not aware that any modern critic of note has supported changes in the text based on these renderings, and indeed, many have protested against them. The rendering of the Revisers is as follows:

> But I know that my Redeemer liveth,
> And that He shall stand up at the last upon the earth:
> And after my skin hath been thus destroyed,
> Yet from my flesh shall I see God:
> Whom I shall see for myself,
> And mine eyes shall behold and not another.

Whether such a rendering robs the passage "of beauty" is a question on which opinions may differ; but at all events it is of far less importance than another question—viz., whether the Revisers have given the true sense of the original. On this point it is satisfactory to find that the Reviewer has no

[1] See *Edinburgh Review* for October, 1885.

dispute with the Revisers. He does not deny that their translation is "strictly literal." But "conceive," he says, "in the opening verses of our Burial Service such words substituted as these: 'And after my skin has been thus destroyed, yet from my flesh shall I see God.'" As if the question at issue were not what is the true sense of a passage of Scripture, but whether an alteration will offend prejudice or shock sensitive feeling. No doubt the rendering of the A.V. has been consecrated to us by the holiest of all memories and the most blessed of all hopes, by the religion and the sorrow of the grave. Not only to English Churchmen, but to great numbers, too, of our Nonconformist brethren, this most solemn and beautiful of all services still speaks with consoling power in the moment of supreme anguish and desolation. Doubtless they would feel the loss if these words were touched. Natural it is to cling to them. But the like might be said almost, if not quite to the same extent, of many other misinterpretations of Scripture. The false rendering has taken possession of men: it is in their heart and on their tongues, and it is difficult to persuade them that it is false. But is that any reason why those who have been set to correct what is false should falter in their work? They will not, indeed, be rash or hasty. They will deal tenderly, so far as they may, with all that custom and religious feeling have made dear; but they will remember that their primary office and paramount duty is to ascertain what is true, and to give that rendering, and no other, which approaches most exactly to the sense of the original.

But the Reviewer's most serious charge is that the new rendering robs the passage "almost of sense." "What," he asks, "is here the exact bearing of 'thus,' and what the meaning of seeing God 'from' one's flesh? Or is it to be inferred that after the 'skin' has been 'thus' destroyed, we are from our 'flesh' to see the Almighty? The rendering is indeed strictly literal, and the meaning of the Revisers may be learned from reading a Commentary. There it will be found that 'thus' means either 'this,' pointing to the body, or else 'in this manner;' and that 'from my flesh' means either 'without my flesh,' out of it, or else 'from my body' in the same sense as the Authorized Version has translated 'in my flesh.' But surely the new version ought to be at least intelligible without a Commentary."

Nearly every line here contains a misrepresentation. In the first place, Job is not saying what *we* are to do: he is expressing *his own* hope and conviction. But the Reviewer tacitly reads a certain meaning into the words, and then finds fault with the Revisers for not expressing that meaning. In the next place, after confessing that the rendering they have

given is "strictly literal," he proceeds to observe that its "meaning may be learned from reading a Commentary," adding that "the new version ought at least to be intelligible without a Commentary." Concerning which it is sufficient to remark that there are and must be passages in the Bible, as in other books, and especially those in which poetry is the instrument of deep thought or strong emotion, which no translation can adequately render, which will only yield their sense to patient intelligent study, which may be fairly susceptible of different explanations, and which for ordinary readers do require a commentary. In fact, this is true not only of translations. There are many passages in all poets, and not seldom in the greatest, which need elucidation even for readers who read them in their own tongue. Their meaning does not lie on the surface, and is not seen at a glance: the poet must have his interpreter.

But the Reviewer is pleased to tell us what will be found in a Commentary by way of interpretation. "There," he says, "it will be found that 'thus' means either 'this,' pointing to the body, or else 'in this manner.'" Now I venture to say it will not be found in any Commentary that "thus" means "this," pointing to the body; for such a statement would be sheer nonsense. What may be found is precisely what is given in the Revisers' margin, viz., that the Hebrew word which in the text is rendered "thus" may also mean "this." Nor, again, will it be found in any Commentary that "from my flesh" means either "without my flesh," out of it, or else "from my body," in the same sense as the A.V. had translated "in my flesh;" for it is certain that "from my flesh" cannot mean "out of my flesh." But what might be found in a Commentary is again precisely what the Revisers have expressed in their margin, viz., that the Hebrew preposition *min* is capable of two meanings, like the English "out of," and may either mean "from" or "without," and accordingly that *mibbesâri* may be rendered either "from my flesh" or "without my flesh."

The Reviewer should have told us plainly whether he would have us sacrifice truth in favour of a certain interpretation because it is popular and familiar. I use deliberately the word "interpretation;" for the rendering given in our A.V., and of course adopted in the Burial Service, is not a rendering of the Hebrew, but an interpretation in the nature of a paraphrase. This was an instance where it behoved the Revisers to be especially on their guard against any bias of prejudice or preconceived opinion. The insertion of the two words "*worms*" and "*body*" in italics in the A.V. has given a colour and a meaning to the passage which are not to be found in the Hebrew. They

make it clear, though the Hebrew does not, that the reference is to a resurrection. This, I believe, to be a quite untenable interpretation. It does violence not only to the text and context, but to the whole scope of the Book. If Job had grasped this truth, the perplexity of his wounded conscience would have been at an end. There have been, indeed, expositors of great name and ability who, preferring the rendering "without my flesh" suppose Job to be looking here for a vindication of his innocence after his death; in the words of one of the most recent and ablest commentators,[1] "The whole expression 'after this my skin has been destroyed and without my flesh' means 'when I have died under the ravages of my disease.' The words do not express in what condition precisely, but *after* what events Job shall see God." But neither does this interpretation commend itself to me. Surely the whole scope of the Book, and especially its closing chapters, show that the vindication of his cause for which Job looked was a vindication *in this life.* Job's quarrel with his friends was this, that he asserted, while they denied, his innocence. He longed for God as the righteous Judge and Goël (or Vindicator) to interpose in the quarrel and establish his righteousness. It was no answer to his friends that his righteousness would be manifested in another world: he desired its vindication here. They as well as he were to be witnesses of it. Job says in effect this: "Although my skin has been *thus* destroyed by the ravages of my disease (*thus* because he points to himself meanwhile), yet from this very flesh of mine thus destroyed shall I see God (who will appear to vindicate my innocence against my accusers). My reins are consumed within me (in longing for that vindication)." And God does appear to vindicate his innocence, and from that flesh of his which had been so disfigured he did see God. Or, perhaps we may say with Godet, that Job himself had formed no very clear conception as to the time and manner of God's interference, whether in this life or in the next. Only he felt how intolerable it was to have his just dealing called in question, and he trusted with a boundless trust in the righteousness of God, that God would in some way appear on his behalf. The righteousness of God is the primary article of his creed. To this he clings; for the manifestation of this righteousness he longs; and hence the passionate cry of his wounded heart:

> Oh that my words were now written!
> Oh that they were inscribed in a book!
> That with an iron pen and lead
> They were graven in the rock for ever!

[1] Dr. A. B. Davidson in his Commentary on the Book in the "Cambridge Bible for Schools."

The rendering of the Revisers (for which I contended long ago in a note to my Hulsean Lectures on "Immortality") does no doubt admit of more than one interpretation. The Reviewer can of course paraphrase it, and put any sense he pleases upon it; he can even understand Job to be speaking of a resurrection; but would he justify the retention in italics of the words "*worms*" and "*body*" as in the A.V., merely because the passage as so rendered is one with which we are familiar in the Burial Service of our Church ?[1] I feel that no protest can be too strong against this attempt to retain a rendering because it is familiar, when we know it to be incorrect. A principle like this, if once admitted, would reduce all Revision to an absurdity.

