

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

commandments, and shall teach men so (and what if he compel men so?), shall be called the least in the kingdom of God'” (“Dissuasive,” II., ii. 4).

F. MEYRICK.

(To be continued.)

ART. II.—THE ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY
SINCE THE RESTORATION.

VII. WILLIAM WAKE (*concluded*).

THE primacy of Wake marked a time of more peaceable character than those of the predecessors of whom I have had to write. George I. was King, and was well established on the throne. There was no longer any serious fear of a Stuart Restoration. The peace of Utrecht in 1711 had ended a period of warfare which had gone on with only five years' break since the Revolution of 1688. The twenty-five years that followed were almost entirely years of peace. And England was the main preserver of it, the main barrier for Europe against the ambition of the house of Bourbon. It is not too much to say that the policy of England has been, on the whole, in favour of peace ever since, eager for the observance of treaties and international friendship.

When George I. became King parties were still talking loud, but much of the old bitterness was gone, inasmuch as very few people wanted the Stuarts back. The Tories were Churchmen hating the Papists, and more loath than ever to see the attempts of King James renewed. But King George knew what their principles had been of yore, and he gave his support to the Whigs. Consequently the party was all but dead in the first years of the House of Hanover. They were in such a minority in the House of Commons that they hardly numbered fifty men; and a mighty cleavage existed in the party outside, for there were still some Tories who longed for the Restoration of the Stuarts, though the majority would not hear of it. It was, indeed, in consequence of this that the Jacobite rising of 1715 took place. It had no hold in England; it was an act of despair on the part of the uncompromising members of the party. Bolingbroke, who, as we have already seen, had split the party and had gone with Atterbury to the side of the Pretender, was in hopes of the co-operation of Charles XII. and Louis XIV.; but the latter died in the very crisis, the Swedish King failed, and the rising of 1715 was an abject failure. The Whigs were stronger than ever, and took

advantage of this to repeat the Occasional Conformity Act, although Archbishop Wake opposed them; "the scandalous practice of occasional conformity," he said, "was condemned by the soberest part of the Dissenters themselves." Atterbury and he for once, at any rate, spoke on the same side. At the trial of his friend Sacheverell, five years before, Wake had gone strongly against him.

But the Church had now entered upon a period of inaction and deadness. The Bishops were for the most part Whigs, the rank and file of clergy Tories. The country squires were partizans of the House of Stuart, and the bucolical clergy were dependent on them. The well-known description of the poor parochial ministers of this period in Macaulay's third chapter is faithfully derived from contemporary literature. All through the time of the two first Georges the higher dignitaries of the Church were separated from the main body of its clergy, and this paralyzed its strength.

But further, rationalism was gaining ground rapidly. The religious wars which had so bitterly afflicted England during the Stuart period were now ended; and even on the Continent there was comparative peace where there had been religious bitterness. Intelligence, physical discoveries, new political theories, all were busy; and the result of them was a rising temper of questioning, not in theology only, but in every department of thought. England had taken a strong lead in literature, and the outburst of it in both France and Germany was largely the result of the imitation of English writers. The past was becoming underrated; the wreck of medieval ideas was followed by a vulgarization which vaunted itself as "common sense." It was a time of coffee-house chatter, of short essays, some of them sprightly and worth keeping, and some frothy—of no more value and taste than corked champagne.

When Voltaire, in 1726, was ordered to leave France because of his quarrel with the Duke of Sully, he came—a young man of thirty-two—to England because he regarded it, not unnaturally, as a land of freedom. There were open Deistical books going, such as the writings of Woolston, Tindal, and Collins. But above these were the discoveries of Newton and the philosophical inquiries of Locke, works which placed England in a higher intellectual position among the nations than she had hitherto taken. Voltaire lived three years on English ground, and it might have been well with him to have rested upon the convictions which he seems to have formed from his experience of our institutions and of the English clergy. But when he went back to the Continent, much impressed with the free spirit of our ecclesiastical life,

and found once more both corruption and intolerance in the Roman Catholic priesthood, he became an embittered enemy of the Church, if not of Christ Himself. His character and opinions must always present insoluble problems, which, in fact, we are not called upon to solve. His daring invective and satire he had learned largely from English writers, but in the spirit of Shylock he had "bettered the instruction."

