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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

AUGUST, 1892.

ART. I.—THE NEW CRITICISM.[1]

I MUST, in the first instance, express my sense of the kindness and confidence to which I owe the invitation to read a paper before this conference on the important subject of recent Biblical criticism. I had rather, indeed, have listened to someone better qualified by special learning, and with the advantage of more time than I can command for such a controversy; but I could not refuse a request made to me on behalf of so important a body of clergymen and laymen to offer them such suggestions as I may be able upon a question which is certainly of vital importance, and which no clergyman can any longer disregard. Until very lately the mass of the clergy and laity had no immediate occasion to be disturbed on the subject of Old Testament criticism. It was well known that revolutionary theories were prevalent in Germany, and were represented in this country by the same section of scholars and writers who were disposed towards rationalistic criticism of the New Testament. But such theories respecting the Old Testament were regarded as of no greater consequence than those relating to the New, which had been, in the general judgment of the English Church, clerical and lay, so decisively refuted. Just as the great mass of English scholars were undisturbed by the revolutionary movement in New Testament criticism connected with the name of Baur, almost until that movement had run its course, so they acquiesced in the old belief respecting the Old Testament, with a similar confidence that the revolutionary theories of some German scholars on that subject, after running their course, would leave the old beliefs in the main, not merely undisproved, but confirmed. But the situation has been gravely altered by the sudden adhesion to

[1] Read before a society of clergymen.

the main contentions of the predominant school of German critics, within the last few years, of persons in authoritative positions in our Church. When it is maintained in a series of Bampton Lectures that there are no Davidic psalms in the Psalter; when another Bampton lecturer, representing some of the most earnest Christian thought of Oxford, calls on us to be prepared to accept some of the most characteristic contentions of German criticism on the Old Testament; when the successor of Dr. Pusey at Oxford publishes an introduction to the literature of the Testament, in which he maintains positions as unquestionable which Dr. Pusey devoted his whole learning and his best energies to refute; when, finally, the Regius Professor of Hebrew at Cambridge, though speaking in more moderate tones, practically surrenders the traditional position, and tells us we need not be disturbed, even if we should have to believe that what we once supposed to be literal history in the Old Testament is but "truth embodied in a tale"—when the matter has reached this pass, it is evident that the struggle which has been in progress in Germany has come closely home to us, and that we can no longer afford to rely on the weight of authority within our own Church. When, above all, the matter has gone so far that it has become a question for newspaper discussion whether, not merely the Apostles, but our Lord Himself, could have spoken and taught on an erroneous assumption respecting the origin of the Old Testament books, it becomes obvious that the central principles of our faith are, at least in some degree, involved in the controversy. It is clearly a duty of thoughtful men in such circumstances to consider the position of the question, and to be prepared, according to St. Peter's injunction, "to give an answer to every man that asketh a reason" of the hope and belief which is in us on this great subject. It is impossible for everyone, or for many persons, to enter into the details of the controversy; but it is of the more importance that its cardinal points should be clearly apprehended, and the principles distinctly recognised on which we should proceed in forming our judgment on the subject. In a single paper this is, of course, all that can be attempted, and my endeavour will be only to offer you a few suggestions for this purpose.

Now, the first thing it is imperative to recognise for a satisfactory treatment of the subject is that there should be no question of the right of criticism to discuss the matters at issue, or, rather, that it is at once our duty and our privilege to listen impartially to all the arguments which can be adduced upon it. We should put ourselves entirely in the wrong if we indulged the slightest suspicion or jealousy of critical in-

quiries, as such, in the matter. We must never forget the great saying of Butler at the conclusion of the fifth chapter of his second part: "Let reason be kept to; and if any part of the Scripture account of the redemption of the world by Christ can be shown to be really contrary to it, let the Scripture, in the name of God, be given up." We base our belief in the Scriptures and our allegiance to Christ upon their claims on our conscience and our reason, and that conscience and that reason we must follow wherever they lead us. The representatives of rationalistic views are always endeavouring to put us in the wrong on this point. They speak of themselves and their allies as "the critics," and they treat those who adhere to the old views as opponents of criticism in general. Let us take care that we allow no justification for such reproaches. The difference between ourselves and them is not that they are critics and we are blind believers, but that they are unsound critics and we are sound ones. Our whole contention is that their arguments will not bear the test of wise and thorough investigation; that they are often marked by lack of common-sense, by a failure of spiritual insight, and by an arbitrary temper; and we maintain that the most thorough investigation, if accompanied by that sound thought and historic sense which are essential to a satisfactory judgment, will justify in the main the old views. I could not say we start without prejudice, for it is doubtful whether anyone can start without some prejudice in investigating matters of such traditional, as well as profound, interest; and certainly the critics, to whom the present position of Old Testament criticism is due, started with an intense prejudice against the old beliefs—a prejudice which is expressly avowed at the outset of their investigations, and which biasses their judgment all through. A Christian, I venture to say, ought to have a prejudice in favour of the belief of the Christian Church from its very commencement; but we, none the less, fully acknowledge that, in exercising our critical judgment, we are bound to put all such prejudices aside, just as a jury are required by a judge at the outset of their deliberations in an important trial to dismiss from their minds any presumptions they may have formed before they came into court. We are as capable of doing this on our side as the rationalists are on the other, and no more can be asked of us or of anyone.

But at the same time it is idle to shut our eyes to the immense issues which are involved in the controversy. Nothing is to be gained by trying to persuade ourselves, as is done by some earnest representatives of the new views, that no serious consequences to Christianity would come from their adoption. If that which purports to be literal history in the Old Testament be

not history at all, but legends or traditions worked up or worked over; if the Pentateuch alleges solemn events to have occurred which did not really occur; if the writers of the Scriptures state that God gave revelations which He never did give; if a book to which our Lord appeals as containing solemn declarations of God's will be really a fictitious representation designed to persuade the Jewish people at the time of Josiah or Manasseh that Moses prescribed ordinances which he never did prescribe—then it is folly for us to disguise from ourselves the fact that the authority of a great part of the Bible is gone, and that, for practical purposes, the authority of the Apostles, if not that of our Lord, is grievously shaken. It is quite clear that if the contentions, for instance, of Professor Driver be true, no plain man can read the Old Testament narratives with any confidence that he is reading a trustworthy statement of matters of fact. The Pentateuch has, in point of fact, produced the impression upon the whole Jewish and the whole Christian Church, since the days of Ezra at least, that Moses delivered the legislation therein contained; but this impression, which it not only has, in fact, produced, but which it was admittedly intended to produce, is, we are told, an erroneous one. Moses, it is said, probably laid the basis of the legislation, but the repeated statements that "the Lord said" so and so "unto Moses and Aaron," in the Book of Numbers for instance, are simply not true. The Lord never did say those things to Moses and Aaron, and the person who wrote the book represented that he did so for the purpose of producing an impression which is not a true, or, as the favourite phrase runs, a "historical" one. How can we trust a book which is undermined at every point by this sort of suspicion? We are not only justified, but compelled, by such considerations, to examine these alleged critical results with the utmost stringency before we admit them. Apart altogether from questions of inspiration, there is a strong presumption in favour of the credibility of a book which has been believed to tell a true story from the first moment when it is known to have existed, and the uniform belief of the Christian and the Jewish Church has similarly a right to be presumed true until the contrary has been strictly demonstrated. A great mistake is, I apprehend, made, though with the best intentions, by some who would minimise the consequences of this criticism. The enemies of the Christian faith will not minimise them, and weapons of the most formidable character are placed in their hands by such admissions. I do not wish to show how such weapons might be employed, but it is enough to suggest what use an opponent of the Gospel might make of the admission, by authoritative English

scholars, that the belief of the whole Jewish and Christian Church respecting the origin and authenticity of their sacred Scriptures has been founded on an illusion. That such an allegation could be without its effect on the authority of a more sacred Name is, I fear, impossible.

From this point of view I would suggest that we have a right to lay far more stress than is often done on the weight of the argument from tradition. It is admitted by the rationalistic critics that there is no exception to the belief, from the earliest times to which unquestionable records reach, that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch; and the probable truth of this belief has of late years become far stronger, as it is now established that the art of writing was well advanced before the time of Moses, and that he did write something. Dr. Driver showed a true apprehension of the starting-point of such inquiries when he commenced by boldly maintaining that "on the authorship of the Books of the Old Testament, as on the completion of the Canon of the Old Testament, the Jews possess no *tradition* worthy of real credence or regard, but only vague and uncertain reminiscences, intermingled often with idle speculations" (p. xxvii.). It may, I think, fairly be regarded as evidence of a lack of impartiality in his investigations, that, in his first edition, in discussing this question, he made no mention whatever of the well-known statement of Josephus on the subject. Josephus states expressly that the Jews had the most fixed and trustworthy traditions on the matter; and it was hardly dealing with the question fairly to leave out of consideration entirely so positive and remarkable a testimony. In later editions Dr. Driver has introduced some observations on Josephus, and acknowledged that he "bears witness, probably, to an opinion more or less current at the time." We are justified in concluding, therefore, that, in his own mind, Dr. Driver attached no weight either to the testimony of the important Jewish writer whom he thus entirely disregarded, or to the "opinion more or less current" among learned Jews in the first century of our era. But it would seem that any sober historical criticism would start from the supposition that this belief is in possession of the ground, and should at least be given the benefit of the doubt.