II. I come now to another well-known passage (Ps. ii. 12): "Kiss the son, lest he be angry." Here no change has been made in the text. But even this does not satisfy the Reviewer. He observes that "the Revisers retain in the text the Messianic rendering, 'Kiss the Son,' although they make it needlessly offensive by printing 'son' (both here and in verse 7) with a small 's.'" There is surely something of the infinitely little in such criticism as this. But the Reviewer ought to have known that the Revisers had excellent authority for this way of printing, for both in Coverdale's and also in the Bishops' Bible "son" is printed with a small "s" in verse 7 as well as in verse 12; and in the Bible of 1611 it is printed with a small letter in verse 7 (though that verse is quoted as Messianic in the New Testament) and with a capital in verse 12.

The Reviewer returns again to this charge (p. 487), and complains that while the Revisers print Azazel with a capital, they print "son" (Ps. ii.) and "spirit of God" with small initials. But if Azazel is a proper name, how is it to be spelt except with a capital ?[2] On the other hand, if the Reviewer

---

[1] It reminds one of an objection raised by another Reviewer to the change of "charity" into "love" in the Revised Version of 1 Cor. xiii. (the latter being the word employed as the equivalent of ἀγάπη in every earlier English Version except the Rhemish), because in the Collect for Quinquagesima Sunday the word used is "charity." Perhaps there is no change which was more imperatively required on every ground than this. And yet it was condemned solely because "charity" stood in the Prayer Book, and had arbitrarily been introduced in a few places in the New Testament by the translators of 1611. It would be as reasonable to object to the change made in the rendering of ὀρφανούς in John xiv. 18, because the collect for the Sunday after Ascension Day has, "we beseech thee leave us not *comfortless*, but send to us thine Holy Ghost to comfort us."

[2] This is like the reproach of the *Quarterly* Reviewer, who is astonished that the Revisers should have printed Gabriel with a large "G" and son of God with a small "s." Would he have had them print Gabriel with a small "g"?

had taken the trouble to look at our common Bibles, he would have found that whereas in Gen. i. "Spirit of God" is printed with a capital, in Isa. xi. "spirit of the Lord" is printed with a small "s."[1] But all this is the veriest trifling.

The Reviewer, however, objects further to the marginal note on this verse. He says: "In the text we read as before, 'Kiss the son.' In the margin we have, 'Lay hold of (or receive) instruction;' and yet another variant, 'Worship in purity.' Thus we have here four entirely different translations of one of the most important passages." How the Reviewer extracts *four entirely different* translations from the text and the two variants in the margin I am at a loss to understand; for surely there is no substantial difference between "*Lay hold of* instruction" and "*receive* instruction." By no stretch of imagination can these be described as *entirely different* meanings. But to let this pass, does the Reviewer think that it would have been wise or honest on the part of the Revisers to have left a passage of such admitted difficulty and uncertainty without any marginal note at all? Apparently he does. For he says (p. 475):

> There are passages on the understanding of which the distinctive teaching of the Old Testament in its bearing on the New has hitherto been supposed to rest. We should make no complaint if the Revisers had felt it necessary so to alter their rendering as to make their previously supposed application impossible. Whatever the seeming loss, it would have been a gain to the cause of truth. [We are thankful for this admission.] But what we have a right to complain of is, that our scholars speak with "a double," "treble," or "fourfold" voice. They say one thing in the text, and presently the opposite in the margin, only to correct themselves once more and yet a third time. A sentence cannot have three different meanings all incompatible with each other.

But what if these different meanings have been put on a passage, as in this case, from the earliest times? and what if no one can pronounce dogmatically, which is the true meaning? What if, as here, taking the Ancient Versions for our guides, the evidence preponderates against the meaning which we have kept in the text? Are the facts to be concealed? I will venture to commend earnestly to the Reviewer's notice the remarks of Jerome on this passage in his *Apologia adv. Rufin.*, lib. i. §19. After observing that he rendered the verb *nash'ku* (the literal rendering of which in Greek and Latin would be καταφιλήσατε and *deosculamini*) by *adorate* as conveying the true sense of the word, because they who worship are wont to

[1] This is not the only instance in which the Reviewer betrays ignorance of the A.V. "What," he exclaims, "does '*sound* wisdom' mean? Can wisdom be unsound?" As if this were an expression which had been introduced by the Revisers, whereas it occurs at least three times in the A.V.—Prov. ii. 7, iii. 21, viii. 14—and has simply been retained by the Revisers.

kiss the hand and bow the head (quoting Job xxxi. 27 in proof); and after insisting on the ambiguity of the noun which he says means not only "son," as in Barjona, Bartimæus, etc., but also "wheat" and "a bundle of ears of wheat," and "elect" and "pure," he thus defends himself from the charge of inconsistency: "In my little commentary, where there was an opportunity of discussing the matter, I had said, *Adorate filium*, but in the body of the work (the translation), not to appear a violent interpreter, and not to give occasion to Jewish calumny, I said, *Adorate pure sive electe*, as Aquila and Symmachus had translated. What injury, then, is done to the faith of the Church, if the reader is instructed in how many different ways a verse is explained by the Jewish interpreters (*apud Hebræos*)?" It is not very encouraging to reflect that this question put by Jerome in the fourth century has lost nothing of its point or cogency in the nineteenth.

The *Edinburgh* and the *Quarterly* Reviewers agree in thinking that injury *is* done to the faith of the Church when a reader is instructed in how many different ways a verse may be explained. It may naturally excite some surprise and some regret that the *Edinburgh Review*, which was once the organ of a reasonable faith, should now range itself on the side of a blind and irrational orthodoxy.[1] But happily there are many indications that these appeals to ignorance and prejudice are losing their force. Men who care about their Bibles wish to know what the Bible really is. They resent these attempts to strangle inquiry, and stamp upon it. They find in the Revised Version, and not least in its margin, the information they desire, and they learn to value it accordingly.

III. But leaving these objections, frivolous and captious as they are, and deriving their weight, if they have any, from the uninstructed prejudices to which they appeal, I will enter upon the more agreeable task of drawing attention to some of the positive merits of the Revision. There is at least one passage in which the most prejudiced reader will hardly fail to acknowledge the striking improvement which has been introduced by the Revisers. I refer to the great Messianic prophecy at the beginning of the ninth chapter of Isaiah. As this passage stands in the A.V. it is scarcely intelligible. Who can have heard it read in the Lesson for Christmas Day without a feeling of distressing perplexity? No doubt there rises upon us,

[1] There is a true and rational orthodoxy, but it is neither timorous nor suspicious; it can rest calmly and fearlessly on the promise, "He shall lead you into the truth in all its variety and compass (εἰς τὴν ἀλήθειαν πᾶσαν)."

even through the obscurity of that version, a grand vision of light and peace. No mistranslation can wholly destroy the effect of the prophecy. But when we come to disentangle the separate words and phrases, and try to give them a consistent sense, we find ourselves engaged in a hopeless task. What, we ask ourselves, is the meaning of the phrase, "The dimness shall not be such as was in her vexation"? Or what are we to understand by first lightly afflicting the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali, and afterwards more grievously afflicting it? How does this fall in with the general scope of the prophecy? How can it be reconciled with what follows in the very next verse, when, speaking of the inhabitants of that same district of Palestine, the prophet says, "The people that sat in darkness have seen a great light"? This is surely the very reverse of the picture which has been presented to us. This is no "more grievous affliction." They were in darkness, and now they see a great light; and light, we know, is a universal image of prosperity. Or again, how can it be said, "Thou hast multiplied the nation, and *not* increased the joy," when the very next words are, "They joy before thee according to the joy in harvest, and as men rejoice when they divide the spoil"? Or yet again, what is meant by the antithesis in verse 5, "Every battle of the warrior is with confused noise and garments rolled in blood, *but this* shall be with burning and fuel of fire"? I think we must all have felt the almost hopeless obscurity of the passage as it stands in our English Bibles.