We have already seen how semi-Arianism had manifested itself in the Church theology. It came to a climax in the writings of Benjamin Hoadly. In the time of Queen Anne he had come into note, being rector of St. Peter-le-Poer, in the City, by some writings of extreme Whig and Low Church principles, one of which ("The Measure of Obedience to the Civil Magistrate") so pleased the House of Commons at a moment of Whig ascendancy, that they sent an address to the Queen calling her attention to the signal service he had done to the cause of civil and religious liberty, a fierce attack being meanwhile made upon it by Atterbury. On the accession of George I. he was made Bishop of Bangor. Wake had just before conferred on him the Lambeth degree of D.D. He never once visited his diocese, but remained in London, where he still held two livings, and occupied himself in religious controversy. It was in March, 1717, that he preached the sermon before the King, on "The Nature of the Kingdom or Church of Christ," out of which the famous Bangorian Controversy arose. All that concerns us here is that on May 3, 1717, the Lower House of Convocation appointed a committee to examine the sermon, and that day week brought in a report that it had a tendency to subvert all government and discipline in the Church of Christ, and to impugn the regal supremacy in causes ecclesiastical, and the authority of the legislature to enforce obedience in matters of religion by civil sanction. This was sent to the Upper House, at which the ministers took fright. A formal condemnation of Hoadly by the Bishops, which would certainly have been approved by the rest of the clergy, would have been most inconvenient to the King and the Government, and therefore a royal mandate prorogued Convocation till November. There can be little doubt that Wake would have agreed to the report if it had come on for discussion. Although he had gone with the Whigs in the attack on Sacheverell, he had done so with discrimination, and his attitude from the moment of his Primacy had leaned to the "High Church" side. In fact, the committee of the Lower House could not have been appointed but by his consent. When November came, Convocation was again prorogued, and so continued to be from time to time, until all hope of its ever meeting again for business died

out of the minds of men. It never did so until the middle of the present century. The effect was very mischievous. Hoadly was translated to Hereford, Salisbury, and Winchester in succession, and only ceased from political controversy in the last years of his life. Some good features of his administration are still to be seen in his occupation of his last diocese. He died, at the age of eighty-five, in 1761. Atterbury, in anger, secretly transferred his allegiance to the Stuarts, and from 1717 plotted on their behalf. The clergy sullenly returned to their parsonages, equally angry with the Whigs and the non-jurors. The Bishops felt their power gone down to zero, and thought more about their own dignity and the enrichment of their families than about clerical discipline. Every sort of heretical opinion found unchecked expression. But yet there was salt left in the Church to preserve it. Even the gentle commonplaces of Addison, the efforts of Sir Roger de Coverley to improve public worship, give us the impression of a real piety and a kindly community; and for deeper theology the non-jurors deserve grateful remembrance. But they were dissolving slowly. Hickeys was dead; Robert Nelson had left them; but Brett and Collier still gave testimony of a spiritual power and life, to which our religious literature is still indebted.

We have noted that Wake was now ranging himself on the Conservative line, as we should express it to-day. When he was Bishop of Lincoln he made an elaborate speech in favour of comprehension with Dissenters; yet in 1718 he spoke against the repeal of the Conformity Bill, and next year opposed the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts. No wonder that he has been accused of inconsistency; yet this is not fair. It is always dangerous to one's own charity to impute bad motives, to judge any man save where overt acts prove his fall. In the present case Wake's change of opinion is entirely explicable; the spirit in which the relaxation was moved exhibited hostility both to the Church and to public morality, and the Archbishop discerned this, and shrank from it. He may have been shortsighted in his view, but he was certainly honest of motive.

But he was now bent on the revival of an idea which had been dear to him in years past, and which circumstances now renewed. It happened that the learned Dr. Du Pin, one of the ablest historians of the Gallican Church (April, 1719), wrote to William Beauvoir, Wake's successor as chaplain of the British Embassy in Paris, complaining of the Papal Bull, "Unigenitus," which Clement XI. had launched against the Jansenists. He declared, and quite truly, that some of the French Bishops were greatly opposed to the Bull, and that they

were upheld by the Theological Faculty of Paris. Beauvoir, who was a personal friend of Wake, wrote and told him of this, and he, in reply, sent a courteous message to Du Pin, who in response (February 11, 1718) expressed a fervid desire for the reunion of the two churches. "Vehementer opto ut unionis inter Ecclesias Anglicanam et Gallicanam ineundæ via aliqua inveniri posset. Non ita sumus ab invicem in plerisque dissiti, ut non possumus mutuo reconciliari. Atque utinam Christiani essent unum ovile."