There is one other presumption which Dr. Driver puts forward on which we are justified in making a strong remonstrance. While making every allowance for what he says in his preface as to the impossibility of his entering into polemical discussion, we have some reason, I think, for resenting the somewhat arrogant tone in which, after the manner of the German critics whose views he upholds, he magisterially pro-

nounces that the arguments of conservative critics are untenable. The tone of his language (p. xix.) to Mr. Girdlestone is somewhat unusual, and it is hardly fair to students to put aside the contention of an experienced scholar like Dr. Green, the chairman of the Old Testament Revision Company in America, with the mere remark (p. 26) that his explanation "does not satisfy the requirements of the case." But, in particular, there is one sentence in Dr. Driver's preface which it is important to meet with a strong contradiction. He says (p. xv.): "Nor can it be doubted that the same conclusions upon any neutral field of investigation would have been accepted without hesitation by all conversant with the subject; they are only opposed in the present instance by some theologians because they are supposed to conflict with the requirements of the Christian faith." Now, one instance to the contrary is more than sufficient. I mean the example of the late Dean Milman. He was eminently competent to form an opinion on the main points at issue; he was acquainted with the whole field of German learning on the subject, down to the time of Ewald in Germany and of Renan in France; and he says expressly, in treating of the date and authenticity of the Book of Deuteronomy, what, for my part, I could not say, that he "holds such questions to be entirely irrelevant to the truth of our religion" ("History of the Jews," 4th edition, 1866, p. 208). Yet what was his conclusion with respect to that crucial question? He unhesitatingly assigned Deuteronomy to Moses, who, he says (p. 207), "recapitulated and consolidated in one brief code, the Book of Deuteronomy, the whole Law, in some degree modified and adapted to the future circumstances of the republic." In a note he adds: "In assigning this antiquity to the Book of Deuteronomy, I run directly counter to almost the whole critical school; I have re-examined the question, I trust dispassionately (I hold such questions to be entirely irrelevant to the truth of our religion), and adhere to my conclusion." "Read the Book of Deuteronomy," he says, "and fairly estimate the difficulties which occur—and that there are difficulties I acknowledge—such as the appointment at this time of Ebal and Gerizim as the scene of the rehearsal of the law by Moses or a writer on the other side of Jordan (the prophetic power of Moses is excluded from such an argument), though one cannot suppose Moses or the Israelites at that time unacquainted with the main features, the general topography, of Cis-Jordanic Palestine. Then read it again, and endeavour to assign it to any other period in the Jewish annals, and judge whether difficulties do not accumulate twenty-fold. In this case, how would the signs of that period have inevitably appeared—anachronisms, a later

tone of thought, of incident, of manners! Even on this special point, at what period would Ebal and Gerizim have been chosen as the two equal antagonistic centres of Jewish reverence and sanctity? If it is a fiction, it is certainly a most felicitous fiction. . . . What I contend for," he concludes, "is not the absolute, unaltered, unmodified integrity of the text, but what I may call the substantial antiquity." So, again, with respect to the Pentateuch, as a whole, he says in his valuable preface (p. xxvii.): "There are two theories between which range all the conclusions of what may be called the critical school: 1. That the Pentateuch in its present form is of very late date—the reign of Hezekiah, Josiah, Manasseh, or even subsequent to these. From what materials it was formed, and on the antiquity of those materials, opinions vary infinitely. 2. That the Pentateuch, even in its present form, is of very high antiquity, as high as the time of Moses; but that it has undergone many interpolations, some additions, and much modification, extending to the language, in successive ages. "If I am to choose," he concludes, "I am most decidedly for the second. For one passage which betrays a later writer or compiler, there are twenty which it seems, in my judgment, that no compiler at any of the designated periods could or would have imagined or invented, or even introduced. The whole is unquestionably ancient (I speak not of the authorship), only particular and separable passages being of later origin."

So, again, of the law as a whole he says (p. 130): "To what other period," than that of Moses, "can the Hebrew constitution be assigned? To that of the Judges?—a time of anarchy, warfare, or servitude! To that of the Kings? when the republic had undergone a total change! To any time after Jerusalem became a metropolis? when the holy city, the pride and glory of the nation, is not even alluded to in the whole law! After the building of the temple? when it is equally silent as to any settled and durable edifice! After the separation of the kingdoms? when the close bond of brotherhood had given place to implacable hostility! Under Hilkiah? under Ezra? when a great number of the statutes had become a dead letter!" All such suggestions he dismisses as impracticable. "I can have no doubt," he concludes, "that the statute-book of Moses, with all his particular enactments, still exists, and that it recites them in the same order, if it may be called order, in which they were promulgated."

These conclusions of so unprejudiced a scholar and so experienced a historian as Dean Milman are alone sufficient to rebut so wholesale a disparagement of all conservative criticism as has just been quoted from Dr. Driver; and they are of the greatest value in themselves. No man need fear the

reproach of theological prejudice, or of incapacity for the due appreciation of criticism, who is content to abide by the conclusions to which so great a historical scholar deliberately and maturely adhered; and few books better deserve fresh study in the present crisis of this controversy than the fourth and last edition of his "History of the Jews," from which I have been quoting.

But still it may be said that it is a rash thing for those who are not professed Hebrew scholars to set themselves in opposition to the combined authority of learned professors at Oxford and Cambridge and of most Hebrew scholars abroad. But on this point let it be remembered, in the first place, that it is not quite correct to speak, as is sometimes done, of this criticism as the "new criticism." It goes back, even in its present form, to about fifty years; and the scholars at Oxford and Cambridge who preceded the present younger race of professors were perfectly familiar with the main contentions of the critical school. Canon Cook, for instance, the editor of the "Speaker's Commentary," was perfectly and profoundly familiar with the whole course of German criticism, from the days when, as a young man, he attended Niebuhr's lectures at Bonn, to the time when he issued the last volume of his Commentary, only ten years ago. All that is really new is the more extreme form which the rationalistic theories have now generally assumed; but the main element in them—the division of the Pentateuch into distinct documents—was practically completed, and even the germs of the new theory itself were laid, in works published more than a generation ago. In the next place, it is to be remembered that there are very able Hebrew scholars who resist the new views. Not to mention living English scholars, it is enough to mention Dr. Green, already referred to, who is contending, step by step, in the American journal *Hebraica*, against what he calls "the Divisive hypothesis," and whose able little book on the Jewish feasts, published by Nisbet, attacks, and in my judgment defeats, the Wellhausen theory on a cardinal point, and affords a very convenient general view of the whole controversy. His previous volume also, on "Moses and the Prophets," is an able refutation of the views of the new school as represented by Dr. Robertson Smith. The late Dr. Edersheim, again, was one of the most learned and able of the Hebrew scholars of our day; and his Warburton Lectures, preached about ten years ago at Lincoln's Inn, offer a decided opposition to the new views. Confessedly, moreover, the question is not one of accuracies of Hebrew scholarship. It is admitted that you cannot at present decide the questions at issue as you might decide the date of an English book—by mere characteristics of language. The critics do not rely on such characteristics,

though it may be that in the future they will be found of more importance in the matter than is at present generally supposed, and of a tendency not now expected. But at present, at all events, the question turns on points of evidence open to general apprehension, on plain grounds of historical judgment and common-sense.

But, in the third place, it may be useful to remember that the only point in which the critics may be said to be fairly agreed—the existence of different sources for the Pentateuch—is one which in no way involves a decision as to the date of those documents. I have looked with especial care into the arguments of recent critics on this point, and the grounds which they allege are such as are open entirely to common judgment, and are wholly indecisive. Dr. Driver, for instance, says (p. 117) with respect to the "Prophetical Narrative," J E, that "The *terminus a quo* is more difficult to fix with confidence; in fact, conclusive criteria fail us. We can only argue upon grounds of probability derived from our view of the progress of the art of writing, or of literary composition, or of the rise and growth of the prophetic tone and feeling in ancient Israel, or of the period at which the traditions contained in the narratives might have taken shape, or of the probability that they would have been written down before the impetus given to culture by the monarchy had taken effect, and similar considerations, for estimating most of which, though plausible arguments, on one side or the other, may be advanced, a standard on which we can confidently rely scarcely admits of being fixed. Nor does the language of J and E bring us to any more definite conclusion. Both belong to the golden age of Hebrew literature. They resemble the best parts of Judges and Samuel (much of which cannot be greatly later than David's own time); but whether they are actually earlier or later than these, the language and style do not enable us to say. . . . All things considered, a date in the early centuries of the monarchy would seem not to be unsuitable, both for J and for E; but it must remain an open question whether both may not in reality be earlier." Even assuming, therefore, the existence of the alleged documents, the critics can allege no conclusive criteria to show that they are not of very early date.

It seems, indeed, very difficult to believe that the elaborate literary process assumed by Dr. Driver and the Continental school of critics is a possible one. To produce such an elaborate mosaic as they represent the Pentateuch to be—with half-verses pieced in amidst a variety of documents—would be a difficult task even at the present day, with the aid of modern paste and scissors. But to suppose that in these days a writer or compiler sat with half a dozen documents before

him, and took a bit from one and a bit from another, seems to me hardly conceivable. Moreover, the necessities of the hypothesis seem to lead to as many difficulties, if not absurdities, as the old Ptolemaic hypothesis of "cycle and epicycle, orb in orb," in relation to the heavenly bodies. One illustration may suffice. Within the last few weeks a very convenient introduction to the Old Testament, from the point of view of the rationalistic school, has been published by Dr. Cornill, of Königsberg, in a standard series of theological handbooks, and has been welcomed by the chief journals of that school as an able and trustworthy account of the present state of the new criticism; and I would beg you to notice what it says respecting that document P, which Dr. Driver tells us is so clearly to be distinguished from the rest. Dr. Cornill, too, says (p. 56) that "P is sharply and clearly distinguishable from all other sources. In most cases there can be scarcely any serious doubt of what belongs to it. Style and mode of expression, language and idea, are everywhere so much the same that we receive the impression of a complete unity." "But," he goes on, "upon more accurate observation, it would appear that what we have to deal with is only a unity of spirit, not a literary unity. It is precisely the history of the origin of P which is most peculiarly complicated. The penetrating investigations of Wellhausen and Kuenen have shown that on the basis of old priestly records (called P_1 by Kuenen) a larger and connected priestly document, partly of narrative and partly of legislative contents, was composed, which forms the kernel and skeleton of P, and may be called P_2. Around this kernel later additions have then gathered and grown, partly supplementing P_2, and partly correcting it; and for these later and latest portions I would propose," says Dr. Cornill, "the general designation of P_x; since the division into P_3, P_4, P_5, etc., is scarcely practicable." I venture to think that when we have got to P_x, this Ptolemaic literary theory must be breaking down under its own complexity, and is reduced by its own necessities to an absurdity. At all events, when we reach such a point we may safely say, with Dean Milman (p. xxiii.), "that the Hebrew records, especially the books of Moses, may have been compiled from various documents, and it may be at an uncertain time, all this is assuredly a legitimate subject of inquiry. There may be some certain discernible marks and signs of difference in age and authorship. But that any critical microscope, in the nineteenth century, can be so exquisite and so powerful as to dissect the whole with perfect nicety, to decompose it, and assign each separate paragraph to its special origin in three, four or five, or more independent documents, each of which has contributed its