But now let us take it as it stands in the R.V., and the striking beauty and force and consistency of the whole will at once become evident. The prophet was speaking in the previous chapter of a time of terrible distress and perplexity which was close at hand. King and people had forsaken their God. Ahaz had refused the sign of deliverance offered him, and was hoping by an alliance with Assyria to beat off his enemies. The people in their terror were seeking to wizards and to necromancers for guidance, instead of seeking to God. And the prophet warns them that the national unbelief and apostasy shall bring its sure chastisement in national despair. Men will look around them in vain for succour. The heavens above and the earth beneath shall be wrapt in the same awful gloom. "They shall turn their faces upward," he says, "and they shall look unto the earth and behold distress and darkness, the gloom of anguish." Nothing can exceed the dramatic force of the picture: it is a night at noonday, the very sun blotted from the heavens; it is a darkness which may be felt. But even whilst the prophet's gaze is fixed upon it, he sees the light trembling on the skirts of the darkness; the sunrise is

behind the cloud. "But there shall be no gloom to her (*i.e.*, to the land) that was in anguish. In the former time He brought into contempt"—"made light of," not "lightly afflicted," as the A.V. has it—"the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali, but in the latter time hath He made it glorious by the way of the sea beyond Jordan, Galilee of the nations."

Take this rendering, and you have a perfectly exact and very striking prediction. It was not true that the land had first been "lightly afflicted" and afterwards was "more grievously afflicted;" but it was true that in the former time the land had been despised. Zebulun, and Naphtali, and Galilee of the nations, had been a byword among the Jews. Their territory had been trampled under foot by every invader who had ever entered Palestine. In the former time the Lord had brought it into contempt; He had abased it; but in the latter time had He made it glorious with a glory far transcending that of any earthly kingdom. For there, amid that despised half-heathen population, the True Light shined; there the Lord of Glory lived, and spake His wonderful words and wrought His wonderful works; there He called fishermen and tax-gatherers to be His first disciples and missionaries to the world. The land was "made glorious" by the feet of Jesus of Nazareth.

Well may the prophet continue: "The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light; they that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined. Thou hast multiplied the nation, Thou hast increased their joy [not, as in A.V., "and *not* increased the joy"—a reading which, though found apparently in the present Hebrew text, has been corrected by the Hebrew scribes themselves]; they joy before Thee according to the joy in harvest, as men rejoice when they divide the spoil. For the yoke of His burden, and the staff of His shoulder, the rod of His oppressor, Thou hast broken as in the day of Midian. For all the armour of the armed man in the tumult (of battle), and the garments rolled in blood shall even be for burning, for fuel of fire." The A.V., by the insertion of the words "*but this*," introduces an antithesis which destroys the whole beauty and force of the picture. Strike out those words, and all becomes clear and consistent. The meaning is that at the advent of the Prince of Peace all wars shall cease. The soldier's sandals and the soldier's cloak, and all the blood-stained gear of battle, shall be gathered together and cast into the fire to be burned. This is the majestic picture of light and peace which dawns upon the prophet's soul in the midst of the national apostasy and gloom, as he looks forward to the birth of the true Immanuel; and this is now for the first time made clear and intelligible to the English reader.

J. J. STEWART PEROWNE.

ART. IV.—NOTES OF A MISSION TOUR IN AMERICA.

SECOND PAPER.[1]

PLEASANTLY situated on the southern bank of that noble river the Hudson, the little town of Newburgh rises on the view as you make your way up the river, leaving West-Point ten miles and New York sixty miles behind you. The place is very quiet and very respectable, and perhaps for an American town disposed to be a little sleepy. The Episcopal Church here dates from a period antecedent to the revolution; but here, as in several other places, it lost its favourable start by sympathizing with the Royalists in the great struggle for independence, and thus not only forfeited what would have been by this time splendid endowments, but ran a very near chance of being extinguished altogether. It was not the place that one would have deliberately chosen for the commencement of such an effort as we had come to America to make; and yet, I believe that this choice was wisely ordered in God's providence; for in commencing any spiritual work it is well to form at the beginning a just estimate of difficulties that will have to be faced and obstacles that must needs be surmounted before the work can be successful, and I know not where we could have gone with greater advantage to form such an estimate than to this very respectable and conservative little town. In no place that we visited did our work at one time come nearer proving a failure, while scarcely anywhere did we obtain more distinct encouragement in the end.

An intense prejudice against Revivalism and all its works, its methods and its aims, was the chief difficulty that had to be faced, and perhaps no wonder. I was assured that every winter, as regularly as the river froze and the ordinary traffic was thus for a time suspended, some of the denominations would open their buildings for revival meetings, and would use all sorts of means—some of them, it was said, of a very sensational character—to work up a revival. These regularly renewed paroxysms of religious fervour were usually followed by a season of reaction and deadness in which spiritual work was hardly expected, and in which spiritual life, in many cases, seemed to sink to a low ebb; and this state of things would continue until frost and fervour once again re-appeared at "the fall." The moral and religious results of this periodic revival system were gravely questioned by the sober-minded

[1] We have found that there is still much that Mr. Aitken could communicate to THE CHURCHMAN that we believe our readers would be interested in. We have therefore requested our esteemed friend to contribute a third paper.—ED.

and thoughtful. It was felt that such a system necessarily tends to induce a spasmodic type of spirituality, and to lead to a generally unhealthy tone of thought and action. Men learn to put off serious thought and go on living in gross sin, with the feeling more or less distinctly present to their mind that peradventure the winter revival may set things right by bringing about their conversion, and thus they become impervious to ordinary religious influences. Further, such observers could not fail to notice that sensational methods and really satisfactory results usually stand in inverse ratio to each other; and sometimes no doubt they would also be unfavourably impressed with the apparent connection between a loud profession and an inconsistent life.

I have seen something of this chronic Revivalism in days gone by in Cornwall, and I am bound to say that its effects are in my opinion such as to justify a very strong feeling against it; and most earnestly do I hope that the Mission movement in our Church will never be allowed to degenerate into anything of this kind. A Mission is designed to set things in motion and pave the way for steady Church work and spiritual progress; it would simply be disastrous if frequent Missions came to be regarded as a substitute for all this. In Cornwall, as in America, the abuse of Revivalism has brought about an intense prejudice against distinctive evangelizing work on the part of the clergy, and it is a curious fact that in this county, the headquarters of Methodism, in spite of the memory of Robert Aitken and the living influence of Bishop Wilkinson, Missions have been, I believe, less generally accepted than in any other diocese.