Wake wrote a very interesting and thoughtful reply. The Church of England, he said, had secured her own independence along with her Catholic usages, in accordance with the will of Christ, and for the edification of her members. The Church of France had now the same opportunity, and might so reconstitute herself that, though she might still differ from us in worship and discipline, and even in some points of doctrine, she might still maintain a true communion with us. He did not think it would be possible to frame a common confession of faith, or liturgy, or discipline for the two Churches, nor was this necessary. Each holding the other as true branches of the Church Catholic, would thereby secure intercommunion in spite of differences. And he was sure, he added, that the best and wisest of his fellow-Churchmen would agree with him in this. Further, he bade Beauvoir to show Du Pin our Ordination Services.

The French doctor was delighted, and wrote in reply: "Il est de mon devoir de vous rendre de très humbles actions de grace de la belle et obligeante lettre, dont votre Excellence m'a bien voulu honorer. Je n'y ai pas moins admiré la beauté du style que les sentiments élevés et dignes d'un grand Prélat. Tout y respire l'amour de la paix, la douceur, la modération, la charité chrétienne; en un mot l'esprit de l'Évangile." This promised well, and the goodwill thus expressed was repeated in an address delivered at the Sorbonne on March 28, 1718, by Dr. de Girardin, one of its most distinguished members. This address is given at length in Mr. Lupton's lucid and exhaustive essay, "Archbishop Wake and the Project of Union between the Gallican and Anglican Churches" (Bell, 1896), to which I must refer the reader for the most full and candid details. De Girardin expressed his approval of the hope which had been held out, as well as of the Sacred Faculty for defending their true grounds of faith. He said it behoved them all in these days of inquiry to be sure what were essentials of belief and what non-essentials, and he recognised the same desire in the English Church both to preserve the faith and to keep the mind open for fresh light. If, he said, they started on the common ground that they

would not hold all Papal decisions to be articles of faith, they were at once holding out a hand of fellowship, and union by the blessing of God might follow.

Wake's response was one both of wise caution and of sincere brotherly love. The Archbishop of Paris, Cardinal de Noailles, had very earnestly expressed his sympathy with the Jansenists and his dislike of the animosity displayed towards them. Louis XIV. had detested them, but he was now dead, and it was hoped that the Regent Orleans would show himself more tolerant. But Wake, in a private letter to Beauvoir, expressed his belief that neither Regent nor Cardinal would break with the Vatican. Du Pin was still sanguine, and drew up a form of Eirenicon, to which he gave the name of "Commonitorium" —*i.e.*, an instruction or explanation of the faith. Wake then wrote to Beauvoir a dignified statement of his own position. Referring to De Girardin's hope of winning over the English people to the views of his Church by certain concessions, Wake says that if this means that the Church of England is to take Gallican direction what to retain and what to give up, they are wasting their time. "I am a friend to Peace, but more to Truth; and they may depend upon it I shall always account our Church to stand upon an equal foot with theirs; and that we are no more to receive laws from them than we desire to impose any upon them. In short, the Church of England is free, is orthodox; she has a plenary authority within herself. She has no need to recur to others to direct her what to believe or what to do; nor will we otherwise than in a brotherly way, and with a full equality of right and power, ever consent to have any treaty with that of France. And therefore, if they mean to deal with us, they must lay down this for a foundation, that we are to deal with one another on equal terms. If, consistently with our own establishment, we can agree upon a closer union with one another, well; if not, we are as much, and upon as good grounds, a free, independent Church as they are." And he adds, very emphatically, that if the French Church is in earnest, there must be proposals from the Cardinal as its representative. If they should be made, the Archbishop will ask leave of the King to consult his brethren with a view to their consideration. He ought not, he says, to enter into negotiations without the King's knowledge, and it would be very odd for him to have a commission to treat with those who have no manner of authority to treat with him. And he sums up by emphatically declaring that, while he is eager for union, he is also determined not to compromise the truth nor the independence of the English Church.