part, this seems to me a task which no mastery of the Hebrew language, with all its kindred tongues, no discernment, however fine and discriminating, can achieve." "There seems to me," he says elsewhere (p. 132), "a fatal fallacy in the ground-work of much of the argument of the critical school. Their minute inferences, and conclusions drawn from slight premises, seem to presuppose an integrity and perfect accuracy in the existing text, not in itself probable, and certainly utterly inconsistent with the general principles of their criticism. They are in this respect, in this alone, almost at one with the most rigid adherent of verbal inspiration."

But on this whole question of the division of the Pentateuch into different sources, there is one observation on which great stress may, I think, with advantage be laid. It is that we are on wholly different grounds when dealing with the Book of Genesis and with the subsequent books. The whole of the history in the Book of Genesis is long anterior to Moses; but the history from the Book of Exodus onwards is contemporary with him. Now, nothing would be more in conformity with the example of other books of the Bible, such as the latter books of Jewish history or the preface to St. Luke's Gospel, than that for the history before his own time Moses should have used ancient documents, under the guidance of what the lamented Dr. Liddon in one of his last sermons called "the inspiration of selection." There can, accordingly, be no doubt that in the Book of Genesis we have literary monuments of far-distant ages, as imperishable as the bricks and other stone monuments of ancient Assyria now in the British Museum. But when we come to the time of Moses himself, we are confronted with the fact that he is expressly stated to have written parts of the Pentateuch; and if the controversy be confined to these later books, we shall be on much surer ground in defending his authorship, his substantial authorship, of the rest. Even here, what can be more probable than that priestly hands wrote parts of the books under his direction, and that consequently variations of style may be detected from point to point. But any of the other theories seems to involve nothing less than deliberate fraud, and, as Dean Milman says, substitutes twenty difficulties for one which is presented by the old belief.

I cannot trespass further on your time; but I trust that these considerations afford good ground for believing that the issue of the present attack on the substantial unity, authenticity and authority of the Pentateuch will meet the same fate as that of the Tübingen School on the New Testament. The critics who are now so confident show conspicuous marks of prejudice and of a lack of common-sense; while on the other side we

have the unanimous tradition of the most tenacious nation on the face of the earth, and of the uniform conviction of the Christian Church down to the present century. There is thus no reason at present for so much as presuming to touch those questions which lie within the very citadel of the Christian faith, respecting the authority of our Lord and that of His Apostles. When, if ever, the belief of centuries has been clearly overthrown, we might then be compelled, with deep and painful anxiety, to approach such inquiries. But for the present we are fully justified in maintaining that the old faith respecting the Jewish Scriptures is in possession of the ground, and that the plain natural interpretation of our Lord's language respecting them corresponds to the soundest conclusions of critical learning.

HENRY WACE.

ART. II.—CLERICAL LIFE IN IRELAND.

IT is not more than some sixty years since a clergyman and an officer fought a duel on the island of Innisfallen, in Killarney Lakes. The clergyman had given unintentional offence to the man of war, one of the garrison of the Castle of Ross. A challenge followed. The parties met on the lonely island. The officer fired his pistol first, and without effect, whereon the clergyman fired his pistol in the air, advanced and shook hands, and the affair was happily over.

The same "Parson D.," a well-known Kerry rector, happened to be in Dublin when the famous duel was arranged between O'Connell, who was a native of the same county, and D'Esterre. The parson was a young man then, and failing to obtain a seat in the coach which plied between Dublin and the Curragh, where the duel was to be fought, he travelled the whole way standing on the step of the coach-door, and was in time to see the fatal shot fired which slew D'Esterre. His emotion was so great at the sight of the spectacle that he flung his hat in the air, shouting, "Hurrah for the Kerry man!"

Curious stories are told of the same "Parson D." He is said once to have borrowed a congregation of the Roman priest to meet the Bishop of the diocese, who had come to preach in his church. The two clergymen were on good terms, too good, indeed, for the Church clergyman had allowed many of his flock to stray to the Roman fold unrebuked. Both were great hunting men, and the priest did not wish to spoil sport, so when a message came from the Protestant rector that the Bishop was coming, and he wished to show him a good congre-

gation, the priest after early Mass bade all the "boys" go over to the parish church for the day, and there never was seen such a congregation as that which crowded aisles and seats alike to greet his lordship.

It was far away in the North in those good old days that another eccentric vicar caused one outer wall of his dining-room to be taken down, an old chaise on C-springs to be brought in, and the wall built up again. In the easy old coach the parson would recline, and smoke his pipe and have his glass, and prepare his sermons. Late in life the good man married, and his lady, who proved to be "the better man," brought in two men with a cross-cut saw, who before the astonished eyes of the vicar cleared the parlour of the cherished divan. This was the vicar who introduced an ingenious mechanism by which, to the saving of the parochial funds, he acted as both his own organist and organ-blower, working a barrel organ by a treadle placed in the reading-desk!

Speaking of barrel organs, I well remember certain churches where there was no other way of accompanying the service. In one church there was an organ with a couple of popular double chants, to which all the Canticles were sung. The Venite was a difficulty, however. What was to be done with the odd verse? The correct thing to do was to let the organ, then, play the first part of the chant alone, and the voices came in on the second half. This often led to amusing mistakes, and the good old rector had been heard to say, "Boys and girls, will you never learn to *humour the organ?*"

I myself remember a worthy West-country vicar who was both simple-hearted and absent-minded. I have known him put on one boot and forget the other, and go to church with a boot on one foot and a slipper on the other. I have been in his study, and you could look down through the holes in the floor into the kitchen below. And he did not seem to notice that there was anything much amiss, or to be in any degree inconvenienced.

But these days of prose and Mrs. Grundy are making a clean sweep of the old eccentricities. The rector is almost an impossibility now (he was no impossibility, but a reality, thirty years ago), who brought two spaniels to church, and encouraged them to sit perfectly well behaved in the two open windows of the chancel, interested spectators of the service.

The days we live in are pruning down originality, and improving things all round in the Church of Ireland. And I will bid good-bye to anecdotes of individuals, and say something about the circumstances which probably would most strike an English clergyman were he to come to minister in

an Irish country district, in the Disestablished Church, in the present day.

The question of finance is one of constant interest. But it must not be thought that in the disendowed Irish Church the clergy receive their support directly at the hands of their people. Matters are arranged too well for that. The voluntary system is a well-organized one. Every diocese has a "diocesan scheme," or "plan." And it is provided that so long as each parish pays in its allotted contribution to the diocesan funds, the clergy will receive the appointed stipend. And in most of the thirteen dioceses any failure to pay is not visited on the then incumbent, but on the defaulting parish, which must make up its arrears before a successor can be appointed. This secures the independence of the clergy, as a general rule.

During the past twenty years £4,069,529 have been contributed voluntarily to the Representative Body for the sustentation of the Church of Ireland; and although the landlords are less and less able to bear the burden, their deficiency in contributions is, as a rule, being made up for by increasing gifts from the middle and lower classes. In some dioceses the plan is working well of collecting the sustentation fund monthly by means of envelopes placed on the church plate, and the collections are acknowledged on a sheet in the porch. In the old times, everything required for the support of the church, and for its repairs and cleaning, down to a sweeping brush or duster, was applied for to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners; now all Church requisites, as well as the support of the ministry, come from the people themselves. The amount given for missionary and charitable purposes has increased very considerably since disestablishment, and these funds have not suffered by the diversion of so much money to sustentation.[1] A large number of new vicarages has been built, and countless churches have been restored in the same period. The laity have learned to give valuable help, and the clergy and laity have been drawn more closely together.

At the same time, it must be owned that it has put the Church to a serious strain in outlying districts to maintain with regularity her ministrations to the people. The consolidation of parishes which has been forced on us has placed many parishioners in a much less convenient position for attending public worship. Afternoon services have taken the place of matins in a great number of churches, and many of our clergy have to take walks or drives of an exhausting kind

[1] The average annual income of the Hibernian branch of the Church Missionary Society for the ten years previous to disestablishment was £6,100; the average for the decennium ending 1890 was £7,490.

between services. One of the Kerry rectors, who has two churches twenty miles apart, has for years served both, without the help of a curate, every Sunday, driving forty miles between the morning and evening services of the mother church.

Outside Ulster the Church is working in the midst of an overwhelming Roman Catholic population. The difficulties and dangers arising from this fact can be realized by a little thought. There is naturally a difficulty in making the ordinary mind grasp firmly the fact that truth does not depend on numbers, and that the Reformed Church is true and must be faithfully adhered to, even though there be a hundred Romanists to every one Churchman in the parish. The whole social and religious atmosphere is saturated with Roman habits of thought. The clergy, monks, and nuns of the Roman Church meet you at every corner, the rubicund appearance of the secular clergy, as a rule, not suggesting the practice of habitual fastings. The clergy and Bishops give themselves airs. They try to make it appear to the uninstructed that they are the only clergy who have any claim to recognition as lawful pastors. The contempt of our ministrations is scarcely veiled. And on the slightest opening, as, *e.g.*, at a death-bed, when the Protestant patient is weak or unconscious, and some Roman Catholic friends are near, they are ready to seize on the dying person, baptize him *in extremis* (even in such a case as a death by *delirium tremens*), bury him with all the rites of the Church, and fasten on his young children afterwards.