Against this kind of systematic Revivalism the Episcopal Church of America has been ever in standing protest, and perhaps with somewhat the same effect as I have observed in Cornwall; fanaticism has been no doubt discouraged, but spirituality has not been sufficiently insisted upon, and in too many cases Churchmen have evinced a disposition to regard fanaticism and spirituality as merely two names for the same thing. No Church in which and by which evangelizing work is not duly recognised and promoted, can long retain a high spiritual tone; for under such circumstances the unspiritual will ever be gaining upon the spiritual, and death, becoming more and more generally prevalent, will stifle what remains of life. It is just here that the American Church seemed to me to be weakest, and therefore I hope all the more from her adoption of the Mission movement.

As I have ventured to speak freely of the clergy of the Episcopal Church of America, to be consistent I ought to give my candid impressions of their flocks; and this seems to me

the proper place to do so ere I proceed further with my account of our first American Mission. There are several points in which I believe American congregations would contrast favourably with English. For example, the voluntary system tends to make laymen feel more distinctly that the church is their own "*cause*," and not merely the rector's. The existence of a representative body in the congregation possessed of considerable powers contributes to this feeling; and I think there are therefore a smaller number of persons in the congregation whose sole connection with it lies in the fact of "their sleeping there of a Sunday morning." Some years ago, a rich gentleman began to attend the ministry of a very energetic and somewhat gifted American clergyman in New York. He was soon observed, and by-and-by the rector paid him a visit and desired to know what work he proposed to undertake, or what causes he would support. "Oh dear," replied the man, not a little disgusted, "I thought when I came to a respectable congregation like yours, people would let me alone and not bother me with constant applications to be doing something, as they did in the last church I attended, which was a very poor one; and here you are at me already." "Oh, my dear sir," replied the facetious rector, "you have made an unfortunate mistake. 'The Church of the Heavenly Rest' is two blocks to the right. We haven't got as far as that yet in our church. No doubt you got *mixed* between the two buildings!" (I may add that I don't think this comfortable gentleman would fare any better to-day in the "Church of the Heavenly Rest" under its present *régime*.)

It almost surprises an English Churchman to notice how much interest American Churchmen will take in their congregation, and what responsibilities they will cheerfully accept when there is a possibility of making things a success. A clergyman, who, I ought to say, possessed no ordinary gifts, received a call from the vestry of a very large church in one of the great cities. For several reasons he did not wish to accept it, and named conditions which he thought it most unlikely that they would accept, for, owing to the old age and ill-health of the previous rector, things had completely run down and the church was nearly empty. The conditions involved a guarantee of £2,000 a year for the support of the clergy, besides a good deal more for church expenses; but it was further stipulated that the church should be absolutely free and open. The conditions were accepted without any hesitation. How many churches are there amongst us whose laymen would undertake a similar responsibility?

Another thing that struck me was the large proportion of the communicants to the congregation. One rector, whose

church would only seat a thousand, assured me that he had eight hundred communicants; and this was not the only case of the kind that came under my notice. Many of these "communicants," no doubt, only receive on Easter Day, and the changes of residence, so frequent in America, tend to swell the muster-roll without really increasing the actual numbers. But still the fact remains that the proportion of communicants to congregation is higher with them than with us. When we ask for an explanation of this, we notice, first, that the American Church is much less than ours the Church of the people. Amongst ourselves you will find ten communicants at Kensington or Belgravia among those who attend church for one at Stepney or Bow. It is a fashion with persons in a certain social grade to attend Holy Communion, and is equally the fashion with others in a lower grade, I know not why, not to do so. But there is a second reason which makes me doubt how far this large proportion of communicants is an altogether healthy sign. I frankly confess that I was not very favourably impressed with the spirituality of the tone of any congregation that I visited there, and one of the results of the prevalence of a low tone of spirituality will always be that criteria of this kind will mean much less than under other circumstances they would. Where a strongly spiritual tone prevails, people are disposed to judge themselves; and if they feel that their hearts are not right, to abstain from acts that seem in place only with the spiritual. But when spiritual distinctions are generally ignored, and public opinion draws no distinction between those who are Christians indeed and those who are Christians only in name, men cease to be affected by such considerations, and participate in Holy Communion with as little misgiving as they would feel in joining in the Litany.

Now, if I were asked what one characteristic of American church-folk most painfully impressed me, I should promptly reply, their *indefiniteness* in things spiritual. It certainly exceeded anything that I am familiar with in England, both in extent and degree, much though we have to complain of it amongst ourselves. Over and over again, in my endeavours to help individuals, I found myself quite at a loss to know whether the soul that I was dealing with was a true believer who had not grasped the full assurance of faith, or a mere formalist who had a name to live but was dead. By many of the clergy, whose spirituality I should be slow to question, not only is the idea of "sudden conversion" definitely discountenanced, but doubt is cast upon the certainty of any experience of justification; and the knowledge of salvation by the remission of sins is not looked upon or

spoken of as being at all necessary to the spiritual life. A reactionary revolt against the hard-and-fast classifications of Methodism no doubt contributes to this state of things, but does not justify it, nor diminish the dangers that it brings in its train. We may not insist upon the accidents of justification; the blessing may be gained suddenly or dawn upon us gradually. We may be able to "name the day" or unable to name the year in which the change took place, but surely we should know whether or not it has taken place; and should learn from our spiritual teachers the real and very serious danger of going on in a state of uncertainty upon this point.

Perhaps it is the prevalence of this general indefiniteness that renders the distinction between true Christians and the world much less obvious than it is amongst us here, or at least causes it to be much less insisted upon. If it be asked, Are American Christians on the whole more worldly than English ones? the answer to the question must largely depend on what we understand by worldliness. It cannot be denied that they have less scruple than many amongst ourselves in participating in certain forms of social gaiety generally supposed by us to be worldly. But, on the other hand, an English friend of mine who has for some years been resident there went so far as to say, "They have a juster idea of worldliness than we in England have; they are really simpler, have less social pride, and much less worldly ambition than many Christian people at home, who would shrink with pious horror from a ball-room or a theatre." Well, to their own Master they stand or fall. I, at least, cannot presume to judge them, but I confess I find it difficult to understand how the theatre and the ball-room contrive to harmonize with the higher aspirations of the spiritual life.

Here, again, we are perhaps seeing a fruit of reaction. Amongst some of the denominations there is still a very strong feeling against "worldly amusements," and in years gone by it was much stronger than it is now. So it came to be a common saying that when people wanted to be religious, but would not give up the world, there was nothing for it but to fall back upon the Episcopal Church; and I have seen the same thing pretty plainly stated by a contemporary Methodist newspaper. Hence, in a curious way, an assertion of liberty from conventional religious restrictions in such matters has come to be regarded as a sign of good Churchmanship, and "strait-laced" notions as a remnant of Puritanism. Feeling strongly as I do that in our intercourse with the world we should avoid, as far as possible, countenancing those institutions which are specially infected by the world's spirit, I greatly regret that so many Christians in America should have

adopted the line that they do adopt on these points, nor can I think that the result is healthy. At the same time, in forming our conclusions in such a matter, we must make full allowance for the prevalence of a general sentiment, even in the religious world, less distinctly unfavourable to participation in what are sometimes, and I think rightly, called worldly amusements than usually obtains amongst us.