The French divines took this plain speaking in good part,

though they seemed, according to Beauvoir, to think that it was not likely to further union. However, Girardin went so far as to say that they thought the use of images, the invocation of saints, the communion in one kind only, might be waived as non-essentials, as well, of course, as the Papal supremacy. The Pope, urged on by the Inquisition, took alarm at the threatening attitude of the French Bishops, and took the initiative as to the struggle by promulgating (August, 1718) a fresh Bull, "*Pastoralis Officii*," in which he pronounced all who rejected the "*Unigenitus*" as "disobedient, contumacious, and refractory." It had the effect intended. Cardinal de Noailles, who was by universal consent a weak man, though he had expressed his approval of the action of Du Pin and Girardin, was frightened by the new Papal move, called his chapter together and gave in his adhesion. Other Bishops did the like, but when they posted up their adhesions on the gates of the churches, the civil magistrates tore them down. Feeling certainly ran high against the Papal usurpation at that moment, so much so that Wake sent a message to Du Pin expressing the hope that the Gallican Church would be firm, and assert its independence. Let the Bishops, he said, reject his usurped authority, and leave him only, as the primitive Church had done, a primacy of place and honour, as Bishop of the once imperial city. He urges them to take Pope Clement at his word—he has declared them contumacious, separate; let them be so, and reject his unfounded claims. Meanwhile, the fact that Wake and the doctors of the Sorbonne, if not the Cardinal Archbishop also, were in correspondence, produced much excitement in Paris. The chapel of the English Embassy was crowded with spectators Sunday after Sunday, and the chaplain performed the English Service in French for their instruction. Wake realized all this, and his hopes grew strong. He again wrote to Du Pin, repeating in the most earnest manner that everything turned on the resolute assertion of the independence, as to authority, of every National Church, and their union with each other by circular letters. The French doctors had accepted the English Communion Service as sufficient, but had made a difficulty over the "*Black Rubric*" at the end of the service, which, as Mr. Lupton truly says, is not really a rubric at all, but a Declaration of Council hastily added in 1552. However, Du Pin's reply shows that the Archbishop's explanation is satisfactory; his chief point is the Papal claims, and he earnestly assures Wake that the doctors of the Sorbonne are with him in their strenuous defence of Gallican liberty, and quotes writers of the past who have contended for the same. Mr. Lupton quotes a letter of Wake to

Beauvoir, written a little later, which shows what a very wise and statesman-like view he had formed of the matter. He foresaw that the project was in danger because the attitude of the Gallicans was inconsistent and illogical. While they are trimming and halting, "allowing the Pope as much as is consistent with their Gallican privileges, we honestly deny him any authority over us. . . . In earnest, I think we treat his Holiness not only with more sincerity, but more respect than they. For to own a power and yet keep a reserve to obey that power only so far and in such cases as we make ourselves judges of, is a greater affront than honestly to confess that we deny the power, and for that reason refuse to obey it. But my design was partly to bring them to this, and partly to see how they would bear at least the proposal of totally breaking off from the Court and Bishop of Rome."

He goes on to say that he hopes the friendship will be carefully continued, though nothing at present may seem to come of it, and he adds that he has on his side none whom he dares trust. His brethren on the Bench were nearly all Low Churchmen, and would have little sympathy with his aspirations. In fact, it is evident that his negotiations, if one may call them so, were becoming known, and were rousing opposition. But a more formidable opposition was rising over the water, and it came from the Jesuits, always the prime movers against any attempts to reform the Church of Rome. They moved the Regent to hostility; the crowds who attended the English services were interfered with, and some were imprisoned. An order was given and executed (February 10, 1719) to seize Du Pin's papers, and they were carried off to the Palais Royal for examination. A Jesuit named Lafiteau was present at the examination, and writes an account of it. "At first," he says, "we thought the letters between Du Pin and the Archbishop of Canterbury were pure civilities, but we soon found that it was something worse: 'Enfin, on parvint à la connaissance du plus abominable complot qu'un Docteur Catholique ait pu trâmer en matière de Religion. L'Apostasie n'eut jamais rien de plus criminel.'" As a specimen of the atrocities which have come to light, he mentions that Du Pin, while he did not alter "l'intégrité du Dogme," was prepared "abolir la Confession auriculaire, et ne plus parler de *Transubstantiation* dans le Sacrement de l'Eucharistie, anéantir les Vœux de Religion, permettre le Mariage des Prêtres, retrancher le Jeûne et l'Abstinence du Carême, se passer du Pope, et n'avoir plus ni commerce avec lui, ni égard pour ses décisions."