What consequences may naturally be expected to flow from this extreme disproportion in numbers, and from the audacious claims which, in striking contrast to the humble position held by the Roman Catholic clergy a hundred years ago, are now insisted on? You will readily believe that, according to the way in which each man views it, either extreme bigotry or a perilous indifference to the dangers of Romanism results on the Protestant side. Bigotry, puritanism, iconoclastic zeal—such are the features of character and action developed in one class by the presence of Romanism. It is this feeling which has led the General Synod to pass extreme canons, invading liberty of individual practice, and leading many of our critics to regard us as a very narrow-minded branch of the Church Catholic.

The other result, which is not uncommon and much to be regretted, is the fatal indifference which falls on some of our people. They see their neighbours nearly all going to Mass, but it no longer strikes them as sad that this is so. It is as "natural" as the damp climate, and as little to be

altered by personal influence. And a considerable number of Church of Ireland parents send their children on too slight grounds to monastery or convent schools, where, whatever may be said to the contrary, a quiet effort is made somehow, or by some person, to instil Romanism into the Protestant child's mind. I knew of a clergyman who, to test the effect of the Roman Catholic National School education (with a conscience clause) on the Protestant child of eight years old, offered the child sixpence to say the "Hail Mary!" and it was instantly repeated. A child in my own parish was given as a premium for writing, by the nuns, a story book altogether written to support the *cultus* of the Blessed Virgin Mary. And another young girl of my parish warmly maintained, as a result of her education by the nuns, that the Church of Ireland is no more ancient than the time of King Henry VIII. Some of our people absorb by every pore in these southern parishes the Roman influence. And some parents call the clergy bigoted if they denounce this attendance at Roman schools, and the mixed marriages, which are not uncommon.

The reader must not, however, gather from the above that a serious leakage is going on under these influences from the Church. The truth is that there is a small amount of conversion going on each way. Every clergyman almost has had his losses and his gains. I should be sorry to express a definite opinion as to the side on which the balance lies. But the statistics of the census of 1891, which are not to be questioned, show that the proportion of Romanists has decreased in the country during the previous decade more than that of Churchmen; or, in other words, that the Church of Ireland forms a somewhat larger percentage of the population now than in any previous decade of the century.

That this increase in the percentage is likely to go on there is little doubt.[1] And at any time it may become far more rapid by positive conversion. Facts point in the direction of a growth of the Church and of the number of Churchpeople. The reader may have heard of Father Connellan, of Athlone, who some five years ago, having been directed by his Bishop to preach on transubstantiation, was so convinced of the falseness of the doctrine while he studied for his sermon that he left the Church of Rome, pretending, by the ingenious stratagem of leaving his clerical garments on the side of a lake and donning a suit of lay clothing, which he had previously hidden near, that he was drowned. His character

[1] No one can, of course, predict what the effect on our poor scattered Protestants would be if a Home Rule Parliament under ecclesiastical patronage were established, but the prospect of the effect on poor Protestants under such circumstances is not a hopeful one.

as a good priest was proclaimed in the pulpit and the press; but when next year he reappeared as a decided Protestant and began to teach his neighbours, no words were too strong to describe the falsity of his motives and the incorrectness of his life. He has found many sympathizers among his family and poor neighbours. His brother and sister have followed him in quitting the Roman obedience, and he is doing useful work in propagating enlightened views of personal religion. During the present year another Roman Catholic clergyman, Father O'Shea, has similarly quitted Rome, and is now zealously working in Dublin in the cause of the Gospel. All over Ireland copies of the Scriptures are being bought from humble colporteurs in large numbers by Roman Catholics. One colportage society sold to them 12,978 Bibles, Testaments, and small religious books during 1891, and the number sold increases yearly. Every colporteur of different societies has the same tale to tell—a wonderful and increasing spirit of inquiry and independence of clerical dictation. There is a little band of evangelists who go to fairs and markets distributing tracts and preaching publicly in towns where the population is a mixed Protestant and Roman Catholic one. They have been very well received, and have sold many copies of the Scriptures.

I believe, from many years' personal contact with the people, that at no time were Irish Romanists more willing to listen to the simple comfort of the story of the Gospel of Christ. "*That's grand!*" heartily exclaimed a young woman to whom not long since I was reading from the Gospel of St. John. And I have never had such absorbed and attentive hearers among Protestants as I have from time to time met among Romanists as I related to them in simple words the story of a free salvation.

So far as can be learned, the old cry against heretics will not longer be tolerated by educated lay Roman Catholic people. It is only a very ardent young curate who will now venture to preach that all Protestants are on the road to perdition. Most of them have got hold of the convenient phrase that "invincible ignorance" on the part of a Protestant will be his excuse at the last. The social relations between the clergy of the two churches are usually those of cold civility. In few places is personal hostility shown by the Roman priest to the Church of Ireland rector. And the like may be said of the mutual relations of the laity. Up to the present a growth of good feeling has been slowly on the increase; it remains to be seen whether threatened political developments will interfere with this. My belief is that they will.

Leaving the subject of the Church of Ireland in relation to

Rome, other features of clerical life in Ireland suggest themselves for consideration. The revival of Church life has been most striking in the last forty years, and has received many fresh impulses since our disestablishment. The determined opposition of our people to Romanism will always prove a safeguard against ultra-Ritualistic developments. But the growth of order, reverence, and beauty has been general. In my youth no one stood at the reading of the Gospel; the people knelt with their backs to the Holy Table or stood facing westward at the prayers. Responding was scarcely heard. The Canticles in country churches were rarely chanted; there were few churches, except in the cities, which could boast of an organ. The clergy universally preached in gowns and bands; the "collection" was made generally before the sermon, and the alms were collected in long-handled copper pans, which were thrust by the churchwarden from the aisle to the end of the pews, and afterwards were laid to rest against the rails of the Communion Table. The churches were seldom opened on a week-day; and, indeed, in a place which I very well know, the introduction of one week-day service was within the last fifteen years regarded as a High Church innovation—so much so that the curate resigned rather than consent to such a change. Except in the city churches, the Holy Communion was scarcely ever celebrated till the afternoon, and was not largely attended. Now, week-day services are almost universal, and the increase in the number of communicants is striking. The introduction of weekly celebrations is common, and has led in places to a quadrupling of the total number of communicants.

If the Church of Ireland has lagged behind her English sister in the development of Church life, this has not been in all respects a misfortune. What we want now is a more tolerant spirit among strong Protestants when an attempt is made to make some moderate change in the order of the services or in the ornaments of a church. Intolerance is not unknown, and painful illustrations of its existence could be given. On the other hand moderate decoration of churches becomes more and more common and popular, while singing and chanting are surprisingly improved. Our Church Hymnal has gone through very many editions, and takes a high rank among English books of praise. Surpliced choirs exist in a small number of churches, and cannot be generally introduced without controversy. The chanting of the Psalms is becoming common, and nearly every diocese has its annual choral festival.

On the whole the revival of Church life in Ireland proceeds steadily, but is not a thing to be accomplished without difficulty.

But it is being accomplished, to the infinite help and comfort of many hearts longing to worship God with reverence and order. In the celebration of the Lord's Supper all acts and gestures which in any way look Romeward, are forbidden by canon. It is well. But it would be impossible by canon to ensure that a humble and loving reverence should characterize every celebration. There are churches still where it is not easy for the worshipper accustomed to the solemn reverence of a simple and earnest celebration to feel his soul uplifted on the wings of worship. And, unhappily, the writer has been told on two or three occasions by English visitors of certain country churches where they could not bring themselves to communicate for the second time.

If there be, then, improvement in many places, and room for improvement in many more, we must hope for the outpouring of a spirit of earnestness and of toleration, of zeal and of moderation, under the influence of which the Church revival in Ireland will be real without being marked by excess and formalism.

The country parson in the remoter parts of Ireland is painfully isolated. He lives perhaps at a distance of from twelve to twenty miles from his next clerical neighbour. A bleak stretch of uninhabited bog, a ridge of heathery mountain, cuts him off from the next parish. He lives and works alone. The infinite help of mental and spiritual contact with his brethren is seldom to be had. "To stir up the gift that is within him is left to himself alone." Under these circumstances, do I slander my brethren when I mention that sometimes there steals over one here and one there a spirit of—shall I call it lassitude—both as to private study and preparation, and as to visiting of the flock? The stimulus of example, of godly emulation, is often wanting. The districts where the flocks are scattered widely and the clergy are far apart are the very districts in which there is most danger of lapses to Romanism, and most need of assiduous attention to the spiritual wants of the people. Here is a little "outlying parish," for instance, seven to ten miles at its nearest point from the residence of the rector, possessing a scanty Church population of some five families distributed among five hundred Roman Catholic families. Here exist at once the condition of danger to the faith of the Church-people, and danger of neglect by the clergy. There are cases in which the clergyman rightly feels that this district claims his special attention, but others exist in which he is known to confine himself to the driving over to hold an afternoon service, neither visiting the houses nor instructing the young. In this occasional neglect (for I am certain such cases are not

frequent) lies one of the great dangers to the fidelity of our people.[1] Mixed marriages, and idle curiosity leading some to Roman Catholic "missions," are other causes of the defections here and there met with and of perversions to Rome.