To return to Newburgh. Thin congregations and abhorrence of after-meetings were, to begin with, the order of the day. As for individuals, they simply declined our proffers of help, and several nights passed without our having an opportunity of conversing with a single awakened or inquiring soul. We were well through the first week before the ice began to break, and then we soon had our hands full. Prejudice yielded to conviction, and many who had hitherto thought themselves good church-folk began to comply with a direction which, I believe, gave great annoyance to some, when it was the text of my first sermon: "Examine yourselves whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves." A happy thought of our rector, a man greatly and deservedly beloved by his flock, gave us an opportunity ere the Mission ended of seeing how prejudice had given way, and how deep a hold the Mission had taken upon the interests and sympathies of these dear people. (I use the word "dear" in no conventional sense, for I feel, as I write, as if Newburgh had a specially warm place in my heart's recollections.) He announced from the desk that, as he was sure his people would like to know me and my fellow-workers personally, he invited *the parish* to meet us in his house on the following Thursday afternoon. To English ears this form of invitation sounded rather alarming. What and if the whole parish should come? But "parish" in America means very much the same as "congregation" in England, and I think that the congregation was pretty well represented in that crowded gathering. I can never forget the warmth and cordiality with which we were greeted that afternoon by one and all, nor, what is far more important, the testimony received from one after another to the benefit that the Mission had proved to themselves or their friends. One of our party observed that this afternoon "tea" was one of the very best "after-meetings" she had ever attended.

Remarkably enough, as we finished our work here, Mr. Moody began his in a huge skating-rink hired for the purpose. I was curious to see whether this prophet has the honour in his own country that we rejoice to give him here in England, and so was very glad that the first meeting of his "Convention," falling on the Saturday succeeding our Mission, gave me an opportunity of meeting him. Yes; it was just the

same—all sorts of vehicles, respectable and grotesque, from all parts of the country crowding the streets; within the huge rink the same familiar sea of faces, the same air of intense and eager interest. I had heard some indistinct rumour that I was wanted to take some part in the meeting; but I was not at all prepared for the imperative order from this most masterful ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν—"I want you to take a clear hour!" But I have learnt with Mr. Moody that there is nothing for it but to obey, so after he had given a very characteristic address upon the Bible and Bible-reading, the "clear hour" had to be taken, and thus I bid Newburgh farewell.

I was glad Mr. Moody chose the subject he did, for I must confess that nothing gave me more painful surprise during my visit to the United States than the neglect of Bible study, even amongst Christian people. True, as a professor at one of the American universities said to me, "Mr. Moody speaks and thinks of the Bible as though it had fallen out of heaven in one volume, printed in Baxter's type according to the English version of 1611, and bound in black morocco, with flaps and gilt edges." But how much better this childlike, uncritical acceptance, coupled with an intense reverence for the Divine oracles and a full confidence in their capacity to make us wise unto salvation, than that superficial and not less uncritical depreciation of the Bible which is so prevalent amongst people who want to be thought abreast of the age, and nowhere more prevalent than in America! How far the one extreme of uncritical acceptance contributes to the other of uncritical depreciation is certainly an important question, and one deserving the very serious consideration of the orthodox of our day. But no harm can be done by showing as plainly and forcibly as possible that the Bible is to us a living book, speaking with a voice of authority such as no other book can pretend to, and claiming obedience where it communicates light; and no one shows this more plainly than D. L. Moody in his strong and trenchant utterances on this subject.

The secularizing of education throughout America renders the children and young people much less familiar with the letter of Scripture than our own at home; and this secular spirit shows a strong disposition to assert itself even in the Sunday-school. My friend and fellow-labourer, Mr. Stephens, in addressing his audiences of children and young people, found it quite impossible to elicit from them the answers about Scripture facts and familiar truths which rise in a shout from English audiences of a similar character, and yet the impression left upon his mind was that the American children are as a rule sharper and certainly much more precocious than ours. One lady teacher in one of the places we visited ob-

served, "We never open a Bible in our school. I have been teaching a considerable number of years, and I don't think I have ever seen a Bible-lesson given. What time we have for instruction after other things are done (and we haven't much) is always taken up with the Church Catechism." I noticed, too, that in several of the congregations that we visited, there were no such institutions as Bible-classes or Bible-readings of any kind in connection with the Church. That several such gatherings were started in consequence of the Missions held in various places I regard as amongst the most satisfactory results of these efforts.

On leaving Newburgh we found ourselves at work in Brooklyn, which is more a part of New York than Birkenhead is of Liverpool. Here, and in the next place we visited, the large manufacturing town of Newark, which also lies close to New York, our experiences were very similar to those I have already described. In each case the beginning was slow. Church-people at first stood aloof because our work savoured too much of the system of "the sects;" and "the sects" stood aloof because we were working for that "most exclusive" of all Protestant communities, the Episcopal Church. We had no hold upon the general population, because we were working for a small and not a very popular ecclesiastical body. We had but little hold to begin with upon that body, because its members were very conservative, and we seemed daring innovators. So in each case we had to win our way gradually, and only in the latter part of our Missions did their success become obvious and impressive.

An incident of the closing day of the Brooklyn Mission has left a very happy impression on my mind, and I think it likely to have an important influence upon the future of Mission-work yonder. On the second Saturday of our Mission, when it had been going on a week, my rector took me to pay my respects, as in duty bound, to the Bishop of Long Island at Garden City. Bishop Littlejohn has a name on this side of the water, and is, I believe, the only American Bishop that has ever held the office of special preacher at an English University. In his own country he has a considerable reputation as a theologian, and perhaps would be generally spoken of as belonging to the old-fashioned High-Church school. I asked him to come and be the celebrant at our closing Communion on the following Friday, but I did not gather from his reply that he was likely to be there. On the Thursday, however, I received an intimation from the Bishop that he had a message to deliver, and he would make a point of being present. He wished me to preach as usual, and then to give him a quarter of an hour for what he had to say. It appeared that during

the course of the week he had been present at a public meeting in which some of the clergy who did not sympathize with the Mission had referred to it in some utterances not distinguished by very good taste or very kindly feeling. The good Bishop went home stirred in spirit. He felt he must speak out; and, as he told me afterwards, though he had much else in hand, he put it all aside, and sat up till after midnight writing a sort of Episcopal manifesto upon the subject of Missions. This he delivered with much force and fire on the morning in question, having prefaced his written remarks by a most cordial reference to the sermon which he had just heard. This paper was afterwards printed in the American *Churchman*, and I suppose it must have been read from one end of the States to the other, carrying all the more weight from the known character and views of the man.

At the luncheon-table afterwards I saw that the Bishop—a man of placid habit, who rarely betrayed any kind of emotion—was a good deal moved; and very deeply interested was I in finding that this Mission had come upon him "like a long-forgotten strain" wafted from some of the happiest ministerial experiences of his bygone life. "During the great American revival, as it was called," he said, "I was the rector of an important church at Newhaven" (I suppose this would be about the year '57). "Unfortunately, most of our Episcopal clergy stood aloof from that movement, but the more I saw and heard of it the more I felt it was the work of God, and that we ought to throw ourselves into it, and endeavour to direct and shape it wisely and soberly. I opened my church-room for special evangelizing gatherings, but soon we were crowded out of that, and had to adjourn to the church. I had no one to help me, and for several weeks I went on preaching three and four times a day, until at last my voice entirely gave way, and after several ineffectual efforts to get assistance, I had to bring the services very reluctantly to a close, but not before a most deep and permanent impression had been produced upon the hearts and minds of many of my people." I was much interested and touched at this testimony, and by the way in which it was given. Here was a man who would be regarded as the soberest of sober Churchmen, and who, the first time I saw him, had been eloquent upon the dangers of the revival system. Yet thirty years ago he had had courage and breadth enough to recognise and make good use of all that was best in a great revival movement with which his own body would then have nothing to do, and God had spared him to see that being done in the American Church at large which he had had the enterprise and the foresight to attempt thirty years before in his own single congregation.