One result, apparently, was the death of Du Pin. He appears to have been overcome with grief that his efforts on

behalf of love and righteousness should have been thus defeated, and he died on June 6, 1719, not quite sixty-two years old.

So practically ended this correspondence. There is a very fine letter of Wake to Beauvoir in the collection of his correspondence, written later, in which he expresses the hope that God will yet open the way both for union of Christendom and the reformation, especially of the French Church.

He had in the same loving spirit exerted himself to draw the foreign Protestants into Christian union. Thus he writes to Beauvoir: "I am at present engaged in two or three other transactions of moment to the foreign Protestants. . . . If I can in any way help to promote this, though I am at present without any help, alone in this project, I shall do my utmost both to keep up my poor little interest with the two doctors (Du Pin and Girardin) and their friends, and to concert proper methods with them about it. The surest way will be, to begin as well, and to go as far, as we can, in settling a friendly correspondence one with another; to agree to own each other as true brethren and members of the Catholic Christian Church; to agree to communicate in everything we can with one another, which on their side is very easy, there being nothing in our offices in any degree contrary to their own principles, and, would they purge out of theirs what is contrary to ours, we might join in the public services with them, and yet leave one another in the free liberty of believing transubstantiation or not, so long as we did not require anything to be done by either in pursuance of that opinion. The Lutherans do this very thing. Many of them communicate, not only in prayers, but the Communion with us, and we never inquire whether they believe consubstantiation, or even pay any worship to Christ as present with the elements, so long as their outward actions are the same with our own, and they give no offence to any with their opinions." Golden words, surely. No wonder that his name is still held in honour, so says the Rev. J. E. B. Mayor, among the foreign Protestants.

We have now done with the greater part of Wake's public life. He was learned, and his great desire for the reunion of Christendom calls for our respect and gratitude. His later years were clouded by great mental infirmity, and to this misfortune we attribute one of the sadder features of his Episcopate. That he should use his patronage on behalf of his family was regarded as a matter of course, and he certainly did it. "That parson must be asleep who does not marry a Wake" was the saying of some witty contemporary, which was caught up and immensely received by the world. By his

wife Etheldreda Hovel, daughter of Sir Wm. Hovel, of Illington, in Norfolk, he had a large family, among which his youngest daughter, Mary, married John Lynch. Two lives of John Lynch lie before me. The first is by Mr. Meadows Cowper, in "Lives of the Deans of Canterbury, 1900." The other is entitled "The Life of Dean Lynch, by a Yeoman of Kent. No Canterbury Tale, 1758." The first is discriminating, but on the whole favourable to him; the second is a fierce attack upon him. It states that after a disreputable career at Cambridge he took Orders at the canonical age, married Mary Wake, who was "exceedingly plain in person and much deformed," persuading his father to make the settlements which the Archbishop insisted on, though thereby he impoverished the whole family. John Lynch, says the pamphleteer (for biographer would not be a fair word), persuaded his father that he could make it up to his sisters by marrying them to clerics, and getting preferment for them out of his father-in-law. And it is one of the charges which this pamphleteer brings against him that he did not keep his word. The bitterness with which he deals with his subject is clear evidence that for some reason or other he simply hated him, and everything points to some personal injury, real or imagined. Anyway his first living preceded his marriage, for Wake gave him the rectory of Allhallows, Bread Street, with St. John, Walbrook, in 1723 (after he had been only two years in Orders), and he did not marry until 1728. Let Mr. Meadows Cowper tell us what followed: "Edward Tenison, promoted to the See of Ossory, resigned the living of Sundridge, and it was conferred upon Lynch by the Archbishop, and this he was allowed to hold by dispensation with his London rectories. At this time he also received the Mastership of St. Cross Hospital, near Winchester, and exchanged Allhallows, Bread Street, for All Hallows the Great, Thames Street; St. John's he resigned. In 1731 his father-in-law bestowed on him the livings of Ickham and Bishopsbourne, near Canterbury, and the sinecure rectory of Eynesford in Kent, upon which he resigned All Hallows the Great. But his preferment did not stop here. Dean Sydall, in the same year, was consecrated Bishop of St. David's, and resigned the Mastership of the Hospitals of St. Nicholas, Harbledown, and of St. John, Canterbury. As Todd naively remarks, the same liberal motive which had induced Sydall to accept these from Tenison inclined Lynch to receive them from Wake." The pamphleteer, after shortly summarizing the above, adds that his greedy appetite was so stimulated by all this that he was always worrying his father-in-law for more, till the Archbishop "sternly rebuked him, and bade him remember that there