There is, however, one wholesome corrective to the evil of isolation which is everywhere present in the Church of Ireland. *Diocesan synods* are held annually in every diocese, and the clergy with the rarest exceptions attend these. The country clerk may be seen there now and then in homely gray shooting coat and trousers, but, as a rule, very much more "correct" clerical habiliments are worn. In fact, these meetings tend to the better dressing of the clergy, and good clergy wives in the country will not suffer their easy-going husbands to appear shabbily dressed before their Bishop and their brethren.

At the Synod the Bishop sees all his clergy and representative laymen (two to each clergyman, elected by the vestries from every parish). Here diocesan finance is the first business, here all diocesan organizations—for education, for temperance work, for missions—are expected to report, and elections of various boards are made, notably of the Diocesan Council, to which the powers of the synod for the year ensuing are delegated. The diocesan nominators are elected, three in number, who, with parochial nominators to the same number for each parish and the Bishop as president, form a board for electing clergymen to vacant benefices. Representatives to the General Synod in Dublin are also triennially chosen by the Diocesan Synods. There also any "burning questions" are discussed; and the meeting face to face once a year of all, from the Bishop to the curate, and from the nobleman to the humblest lay representative of the farming class, does good to all.

The Bishop also meets his clergy at an annual visitation. From long distances they assemble, and, though the gathering is in a church or cathedral, the meeting of the clergy on such an occasion is not altogether an official one. While the long interval passes slowly by before each rural parson is called up to meet Bishop, Archdeacon, and Rural Dean at the chancel steps, a low hum of conversation proceeds. When a name is called

[1] I must not be taken as suggesting that this slackness in the duty of parochial visitation is a general evil in the Irish Church. Very far from it. On the contrary, the life of the parochial clergy is chiefly passed in visiting and teaching. It is study, not parochial work, which more commonly suffers. As a result of the pastoral care given, it will be found that in Ireland there is a larger proportion both of confirmees and of communicants to the Church population than is to be found in most of the English dioceses.

aloud, sometimes a hurried struggle to get into the gown lent by a clerical brother is barely ended as the wearer reaches the presence of his Bishop, answers to his name, and waits for the praise, inquiry, criticism, or mild rebuke which the state of his "returns" demands. The Archdeacons hold no visitation. The Rural Deans inspect the churches and "glebes," as the houses of the incumbents are nearly always called in Ireland. Ruridiaconal Chapters are little known in this country; but the work of the Rural Deans is of a very valuable kind, in discovering weak points both in the structures which they inspect and in the statistical records of work done in each parish.

What about the appointment of Bishops and incumbents in the Irish Church of to-day?

The vacant parish is "filled" by the election of an incumbent by the board of nomination already described. An advertisement is inserted in Church and daily papers. Sometimes this takes the form of inviting application from those who desire the appointment. Such advertisements are not always pleasant reading. Take an example: "The parish of A. will shortly be vacant. Gross value, £180, with a house and five acres of land at £35 a year. Two churches to serve, five miles apart. *Candidates for the benefice must forward with their applications copies of testimonials to such an address.*"

Now, this seems objectionable from beginning to end. It puts the stamp of approbation on "candidature" for a holy office; and although these advertisements do not offer any very thrilling temptations to candidates, yet it seems to proclaim to the world that you must be a candidate or you will not get a living.

Fault need not be found with the principle of joining with the Bishop a Diocesan and Parochial Board of Nomination; but it is strongly felt that candidature should be discouraged, and appointments should be made, as a rule, from among those who do not put themselves forward. There is no other Church, Roman or Reformed, in Ireland which adopts this plan of advertising vacancies. Therefore it is clear that such a plan need not exist, and its existence is a wrong done to the sensibilities of the clergy and to the spiritual character of appointments.

With a few words on the appointment to bishoprics I shall conclude this paper. The Irish Bishops before disestablishment were nominated, as in England, by the Crown. And to the See of Dublin, at least, Englishmen were very commonly appointed. Under our new condition appointment to a see is made on the result of an election by the Diocesan Synod of the diocese or united dioceses. If one clergyman after certain

preliminary votes have been taken has a clear majority of votes of both clergy and laity, his name only is submitted to the Synod, and if he then receives two-thirds of the votes of each order he is declared elected. If two have approximately equal votes, the selection as between them is left to the bench of Bishops (Constitution, cap. vi.). For the first few years of disestablishment the choice was usually made as from the whole body of Irish clergy. The present Bishops of Cashel, of Cork, of Ossory, and the late Bishop Reeves of Down, together with both the Archbishops, were called from other dioceses. The tide has, however, lately, and apparently definitely, turned in favour of choosing a diocesan clergyman to rule over his brethren. The last elections to Killaloe, Kilmore, Down and Connor, Clogher, and Tuam all resulted thus.

There seems to be something to be said on both sides of the question as between these two modes of election. For the appointment of a clergyman of the diocese it may be urged that he knows the diocese better than a stranger could, that he will be probably the man who on the whole has best made his mark there, and that when a piece of patronage is given to the Synod it is natural that they should use it to reward local merit. But, on the other hand, it must be felt that distinction for work, learning, devotion to the Church as a whole, should qualify a clergyman for election in any part of the land. Now the best man may have to wait for many years for election to the episcopate if he can look for appointment no where except in his own diocese. One motive in every election should be the strengthening of the Bench of Bishops by the introduction of the strongest and best men of the Church, which cannot be done by strictly diocesan elections. It will, as a general rule, be most for the interest of the diocese itself to be ruled by one who has gained experience in some wider sphere, who is free from all local party entanglements and prejudices, and who will have a ruling power and impartiality not easy to acquire when, from holding the position of a brother and an equal, he is constituted in one day a superior and a father in God.

A Rural Dean.

Art. III.—THE SERVANT OF CHRIST.

No. VIII.—Unworldliness.

IT was a cold night. It was a pleasant, roaring fire. Peter had gone through much in the chill scene in the garden. He was an elderly man, and it was hard upon him to have to

spend the whole night watching and waiting and shivering. Comfort was there before him in the servants' hall; what harm if he made himself as comfortable as circumstances would allow? So he stood there and made the best of it—while his Master was being insulted in the further room. Perhaps it would all come to nothing, like other plots which had before been made against the life of Jesus. Twice St. John tells us, in his simple and solemn language, how Peter enjoyed that fire. So does St. Mark, who was Peter's own reporter. "He sat with the servants and warmed himself at the fire." "Peter stood with them and warmed himself." "Simon Peter stood and warmed himself." A cheerful glow took possession of his weary limbs. He felt like a man who has had a hot bath after a long day's hunting. He was refreshed like the man in Isaiah, who said, "Aha! I am warm, I have seen the fire." He was ready for anything. He was quite happy with the servants. All the impetuous heroism which had seemed very well in the romantic exaltation of the garden looked now far off and foolish. It had died away in the blaze of that comfortable fire. A maid came and stared at him. "And you also were with Jesus of Nazareth," she said positively. What nonsense! Another maid, zealous against those whom her master hated, was equally certain: "This is one of them." What an absurd idea! Certainly not. But he went on talking, and then there could be no longer any doubt. The little group round the fire became quite sure as the night wore on; his odd Galilean accent proved what the maids had said. Then he began to curse and to swear. Why could they not leave him alone? Why would they not believe what he said? Unhappy Peter! If he could have denied himself that fire, what a life-long memory of anguish would he have been spared!

There was a learned Scottish Bishop who died a few years ago. He was one of the lights of his age, and all his people regarded him with love and veneration. His house was some distance from the great town where most of his work lay. So his people built him a beautiful library in the town, at considerable expense and in the most approved taste. He said he would accept it on one condition. There was a Gothic stone fireplace, high and massive. Let them carve conspicuously on it, in letters which all could read: "Simon Peter stood and warmed himself." It would be to him and to his successors an unfailing warning against the luxury and self-indulgence and sloth which would otherwise be the natural result of that beautiful chamber which they had prepared for him.

And many as are the enemies of our spiritual life, I ask whether there is any which is more subtle, or to which we

more readily fall victims, than the doctrine of material comfort? I do not say that in all cases it absolutely ruins the spiritual life, but it has the dismal effect of stunting it and maiming it amongst the countless myriads of those who say that they are Christians. It is not, perhaps, except in a few notorious cases, that it lures on into deliberate deadly sin; but it works ill enough in robbing so many of anything which deserves the name of faith and peace and love.

How many are there who understand in any practical sense what is meant by denying themselves, and taking up their cross daily and following Christ? The words have been so familiar to us since our childhood, that they leave no impression behind when we hear them. We have, perhaps, a vague idea that they mean that we must keep the Ten Commandments, and refuse to do anything which the Ten Commandments forbid, however earnestly we may long for it. Such a supposition does not convey even a faint shadow of what is intended by these words which we all profess to be carrying out. They mean that we have a natural personality in the world, our name, our rank, our pedigree, our tastes, our fortunes—all that the people of the world would think of when they speak of us—and that, with regard to all that, we are to be as if it did not exist at all; that we are to strip ourselves in spirit of all our natural advantages and inclinations, and sacrifice them entirely to the doing of active intentional good for Christ; that we are to go about with as little tie to this world as if we were carrying a beam of wood on our shoulders on the very last day of our lives, to be crucified beside our Master; that by accepting the redemption of Jesus Christ we became His bondsmen. Everything that we had, whether it was much or little, was to be given up to Him and to His service. We were to retain it all in our own hands, so that we might have both the responsibility and the delight of employing it for that service.