In speaking of Bishop Littlejohn and my visit to him, I have incidentally mentioned Garden City and its cathedral. It is not quite the only building connected with the Episcopal Church in America that bears the name of cathedral, but it may perhaps be regarded as the building most deserving of the title so far as appearances go; and I think it very probable indeed that within a decade or two something like an English cathedral corporation and an English cathedral city will have been reproduced here. The cathedral owes its existence to the munificence of a lady, the widow of the late millionnaire Stewart, whose body lies (or is believed to lie) in the cathedral crypt. A very heavy sum has been expended in raising this structure, which, however, is not large; on the whole the effect is successful. Much of the detail work is very elaborate and conscientious, and no expense had been spared in carrying out the architect's designs. We are reminded, however, that we are in America by the substitution of metal pillars (I believe they are bronze) for marble in the aisles, and more agreeably by the presence of an organ that is a perfect marvel of mechanism, which is, indeed, five organs connected by one set of key-boards, one being situated in the crypt, and one in the tower, and one in the roof, if I remember rightly. But there these buildings stand—an accomplished fact—a genuine cathedral, with a Bishop's house (I suppose I must not call it a palace), and, contiguous, a very large public school conducted on Church principles, and destined, if my predictions are worth anything, to become one of the most important educational centres in the land.

Will the cathedral system ever take root in America? Dr. Phillips Brooks says, "No. It isn't American, and the conditions which created it in England are wanting here." I am not so sure of this; but I do feel very certain of one thing, that if they ever develop anything of the kind, it will be so practically and sensibly done, that it will be a real source of strength to them where it is often a source of weakness to us. It will not be necessary for any future Dean of an American cathedral to spend ten years in endeavouring to discover the duties of his office, as one of ours is said to have affirmed that he had done without any success. We shall never see there a number of respectable elderly gentlemen, otherwise unknown to fame, gathered round the precincts of some imposing edifice, with no greater responsibility resting upon them in virtue of their office than an obligation to preach one dry sermon in a week and to read the lessons at daily prayers, and to draw a thousand a year for doing so. Dignified ecclesiastical sinecures will never commend themselves to the practical

common-sense of America, and it will be well for us when we cease as a Church to sanction them.

But cathedral offices need not be sinecures, and peradventure while we are appointing Commissioners and talking about what ought to be, leaving everything in the meanwhile just exactly as it was, these *go-ahead* people in America may actually evolve a rational cathedral system before our eyes. One thing is clear, they would be much the better for some definite provision such as our cathedral system ought, if rightly worked, to supply, for the maintenance of men of literary eminence and erudition in posts in which they may exercise their special talents without being overburdened with parochial responsibilities, or, on the other hand (as in universities), losing touch altogether of the practical work and life of the Church. The tendency of the elective system in America, as in Ireland, is to exclude men of distinguished learning and literary ability from the Episcopate, in favour of men who have proved themselves successful parish priests. This may not be altogether a disadvantage, for there is no reason in the nature of things why a student exhumed from an erudite sepulture within college cloisters should suddenly blossom forth into an able administrator or a popular orator; but every church must need some *locus standi* for men of real learning in her organization, and the cathedral system, properly worked, should offer this.

Not less do we need men of activity at headquarters in each diocese, who will take the lead in various branches of Church work, and act as a kind of staff around the Episcopal general. It is in this form, I think, that the cathedral system is most likely to commend itself, at first at any rate, to the practical American mind; and perhaps, if the Mission movement becomes as popular in the Episcopal Church as I hope it may, *Diocesan Mission* Canons, charged with the superintendence of Mission work in their dioceses, may begin to appear amongst them as they are already appearing amongst us.

Certain it is, from what Americans have done and are doing, that a development of this kind might take place with great rapidity. We on this side inherit the accumulated wealth of ages; they have had to do everything themselves, and it is astonishing to think of what they have done. Their magnificent country, with its boundless resources, is compensation for much that the ages have given us, and they are by no means ignorant of their advantages in this respect. At Newark, on the national Thanksgiving Day, I had the pleasure of hearing the rector, a man of noted eloquence, deliver an oration rather than a sermon on the words, "All that I have is thine;" and his object

was to stimulate grateful feelings and a sense of responsibility by showing that the United States possessed about every material, political, and social blessing that the great Father could bestow. It was unfortunate for this application of the text that the words were spoken to the *elder* brother (!) But the preacher was right; they already have their endowments yonder in one great endowment: it only remains for them to turn their wealth into cash.

I cannot take leave of Garden City and its cathedral establishment without saying a word or two about the magnificent school which the same munificent benefactress has erected hard by, and in full connection with it. My friend Mr. Van-de-Water, the rector of the church in Brooklyn in which I was holding my Mission, regards the creation of this great public school in connection with the Episcopal Church as one of the most important and promising features of her development. The school system in America is curiously different from ours, and I do not think that the difference is to their advantage. Public schools in our sense of the word do not exist. A public school with them means what we should call an elementary school. The nearest approach to anything like an English public school that they have is the University, to which boys are admitted at such an early age that you are reminded rather of the upper forms of Harrow and Rugby than of University life in Oxford or Cambridge, in what you see there. I noticed at Yale College that the professors all spoke of the students as "boys;" I never once heard the word "men" used of them. In preparation for the University private schools are the order of the day, and these depend for their success entirely upon the capacity and repute of the head-master and proprietor. The experiment, then, of establishing something like a great public school in connection with an Episcopal cathedral, and with a distinct Church tone, will be watched with the greatest interest all over the States, and may lead to a gradual revolution in their educational methods. The school has only just been opened, but already it is a splendid success, and I shall not be surprised to hear in the course of a few years that its numbers have risen from one hundred to five hundred. The arrangements are as nearly perfect as possible. Every boy has a separate room, and not a very small one, entirely to himself, and they all open out into long corridors carefully warmed and ventilated. The military system of discipline common in American schools is maintained, which, though it is not very much in harmony with an Englishman's ideas and prejudices, is said to work extremely well. All the boys wear uniform, and the school itself is a sort of regiment with its officers and

privates, all alike under strict discipline. The masters have nothing to do with the discipline of the school; they are simply "friends who teach." If a boy offends they report him to his military superior, and he is duly court-martialled, and punished accordingly. It seems all very funny to an Englishman, but I believe it works exceedingly well, and undoubtedly there is in this school a really earnest effort being made to bring a good religious and pure moral influence to bear upon the boys of the upper classes, and to make them both true Christians and good Churchmen.

The New York Mission followed upon the heels of our work at Newark. Our post was St. George's Church, where the vicar was an Englishman, and one who had had much to do with bringing the general Mission about. Himself a distinguished Mission preacher, the Rev. W. Rainsford spared no pains to make the Mission a success in every sense of the word. A surpliced choir of about fifty men and boys, assisted by an equal number of ladies, led the singing, while a large band of willing labourers beat up the neighbourhood around, the houses of the wealthy as well as the lodgings of the poor. The Mission was thoroughly well worked, and I believe that the labourers were rewarded by a season of real and widely extended blessing. St. George's Church is one of the largest in New York, and also one of the best attended. It is entirely free and open, and yet boasts an abundant income. The system by which this desirable state of things is brought about is worth describing, as I am not aware that it prevails in any church amongst us.