were other clergy who had claims on him as learned and deserving men." One rather wonders how the writer knew this. Then he goes on: "This checked him until Wake fell sick and childish, and then Lynch saw his opportunity. No lease or grant was made except under his direction, and by observing and continuing his opportunities he became possessed of several hospitals, having no inspector to control him." Of one of these our "Yeoman" writes: "It is endowed with large farms and many other great manors of immense yearly value, the full income of which he wisely conceals from the knowledge of the world, and pockets the whole revenue without account, keeping on foot a small number of old men, who on account of the badness of the times are obliged to put up with a pittance of small beer, bread and cheese, and a mortified chaplain to show them the way to heaven." Evidently he means St. Cross at Winchester here, and making allowance for the personal animosity which is clear enough all through this Memoir, it must be confessed that the abuses of St. Cross lasted down into the middle of the present century. Then our pamphleteer says that by truckling to the great men he procured to himself the Deanery as an additional pittance, that he sold the Archbishop's preferments in the most shameless and heartless manner, freely lying to the purchasers as to the value of the livings they bought. Abuse of this sort defeats itself by its own violence; he follows it up with many pages of horrible charges as to Lynch's personal life, and broadly insinuates that he has been guilty of two murders, one of a choir boy and the other of a canon. The good Archbishop, he says, in his lucid intervals, has remonstrated, but in vain.

There is no doubt that though, as we have said, there are bright stars in the darkness, it *was* a dark and evil time. The South Sea Bubble in 1720, which has left its name in our commercial records, brought ruin upon thousands, and went far to drive men to believe that righteousness and honesty had departed from the earth. Selfishness seemed to rule triumphant. Education was at its lowest point. Towns were growing up and left to heathenism, and the village peasantry were neglected. The rich clergy were non-resident. But a great movement was at hand. In October, 1735, John Wesley, a young man of thirty-two, who largely owed his spiritual life to the non-juror, William Law, went forth to preach to the Indians and settlers in North America. On his return to England, February 1, 1738, Wake had been dead a year.

The Archbishop died at Lambeth on January 24, 1737. He was buried at Croydon. According to the *Gentleman's Magazine*, he had amassed a fortune of £100,000, although

he had expended much on the buildings of his diocese. In *Notes and Queries*, vii. Series, xii. 345, there is an interesting note about the library which he founded for the use of the clergy during his Lincoln Episcopate. He left a very valuable collection of coins and medals, as well as his library, to his college, Christ Church, Oxford. There are good portraits of him at Lambeth, at Oxford, at St. James's, Piccadilly, and in the National Portrait Gallery. Mr. H. B. Wheatley says that he was the last Archbishop of Canterbury who crossed from Lambeth to the House of Lords in the state barge.

W. BENHAM.

(*To be continued.*)



ART. III.—THE DIVINE TITLE “LORD OF HOSTS”
IN ITS BEARING ON THE THEORIES OF THE
HIGHER CRITICISM.

THE bearing of this Divine title for God, *Jehovah Tsebâôth*, on the theories of the Higher Critics as to the composition of the Pentateuch and Book of Joshua, the “Hexateuch,” as they call it, appears to have hardly attracted the attention which the subject deserves. Any argument based on some particular title for God, or on the presence or the absence from certain parts of the Bible of some particular expression, may be pressed, it would seem, with peculiar propriety against the theories of the Higher Criticism; because these theories may be said to have taken their rise originally in the person of the physician Astruc, through his noticing that two different names—“Elohim” and “Jehovah”—were used for God in the Book of Genesis; and, further, because it may be said generally that the critical theories in the present day are based in a great measure on the occurrence or the non-occurrence of various words and expressions in some one verse or passage in the Old Testament, as compared with some other.

The title for God, “Lord of hosts,” “Lord God of hosts,” “God of hosts,” never, as is well known, occurs in the Pentateuch, nor in the Books of Joshua, Judges, or Ruth. The first occasion on which it is used in the Bible is in 1 Sam. i. 3, in the passage, “And this man went up out of his city yearly to worship and to sacrifice unto the Lord of hosts in Shiloh.” The pre-Samuelitic period of the history of Israel is thus differentiated from the post-Samuelitic period by this circumstance, that in connection with the former period this title