But all of it—name and fortune, house and lands, energies and abilities, health and strength, time, tastes and inclinations—all were to be His. The world was to have none of it. Every fraction of it all that was spent upon the world and the passing fading employments of the world would be stolen and robbed from Christ. Medals, decorations, Privy Councillorships, titles, estates, fortunes, all social ambitions, every social limit and distinction, every phase of mere amusement and worldly pleasure, every kind of place-hunting and every thought of worldly power—these the bondsman of Jesus would thankfully give up wholly and absolutely, glad to have done with them altogether, for he knew them to be so many snares set for him by the devil against the perfect loyalty of

his self-surrender. They would be to him as the comfortable fire which made Peter fall. The whole of his forces, the whole of his powers and personality, he would devote to the establishing of good and the conquering of evil, and the relief of suffering and distress. If he was a minister of the Word he would have no thought except constantly to speak the truth, boldly to rebuke vice, and patiently suffer for the truth's sake. The dignities of the Church would seem to him only so much additional responsibility for which he was unfitted and from which he shrank. If he was a politician, his only ambition would be to make his public acts and votes accord strictly and unflinchingly, and at all hazards, with his deliberate convictions and his private speech. If he was a soldier, he would refuse all other reward except the privilege of doing his duty. If he was invited to dinner, he would say: "Ask the poor and needy; do not ask me. They need it; I do not." His faith would be the faith which removes mountains; his life would be one long act of beneficence; and when he was called to his reward and his rest and his home, innumerable toilers and strugglers who had been strengthened by his example and influence would rise up and call him blessed. All that is the result when a man believes Christ, and denies himself, and takes up his cross daily and follows Him.

The contrast between the Gospel of Christ and the gospel of material comfort and compromise with the world—the gospel, that is, of serving God and Mammon—is very considerable indeed. Like Peter on that one fatal occasion, our favourite spiritual attitude is that of standing and warming ourselves. The terms of our disastrous compromise with the world are the result of a most unhappy mistake. They are that, if you give a tenth of your income to what men are pleased to call charity, you shall give the rest to the world. Indeed, those who give a tenth are often thought to be doing something particularly splendid and noble. If you give a tenth, it is thought that Jesus has no sort of claim upon the rest. I have called it a disastrous compromise and an unhappy mistake, because it is the flattest and boldest contradiction which His teaching has ever received. The mistake arises from the old Judaizing tendencies of the dark days of Christendom. Because the Jews were ordered to give a tenth merely to support the priests and Levites in the service of the temple, therefore these Judaizing heretics jumped to the conclusion that when our Lord said, "Sell that ye have, and give alms," and when He said, "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth," and when He said, "Make to yourselves friends of the Mammon of unrighteousness," and when He said, "Ye cannot serve God and Mammon," what He really meant to say was,

"Give one-tenth to God, and give nine-tenths to the world." So we make the Word of God of none effect with our traditions, and we open the way for that gospel of material comfort which is so calamitous to our souls. We wallow daily in the enjoyments of the world, and then we wonder what St. John could have meant by the lust of the eyes and the pride of life. We delight in brilliant assemblies, in every kind of extravagance and luxury, in costly dresses and the flashing of diamonds, in expensive flowers, in splendid entertainments, in a competition of ostentation and display—everything that is most contrary to the spirit and the letter of the laws of the kingdom of God—and then we have the impudence to complain that our faith is weak, and that the times are out of joint. Or we pretend not to care for these things, and yet we are busy with them from morning till night for five months of the year. We live in an atmosphere of unreality, in which the spiritual lamp must necessarily burn low, and in which any honest and sincere attempt to carry out the teaching of Christ seems a contrast so harsh as to be impossible. We bring up our children to think of nothing but amusement, hour after hour and day after day, and then we wonder that they have grown up hard, cynical, selfish, and faithless; that their pulse never stirs to what is noble; that their heart never beats to what is great. Year by year, as the younger generations take the place of the old, the life of the English country house becomes more selfish and isolated. It is only one of the countless ways in which the god of this world, the god of comfort, selfishness, and self-indulgence, is worshipped. Simon Peter stood and warmed himself, and thought not of his Master and of all that He was suffering within earshot.

Yet in this age of universal cant we are not likely to leave ourselves without ingenious and plausible attempts to excuse ourselves for such conduct. We say that luxury employs the poor, and that giving away does more harm than good. What cruel hypocrisy! We speak as if luxury was the only thing which employed the poor; whereas this poor miserable, mean little fact, that it does give work, is only mentioned at all because there is nothing else to say for it. Does nothing else give employment? Is there nothing to be done which can raise the soul of the employer instead of poisoning it, or which, instead of embittering the employed, can ennoble them? Would the cultivation of the boundless lands of the colonies give no employment? Would it be so very harmful a thing if a working man, not able to find a place at home in the great struggle of life, should, by our Christian sympathy, be able to say, "I elect to go and work in Australia, or in New Zealand, or Canada," and should be conveyed there without cost to himself? How

is he to find himself means for a voyage to the other side of the earth? Would it pauperize the young men of London if in every parish were provided for them by our superfluities a gymnasium and a club-house? Believe me that this talk with which they delude people about pauperization and the harm of doing good with all that we possess is nothing but cant and hypocrisy from beginning to end. It has nothing whatever to do with the glorious fellowship of the kingdom of God. God in His great mercy has provided in Christian self-sacrifice and Christian brotherhood and Christian sympathy a remedy for every evil—social, political, and economical—which can threaten us; and there is nothing but this false and heretical gospel of material comfort and of compromise with the world, this gospel of warming ourselves at the fire of the world's enjoyments, which is in the way to prevent us from applying His golden rule of love. Have we never thought how terrible it is to remember that the cost of one useless, extravagant, enervating entertainment, where we should think it out of place so much as to mention the name of Jesus, would make happy for ever in the more hopeful freedom of Great Britain some simple, earnest, despairing family of our brothers and sisters in Christ?

There is another aspect of unworldliness which we must not omit. And that is the absence of arrogance.

I wish we could get rid of that word "condescend," which we have in our English translation of Rom. xii. 16: "Mind not high things, but condescend to men of low estate." It does not in the least represent the meaning of the Greek. The literal translation is exactly this: "Being carried along with, going along with, things that are lowly." There is no idea of looking down from a higher place; on the contrary, the notion is mingling with things which have no mark of worldly distinction about them, being daily interested with them, standing on the same level with them, moving with them, being busied about them. Putting this mistranslation aside, there is no such word in the Bible as condescension; it is altogether an un-Christian idea. Those who praise great people for being condescending only show their own meanness, baseness, and servility. Amongst the fellow-citizens of the kingdom of Christ there is no such thing; nothing but feelings of sympathy, intelligent interest, the mutual respect which comes from having the same great objects in common—kind, friendly, brotherly regard.

In the world, of course, it is very different. The citizens of the world will always be on the look out for great people and great things, in the hope of having some of the lustre reflected back upon themselves. No matter how keenly they may be

satirized and ridiculed, they will always be at it. Every worldly hostess will never cease trying to get showy, distinguished people to her dinners and her parties. Every worldly man will be glad to mention casually the distinguished people whom he has met or with whom he has spoken. He will contrive, without offence if possible, to let people know if he is connected with distinguished families, or has done distinguished things. There are greater and less degrees of skill in imparting this knowledge. Flagrant want of taste is soon ridiculed, but a skilful performer will get the consideration which he expects without any very open breach of the understandings of society. The heartless law of climbing has become in a highly artificial condition of life a real science. Even from a worldly point of view it is very vulgar, and very far from beautiful. But as it is practised so universally in the world, the vulgarity and ugliness are only noticed when they present themselves with too great unskilfulness. The proficients in worldliness often salve their consciences by thinking that there is some particular form of minding high things of which they themselves are not guilty. Some of them do not think much of titled people, but rather of some other kind of social brilliance; some of them do not pay any reverence to the rich; some think very little of the successful. But such excuses are mere delusions. To all people who are imbued with the spirit of the world there is some form of distinction, some ideal of high things, on which they set their minds, and which corrupts their characters. For the results of it are false estimates of what is really good, false limits for the affections of the heart, false standards of right and wrong, a real and essential vulgarity and ignobleness of soul, a hardness and coolness towards those who perhaps have most claim on the sympathies, a widening of the lines of demarcation between different classes of society, a tendency to the disruption and dislocation of social life itself. It is only by the opposite conduct of those who are really wise and good that social institutions are held together. To the wise and good the children of this world owe in reality a debt of which they are little aware, and which they would be the last to acknowledge. Their social conduct is followed by disappointment, jealousies, heart-burnings, envyings, anger, discontent, and rage, which, if not mitigated by the Christian virtues of those who are better, would bring the calamities of ruin and upheaval.

The impartial love of our fellows which is the result of loyal faith in our Lord Jesus Christ sweeps away all these false ideals and unhealthy passions. None is so true a gentleman as the perfect Christian. His homage is aroused, not by titles, or splendours, or riches, or distinctions, or success of any kind

in any class of life, but by likeness to the example of the Word made flesh. I do not mean, of course, that those who have received from God the gift of a long and meritorious ancestry, or of refined and gentle birth, should despise such invaluable incentives to right feeling, good manners, and noble deeds. But the lust of the eyes and the pride of life may be found in every class, however unexalted; the Christian detects them wherever they show themselves, and has no share in their vanities. The enthusiastic worship of a prize-fighter, an athlete, a cricketer, an actor, is just as unchristian as servility to a duke or zeal for a millionaire. There are the high things of the pot-house and the street just as much as there are the high things of the Court or of the Drawing-room, or of Parliament, or of municipal life. St. Paul, in his care for the true health and happiness of our souls, will allow us to mind none of these things. "Set not your mind on high things, but go along with things that are lowly."