As soon as anyone joins the congregation he is waited on by one of the vestrymen, and politely asked what he intends to contribute to the support of the church. I believe he is only asked to name an approximate sum, and that he enters into no such distinct obligation as is implied in an annual subscription. He is then supplied with fifty-two small envelopes for the year, and is asked to place his regular contribution in the collecting plate at the offertory, enclosed in one of the envelopes; whatever he desires to give to other specific objects he can place in the plate not under cover. The treasurer for the church and, I think, one other gentleman keep a careful account of all the moneys thus received, and of the number of the envelopes through which they come, for each set of envelopes has its own special number. They know, therefore, exactly what each person contributes, but no one else does, for the book is not seen by any other eyes. I am afraid to state the sum that is received through these envelopes, but I know the amount greatly surprised me. I do not think anything like so much would have been obtained from letting

pews, and besides this large amounts were collected from time to time for special objects.

Both here and in other churches all over America we found ourselves at a disadvantage in our Mission work yonder, from a cause that does not operate, at any rate to anything like the same extent, amongst ourselves at home. It is a curious fact that Sunday-evening services are unfrequent, unfashionable, and, when they are held, usually ill-attended in America. At St. George's Church, on the first Sunday of the Mission, we were crowded in the morning service, and, judging from the analogies of London, one should have expected to see crowds turned from the doors in the evening. This has happened repeatedly in Mission services that I have held, even in the most fashionable parts of London. But at St. George's as a rule the evening service is a Mission service, with a short irregular liturgical element, and a good deal, I suppose, that is extempore; and this is usually attended by five or six hundred, in a church in which about seventeen hundred will gather in the morning. It was thought very satisfactory that the body of the church was filled the first Sunday evening, but the galleries were not even opened. It is easy to see how great a disadvantage a Mission labours under when it gets no fair start on the first Sunday night. But such are the habits of the people, and really I am quite unable to say whether this arises from their being behind us or in advance of us. Is it that with their usual conservatism they are just emerging from where we were seventy years ago, in the days when Charles Simeon created almost a riot, and was mobbed by undergraduates for holding an evening service? or is it that they are already where we are to be in the twentieth century, when the triumphant body shall have dictated its terms finally to the soul, and bid it master its appetite as best it may, and not interfere with the imperious claims of the eight o'clock dinner? I know not. I only know this American peculiarity is somewhat hard upon Missions and Missioners! A similar strong indisposition to turn out at night hampers and checks all week-night parochial work. Our very earnest and active rector at Brooklyn assured me that it would be simply futile to attempt following up the Mission by week-evening meetings of any sort or kind. The habits of the people, he asserted, were thoroughly opposed to anything of the kind, and you might as well turn back Niagara as attempt to alter them. As a matter of fact, in that otherwise well-worked church, I think I am right in saying that from Monday morning to Saturday night it never occurred to them to hold regularly any single religious meeting or service of a congregational character. It was no use trying; people would not come.

Probably the feature of the Advent Mission at New York that excited the most general interest was the series of services for business men at old Trinity Church. Old Trinity is the mother-church of New York; in an English town we should call it the old parish church. After the Revolution, although it always, I believe, sided with the Royalists, it was, by a rare act of generosity, allowed to retain the royal farm with which Queen Anne had endowed it. It has to-day, I suppose, the largest endowment of any church in the world. I have heard the sum variously estimated at seventy, eighty, and a hundred thousand pounds per annum, which of course is not all spent upon that single church, but supports several daughter churches. The church still retains in New York something of the prestige which with us belongs to the old parish churches of our big towns. A committee of laymen was formed to promote these gatherings of business men, and with much painstaking care they made all the necessary preparations. But I think we were perhaps more indebted to Dr. Douglas, the assistant-minister at Trinity, than to anyone else for the success of the meetings, from the very first, in point of numbers. He did, I think, everything that could be done, and represented in his friendly activities the cordial sympathy and goodwill of Dr. Dix, the rector of the parish.

I had heard much of the extreme tension of business life in New York, and that men were so pushed all day long that it would probably be far more difficult to secure a congregation there than in London. Besides, while I may be pretty well known here, in New York I was a perfect stranger. I must say, then, that it was a very agreeable surprise to me when, on entering the great church on the first Monday of the Mission, I found it nearly full, and ere I gave my text there were already some standing round the door. I have conducted similar services in London and in most large towns of England, but I shall always look back upon these gatherings at Trinity as the most interesting and apparently successful I have ever held. The interest went on increasing from day to day, until choir and aisles and every other available part of the building were crowded with a congregation of men only, and mostly of *bonâ-fide* business men. So general was the interest excited that it was decided that we must go on another (*i.e.*, a third) week, chiefly at the suggestion (or shall I say the command?) of D. L. Moody, who suddenly appeared on the scene, greatly rejoicing at this success. He observed to me, with much emphasis, "You are probably doing the greatest work of your life, *right here*, now."

Well, "the day will declare," and it will never be known till then what the Lord may have been pleased to do through

those services. After-meetings were, of course, out of the question, and only a few of those who heard me at Trinity could follow me to St. George's. But I cannot doubt that out of that crowd of eager faces not a few received a message of life.

The last service was a most impressive one; Bishop Potter attended, and spoke in very cordial terms of the work; after which, in the course of my closing address, I read a most affecting letter from a business man, detailing some of the special temptations of business life, arising from the habit of making it the duty of the younger men connected with certain firms to "*entertain*" big customers from the country on their occasional visits to town. The writer gave a really ghastly list of tragic consequences that he knew to have been due to this arrangement, mentioning (without names) some twenty acquaintances of his, who had been amongst the flower of New York commercial men, and none of whom had received a smaller income than £1,000 a year, but who had all gone to ruin, owing to habits of sin formed by "entertaining customers," a process that usually began with a champagne supper, proceeded with a visit to the theatre, and concluded at the house of ill-fame. Greatly was that vast congregation stirred by these terrible statements, the more impressive because of their evident truthfulness and sincerity; and few eyes were dry as the writer closed in some such words as these: "You ask, perhaps, how have you then escaped? I have not escaped! Prematurely old, with a shattered constitution and a blighted life, I linger out what remains, trying to find comfort in the thought of God's pardoning mercy, hoping to join by-and-by my dear father and mother, who are waiting for me yonder."

Thus this most interesting series of gatherings came to its close amidst expressions of warm and friendly feelings that were almost overpowering to their recipient. For Americans are certainly more demonstrative than we are, and I like them none the worse for it. I think the preacher must have been quite twenty minutes in making his way from the pulpit to the vestry, so many gathered round to press his hand and utter words of thanks and fervent good wishes. I do not know how soon they will forget my words, but it will be long indeed before I forget their friendly cordiality and sympathetic enthusiasm.

W. Hay M. H. Aitken.

(*To be continued.*)

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

SECOND PAPER.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Here we will quote a characteristic piece from Wellhausen:

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

"The question before us," says Wellhausen,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

FREDK. E. TOYNE.

ART. VI.—THE HOME RULE CAMPAIGN.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

And while there are these incidental gains to politics

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

GILBERT VENABLES.

Short Notices.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Heralds of the Cross; or, the Fulfilling of the Command. Chapters on Missionary Work. By FRANCES ARNOLD-FORSTER. Illustrated edition. Hatchards.

"Heralds of the Cross" was warmly commended in these pages as soon as it appeared, and we have much pleasure in inviting attention to the present edition, large paper, illustrated. It is a singularly interesting book, and will long remain a general favourite. Its teaching power is great. A better "Missionary" present than this attractive volume there can hardly be.

The admirable article on "The Hour of Communion," by the Rev. N. DIMOCK (one of the most learned of our liturgialists), which appeared in the March CHURCHMAN, has been published as a pamphlet by Mr. Elliot Stock.

The *Church Sunday School Magazine* contains a report of the proceedings at the forty-third Anniversary of the C.E.S.S. Institute; Conference, Annual Meeting, and Festival Service. The Archbishop of Dublin's sermon, and the addresses of the Bishops of Exeter and Bedford, the Dean of Gloucester, and others, will richly repay reading. If any one of our readers is unaware of the great good work being done by the Institute, he will do well to procure a copy of the Magazine for June.

In the June *Blackwood* appears a very readable paper, "French Examiners under the Civil Service." Another paper treats of Gwillim, about whom many readers of "Rob Roy" know—the extent of their knowledge—that Sir Hildebrand used to read that great authority on heraldry of a winter's evening. "Moral Degeneracy; who is its Author?" *Blackwood's* answer may be easily guessed. *Blackwood* says:

> The history of the last six years, and Mr. Gladstone's figure in it, has been deeply impressed on the consciousness of us all. There can be, there is, no disagreement among us as to his attitude with regard to Home Rule up to last Christmas. If he were to protest on the subject (as perhaps it might be congenial for him to do) up to Christmas next, he could not induce a man, woman, or child to believe his report. It is perfectly well known how he has spoken of Home Rule and Home Rulers; it is fresh in our memories in what terms he was good enough to speak of an imaginary but dreaded coalition of Conservatives and Home Rulers; our ears ring still with the scream in which at the last election he besought the constituencies to give him a substantial majority to avert the calamitous drama which has now been produced at his own instance, and in which he monopolises all the chief parts, being Lion, Moonshine, Pyramus, and Wall. The force of what Mrs. Gamp called "bragian boldness," could hardly go beyond this!

A readable little book, with a good deal of information, is *Burma*, by Mr. J. G. SCOTT, "Shway Yoe." Few Englishmen know so much about Burma. His *France and Tong-King* was recommended in these pages a year or two ago. (Geo. Redway, York Street, Covent Garden.)

From the Religious Tract Society we have received: *The Life of Latimer*, *Olive's Story*, *Adventures in Mongolia*, and *Wit and Wisdom of Thomas Fuller*, neatly got up in cloth; specimens of the new "R.T.S. Library, illustrated," commended in the June CHURCHMAN.

We are much pleased with Messrs. Hatchards' new illustrated edition of the Prayer Book, *The Book of Common Prayer arranged as read in Churches.* As regards binding, type, and illustrations (photographs), this is a dainty volume. Designed mainly for young people, it is not a complete edition.

THE MONTH.

THE Home Rule Bill was rejected, on Tuesday morning, the 8th, at half-past one o'clock, by 341 to 311. In the minority were 85 "Nationalists." 92 Whigs and Radicals voted against the Bill. The speech of Mr. Goschen was unanswerable. Mr. Parnell spoke with careful moderation; but he declared that he must have Ulster. Mr. Gladstone's closing speech, with striking passages and an eloquent peroration, was to a large extent wide of the mark, and probably had no influence over the waverers. In the largest division ever taken in any House of Commons he was beaten by thirty votes. On the 10th, he announced that the Queen had been pleased to accept the advice of her Ministers, and that Parliament would be dissolved on the earliest possible day. Mr. Chamberlain's contribution to the debate was of singular value, especially with regard to the Imperial Parliament, and the Protestant minority in Ireland. Mr. Findlay and Mr. Winterbotham spoke with power. In its own line Sir Henry James's speech was unrivalled. Mr. Albert Grey did great good service.

The *Guardian* (of the 9th) said:

> The danger that has threatened England since the accession of Mr. Gladstone to power has happily been averted by the division of yesterday morning. We have no desire to set too high a value on the result of a single engagement, or to make light of the task which still lies before the defenders of the Union. Still, in the first pitched battle victory has fallen to the right side, and we may fairly see in this an earnest of success as well as a stimulus to exertion. The proposed withdrawal of the Bill made its rejection the more important.

The *Record* (of the 11th) complained that at the most inconvenient time of the year the country will be called upon to pronounce upon a policy which was sprung like a mine upon it five months ago:

> A whole session has been worse than wasted. A serious money loss will be occasioned by the disturbance of business, in addition to the heavy cost to individuals by a General Election. And all this to gratify the vanity of one man, in whose absence, as Mr. Bright truly says, not twenty members outside the circle of the Irish Nationalists would listen for a moment to such proposals.

The *Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette* (of the 12th) said:

> Mr. Gladstone's Bill for governing Ireland through the National League was happily defeated by the decisive majority of thirty on Tuesday morning. Where the Old Parliamentary Hand failed it is not likely that any other tactician will succeed. It is a great deliverance wrought for us by God, for which we cannot feel too thankful. We are reminded of the escape of the Jews from the machinations of Haman, the son of Hammedatha, the Agagite, and, like them, in the hour of their deliverance from imminent peril, we may well rejoice. . . . We are not yet escaped, however, from all our difficulties. A dissolution is resolved on,

and the result will be awaited by the Protestants of Ireland with the utmost anxiety.

Mr. Chamberlain is heading an assault upon the Caucus. His "Radical Union"—for the promotion of local self-government in England, Scotland, and Ireland—will at all events lessen the chances of some Ministerialist Radicals.

In many Scotch constituencies, happily, a strong Protestant current is running. A deputation from Ulster Presbyterians was most heartily received in Edinburgh.

Last night (the 18th) in Edinburgh, the Prime Minister made a speech, on which the *Times* comments: "Mr. Gladstone has surpassed himself, and that is saying a great deal, in audacious quibbling with plain issues, in juggling with empty phrases, in ignoring or perverting notorious facts, and in setting at defiance logic and common-sense."

The *Record* criticizes with severity the appointment of Lord Halifax, on the advice of Mr. Gladstone, as an Ecclesiastical Commissioner; and a speech by his lordship at the recent E.C.U. anniversary, touching "communion with the Roman See."

In the new Act the hours of marriage are extended to three o'clock in the afternoon.

Mr. Eliot, the well-known Bournemouth Vicar, has been made, we gladly note, Canon of Windsor. Mr. Jayne, Principal of Lampeter, has accepted the Vicarage of Leeds.

The Church of England Purity Society has held its third annual meeting at Lambeth Palace.—At the Conference of the National Society, an interesting paper on Free Education was read by Mr. Talbot, M.P.—At the anniversary of the S.P.G., a very full and effective speech was made by the Archbishop of Canterbury.

An interesting farewell service was held at Lambeth Palace Chapel, Canon Maclean and the Rev. W. H. Browne setting out to undertake the work of the Archbishop of Canterbury's Mission to the Assyrian Christians.

The report of the Commission appointed by the Archbishop touching the benefices in Canterbury contains two recommendations which we gladly record, viz., the union of certain parishes and the suppression of one of the canonries.

In the *Record* of the 4th appeared a very interesting paper, "In Memoriam: Canon James Bardsley."

The second reading of the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill was rejected by a large majority. The Duke of Argyll's speech was one of singular eloquence.

Dr. Knox, late Bishop of Down, has been enthroned as Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of all Ireland. Dr. Stack, Archdeacon of Clogher and Rector of Monaghan, has been elected to preside over the revived See of Clogher.