There are those who in their indiscretion outstrip St. Paul and wrongly apply his words. They do not understand him fully, and so they are led into an entirely false position, and jeopardize the interests of the kingdom of Christ. They jump at the conclusion that because we are not to set our minds on high things therefore there ought to be no high things at all. They think we ought at once to do away with all high things by law or by revolution. St. Paul was not so silly. He had, of course, nothing but Divine wisdom in his mind; but I speak by way of comparison with these foolish, hot-headed zealots. I have spoken of St. Paul's great practical wisdom. St. Paul was wise enough to see that until all the world was really converted, and had become genuinely and sincerely Christian, there would always be high things. In a society composed largely of worldly people, there would be always great distinctions of rank and fortune and personal advantages, no matter on what principles social life might be organized. St. Paul had no intention of beginning at the wrong end, and of making laws for the world on Christian principles which the world would be unable to bear, and which would do the world no good. He saw the futility of attempting to spread Christian practice and feeling by legislation. And, indeed, as a very large part of mankind will always remain untouched by the life and death of the Lord Jesus Christ, and as they will always be minding high things of one sort or another as long as they remain unconverted, I am not sure whether it is not better that they should worship a long line of distinguished and very often patriotic ancestors, or even wealth, with all its opportunities of usefulness, than that they should worship mere success, or bow themselves

down to the prize-fighter, the athlete, the dancer, or the actor. However that may be, St. Paul saw that we must begin at the other end, and he said to his individual converted Christian: "Take care that you do not set your mind on high things, whatever other people may do; but go along with things that are lowly."

What is this going along with things that are lowly? He who is by baptism and by personal loyalty one with the Lord Jesus Christ makes no distinction between class and class as such: he honours the King, he pays honour to whom honour is due, custom to whom custom, tribute to whom tribute, fear to whom fear. But, in spite of this sincere and faithful compliance with the ordinances of social life, he is just as ready to honour all men. He treats all alike with the same courtesy and deference. If he is in office or an employer, he expects obedience; but where that obedience is cheerfully paid he allows no sense of inferiority to be felt. He is, in fact, not only willing but anxious to be on friendly terms with Christian people of all classes. With those who are not really and sincerely citizens of the kingdom of heaven, he will, of course, be very largely on his guard, because otherwise they would take advantage of his kindness. But with those who are by their fruits and by their daily conduct conscious and loyal servants of the same Master he has no fear of being on terms of happy equality, no matter what may be their condition of life. Their interests are his interests, their sorrows his sorrows, their joys his joys, their welfare his concern. If he honours all men he loves the brotherhood.

While we remain here, mixed up as we are every day with the people of the world, it is very difficult for us to carry out this ideal. But if we have the true principle in our hearts, God's Holy Spirit will enable us to apply it as each occasion arises. Such reflections should urge us to abjure, with more vigorous purpose and decision than ever, the false lights, the foolish ambitions, the misguiding, disappointing and corrupting motives of the world, and, following that Divine Pattern whose loveliness none can approach, who emptied Himself of His glory, and took upon Him the form of a servant, to wean ourselves from all temptations which we may have to this distorting and most unchristian habit of mind, and by taking to our hearts those who in their lives and conduct show that they have been with Jesus, to help to bind together in godly union, peace, and mutual confidence and understanding the widely different members and classes of our common fellowship in Christ Jesus.

WILLIAM SINCLAIR.

ART. IV.—MARK XIII. 32.

Περὶ δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ἢ τῆς ὥρας οὐδεὶς οἶδεν, οὐδὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι ἐν οὐρανῷ, οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός, εἰ μὴ ὁ Πατήρ.

But of that day or that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.—R.V.

THIS passage has furnished an ample field for comment and controversy in ancient times, as well as in our own. Many of the Fathers, whose names are above all suspicion of heresy or advocacy of doubtful theories, have given evidence in their writings that they maintained that our Lord was speaking entirely from the standpoint of the human nature which He had assumed, in which, as He suffered hunger and thirst and presented other features of likeness to His brethren in the flesh, so in this utterance He showed that His human knowledge was limited by the conditions He had submitted to; while they hold that at the same time in His Divine nature He knew all things. Others assert that our Lord in this place was speaking *economically*, or according to the necessities of the case. It was not good for His disciples to know this secret, consequently it was not conceded to Him by the Father to reveal it. He knew, and yet did not know for the purpose of making it known to others. Whatever weight or consideration we may give to these theories, whether they are satisfactory or otherwise in our estimation, one thing is clear, that modern critics have considerably advanced upon the admissions made by the ancients, as they venture to argue that this passage furnishes an example to be extended universally; they infer that as the Lord's knowledge was limited on this particular question, it was upon many, if not upon all, others; that in "emptying Himself" He laid aside all the Divine prerogatives, and amongst them omniscience; and therefore His opinion upon any subject connected with modern learning, such as science or criticism, was only of the same value as that of any other Jew of His time and locality. A moment's reflection will teach us that this is making our passage to be endowed with an elasticity which is quite unwarranted. For this conclusion there are, indeed, no grounds. We might as well say of any one of our fellow men that because he admitted his nescience of some abstruse question in Hebrew or in Sanskrit grammar he knew nothing, therefore, of Latin or Greek or other departments of a liberal education; or because a man did not know one trade he could not know any. The utmost that can fairly be inferred from this passage is that our Lord stated that this particular secret was not made known to Him by the Father, but it is simply

gratuitous to include other matters; indeed, the impression made upon the mind is that all other questions were made known to Him, hence the emphasis laid upon the exception. Again, it is to be borne in mind that the general question of our Lord's knowledge during His earthly ministry is capable of being submitted to test and proof. If anyone will take the pains to compare all the places in which our Lord's knowledge is definitely spoken of, he will find that it was always certain, infallible, and superhuman (see CHURCHMAN for January, 1892). This would lead us to conclude that although there was no mixture or confusion between the Divine and human properties in our Lord, yet that the former always aided, directed, and illumined the latter. This passage, even if we were to admit that it refers to the human nature alone, stands in solitude and isolation. We have said this text stands alone, if thus interpreted, but there is another passage, not bound by this supposed restriction, which undoubtedly refers to a kindred or, we might say, practically to the same subject, though at a different period of our Lord's presence upon earth.

It is generally admitted, even by those that hold the limitation theory, that after the Resurrection the limitations, whatever they had been, were removed, and that thenceforth the Lord's knowledge was perfect in all respects, as St. Peter confessed, "Lord, Thou knowest all things." Now, the question which was put to the Lord in Mark xiii. involved the *how* and the *when* with reference to His coming. To the former He replied most definitely by describing the signs that would appear in heaven above and the troubles and terrors that would come upon the earth beneath; but to the latter He gave no answer beyond the information that this was a secret which no one knew, neither the angels nor the Son, but the Father only. If we turn to Acts i. 7 we hear the disciples, after the Resurrection and just before the Ascension of the Lord, making this inquiry: "Lord, wilt Thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" This question embodied the same secret as before, for the restoration of the kingdom and the second advent are synchronous events. It is noteworthy that our Lord made the same reply to all intents and purposes as in the former case: "It is not for you to know the times or seasons which the Father placed in His own authority" (*ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ*). It is true that there is no specific mention made of either the angels or the Son, but the strong and definite expression (*ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ, in His own proper* authority) seems evidently intended to bring the former declaration to their remembrance, and to insist upon the sole proprietorship of the Father in this one particular. So we

may conclude that neither before nor after the Resurrection—neither in the state of humiliation nor after His victory was achieved and He had given proof of His being the Son of God—did our Lord know the day or the hour of the Second Advent.

We are now brought face to face with a still greater difficulty. Our modern critics argue, as we have seen, that the Lord confessed His nescience in the passage in St. Mark, and they refuse to restrict this to that one singular instance, as He appears to do Himself. To be consistent, they must also admit that the same nescience is implicitly contained in the citation from the Acts which was made after His Resurrection, which was the determining proof of His Deity.

But the previous difficulties vanish in the presence of a far greater one, which appears to be beyond the power of refutation, that ὁ υἱός, the Son, when found absolutely and alone, without any qualifying adjunct, is never predicated of the human nature of our Lord as such, but always of the original Divine personality. If this is proved, the whole argument for the limitation theory, as based upon this passage, crumbles to pieces, and the purpose for which it has been so vigorously advanced, to prove that our Lord's ignorance concerning the real authorship of the Pentateuch, of a prophecy, or of a psalm of David, is hereby accounted for, is scattered to the winds.

We may anticipate the objection with which this will be met, that such a proposition would introduce a far more serious heresy than the one removed or avoided; but this is a matter for after-consideration. The simple question before us now is this: What is the use throughout the New Testament of the title ὁ υἱός, *the Son*? If we examine all the passages in which it occurs, and if it is found to be a truth that the personal Word is thus represented, or if in some places the duplex nature in the one Divine person is involved, yet it never connotes the humanity alone, but the Deity is always foremost, then we must seek a satisfactory solution of the problem elsewhere; but we must not ignore the value of the term on which the truth of the quotient depends, or build up a visionary doctrine upon a foundation that refuses to bear it.

I must here express my regret that the Editor cannot spare the space for a brief exposition of the passages involved, to enable me to show the connection between the statements contained in them with their contexts, and so to establish the thesis that *the Son* is always equivalent to *the Son of God* and not to *the Son of man* as such; but we may leave the intelligent reader to carry out this comparison by himself. The following is the list of the places where ὁ υἱός, *the Son*, occurs absolutely as in the text, which is the ground of the controversy (we omit those where any such qualifying

words as θεοῦ or αὐτοῦ are added): Matt. xi. 27; xxviii. 19; Luke x. 22;[1] John iii. 17. In the received text αὐτοῦ is added; but it is omitted in the Revised Version. The former is the reading of A and D, and the latter of B and ℵ. John iii. 35, 36; v. 19-28. In this passage ὁ υἱός is found independently in various cases; once it is followed by τ. θεοῦ and once by ἀνθρώπου, but the Divine personality is prominent throughout. John vi. 40; viii. 35, 36; xiv. 13; xvii. 1. The reading *the Son* in the second clause is supported by B ℵ C, and *Thy Son* by A D. The former is adopted by the Revised Version. 1 Cor. xv. 27, 28; Heb. i. 8; 1 John ii. 22-24; iv. 14; v. 12; 2 John 9.

In passing these various passages under the strictest scrutiny, only one conclusion will appear to be possible, as no single exception can be found to the rule; that is, that whenever ὁ υἱός, *the Son*, stands by itself without any additional definition or amplification, it never connotes only the human nature of the Lord as such. In those examples which refer to the pre-incarnate period, the Divine nature only is defined; and in those which relate to the post-incarnate period, the Person subsisting in the two natures is expressed; but even in these instances it must be remembered that, as our Lord was a Person in the Godhead before His assumption of our flesh, His personality is therefore Divine, and could not be affected by the incarnation. After that act He was in no respect less than He was before; there was the addition of the human nature to the Divine nature, but no subtraction of any kind from the Divine. Whenever, therefore, the person of the Son is spoken of, it is the Deity that is prominent; when the manhood, as such, is specified with the attributes, appearance, and concomitants of human nature, it is never expressed by *the Son* or by *the Son of God*, but by *the Son of man*.

We are now in a position to apply the result of this investigation to Mark xiii. 32. This passage has, both in ancient and modern times, as we have said already, called forth much comment and controversy, but has never been made a more conspicuous battle-field between two schools of thought than at

[1] John i. 18: "The only begotten Son (or God only begotten)," ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός, or Θεός. This text hardly comes under our category for two reasons: first, there is an adjective with the noun; secondly, because the reading *Son* is doubtful; υἱός is supported by A and the bulk of manuscripts, and the Curetonian Syriac version; and Θεός by B ℵ and the Peshitto Syriac. Professor Rendel Harris makes a clever suggestion that the double reading arose from a misunderstanding of a very ancient system of abbreviation which stood for all cases of the same word alike. See "Study of Codex Bezæ," p. 252. If υἱός is retained as the true reading, the personality and the Deity are as unquestionable as if the reading Θεός was adopted.

the present period. It has been chosen as the centre of the controversy, the pivot on which the whole question of the limitation theory turns. Writer after writer challenges those that are at issue with him. Does not our Lord Himself tell us plainly that in the days of His humiliation in the flesh one thing was positively unknown by Him? When, therefore, He took on Him our nature, they continue to urge, He submitted—voluntarily, indeed, but actually—to limitations, the limitations of ordinary human nature; they deny the possibility of knowing in one capacity and not knowing in another, knowledge and nescience being a self-contradiction in the same person, neither can *economy* be pleaded here as an escape from the difficulty. The Lord Himself confesses nescience, or even ignorance, of this fact, and, as we have seen, they claim this as a ground for believing that a like nescience or ignorance pertained to His human nature on all subjects that had not been discovered by man's intellect or investigations up to that date among His own people and in His own locality. This is plain speaking, but we meet with such opinions expressed in various literary productions, magazine articles, letters and books of the so-called advanced rationalistic school. It therefore seems to be no breach of charity nor a false accusation to say that such teaching leads men to think not that the Divine assumed the human nature, but the human the Divine, and then the Divine was reduced to the contracted conditions of humanity. The incarnation thus viewed is made a nullity. But to return to the passage which is held to afford proof beyond the reach of doubt of the nescience of the human nature of our Lord, and is advanced with all confidence to save His character for veracity when He differs in His expressed opinions and plain teaching from the results of modern criticism concerning the authorship of some of the books of the Old Testament Scriptures; what can be said when it appears evident from the examination of all the places where the title *the Son*, ὁ υἱός, is found, that our Lord was not pointing to the time of His humiliation on earth, nor speaking of Himself as the Son of man, nor restricting Himself to the proprieties of humanity, but was speaking of Himself as *the Son*, the Son of God, the Divine Person who was one with the Father from all eternity? What becomes of the foundation-stone which has been elected to support the limitation theory? It has shifted its position. What becomes of the superstructure reared upon it? It is fallen to the ground. Where is the proof of the nescience of the human nature? The human nature is not the meaning of the phrase, and if the phrase refuses to maintain that reference, where shall be found the inference derived from such a supposition?

The plain truth is that, whatever this utterance of our Lord may portend, one thing is clear, it cannot mean what these critics teach. *The Son* does not signify the *human*, but the *Divine* nature, or rather Divine person, of the Lord, and if He had intended to reveal any mystery which concerned the nature which He had assumed, He would have used the phrase which He always employed when such was His purpose and intention, *the Son of man*.

In the endeavour to solve an intricate problem, it is an easy task to determine what the unknown quantity is not; it is quite another thing to arrive at the true solution, which will satisfy all the conditions of the problem, and prove itself to be the quotient. In the above question the value of the term *the Son* has been demonstrated to be not the *human nature*, and we may advance a step further towards a certain result: it expresses the Divine nature, or the Person who possesses both the Divine and human natures, in which case the former, and not the latter, is always the prominent feature. But when we attempt to proceed further, and would fain unveil the mystery by demanding, "How can these things be?" then we are aware of the difficulties that arrest our progress. How is the statement to be explained of the Deity or Divine Sonship of the Lord? We repeat that the difficulty, or even the inability, to obtain a true answer does not make a false answer right. It was our purpose to prove that the exposition that made *the Son* simply equivalent to the *Son of man*, and so accounted for our Lord's ignorance of His own Scriptures, was without foundation, and erroneous. So far that point has, we think, been demonstrated; but how we are to account for the features of the new problem that confronts us is a different question.

It may be that in the union of the Persons of the Deity, in the identity of essence and the distinction of Persons, in the oneness of Being and the difference of the offices, there may be mysteries into which the mind of man has not the ability or capacity to be initiated. It is almost postulated nowadays that reason can understand "all mysteries and all knowledge," and search out even the depths of Deity; but there are boundaries probably which we cannot pass, and secret things which belong to the Lord our God which we cannot unveil and disclose. But in seeking to satisfy our minds as far as may be given to us, some modes of explanation may be suggested. The following may claim attention as probable solutions:

(1) It is the Catholic Faith that the Son is of the same essence as the Father, and in the Trinity there is nothing before or after, greater or less. The Persons subsisting in one and the

same essence are in all respects consubstantial, co-equal, and co-eternal; but the Son is Son because the Father is Father, and whatever the Son is, or has in essence, attributes and powers, He has from the Father, and in this consists the distinction of the Persons. The Father is and has all from Himself, He alone has aseity, whereas the Son is and has all from the Father. Hence our Lord says: "The Son can do nothing from Himself, but what He seeth the Father doing" (John v. 19). "The words which Thou gavest Me I have given unto them" (John xvii. 8). "The works which the Father hath given Me to accomplish, the very works that I do bear witness of Me that the Father hath sent Me" (John v. 36). And thus in all things "The only begotten Son (God) which is in the bosom of the Father, He declared Him" (John i. 18). It is He whose office it has been in all spheres, ages, and dispensations to make the Deity intelligible to the creatures. The Father revealed to the Son, and the Son is the Mediator between God and man. The Son says and does only what the Father commissions Him to say and do. All, therefore, which the Son is in Himself, has, works, speaks or reveals, is from the Father, as much in the depths of eternity as in the time of His incarnation, when the Word took up His tabernacle in the flesh. This is the explicit side of the truth revealed; the implicit side would suggest that what the Father did not convey to the Son either in eternity or in time was the prerogative of the Father as Father, a propriety of His *Person* as such, involving no differentiation in essence, but intimating a phase of distinction between the *Person* of the Father and the *Person* of the Son. It may help us to remember that knowledge, as the attribute or capacity of knowing, belongs to the *nature* of all sentient beings; but knowledge, in the concrete sense of the things that are known, belongs to the *person*. It may be in the depths of this mystery that the secret "neither knoweth the Son" is folded up and hidden, and the "pavilion of dark waters" that surrounds the Deity, like the veil of the Holy of Holies, conceals the mystery from the scrutiny of man. It may be readily advanced against this that the omniscience of the Son is invaded, but accurately stated and understood there is here no invasion or diminution of the honour due unto the Son. The attribute of omniscience of the Father and of the Son pertains to the *nature and essence* of Godhead, and is with all other attributes of Deity given by eternal generation to the Son by the Father; but the function of agency and instrumentality both in eternity and in time, and the charge of special revelations, whether in word or work, in connection with office or mission, are appurtenances and properties which belong to the *Person*. The attribute is not

here limited, but authority is not delegated to disclose a certain event. The Father is the ultimate Source of all sovereignty, authority and power; the Son is the agent of the Father in the dispensation of these attributes of Godhead. Throughout the New Testament the prepositions ὑπό and διά represent the mode of operation, and it is possible that this is the intent of the passage under discussion, that all the attribute of knowledge was the original property of the Father, and was with all other Divine attributes eternally generated in the Son, but can only be *exercised* by the Son in the way and for the purpose and at the time that befit the wisdom and decree of the Father: light accompanied by immediate illumination, speech contemporaneously caught and re-uttered by the echo. This word has never been spoken by the Father, and therefore never heard nor issued by the Son. In the material creation we read, "And God said," that is, uttered His word, and each specific act of creation followed, the Father working by the agency of the Son. If God had not uttered His creative word at any stage in the construction of the universe, the creative act would not have taken place, and the working through the Son, so far as that particular act was concerned, would have been suspended unacted and unknown; so the same argument will apply to the utterance of the word of revelation: if not "said" by the Father, it is not formulated by the Son, and consequently finds no divulgence among angels in heaven or mankind upon earth. In any case, the mystery pertains to the Divine Person and not to the Humanity.

(2) In addition to the explanation that has come down to us from some of the Fathers, alluded to in the beginning of this paper, that our Lord as the Word—that is, in His Divine nature—knew the date of the day of judgment as He knew all things, being omniscient, but in His human nature He was content to submit Himself to the laws of the nature He had assumed, there is another held also by ancient teachers of high repute, that our Lord was speaking economically, not with reference to Himself or His own knowledge, but what was suitable to His disciples and their converts afterwards; in other words, He did not know the date of His coming for the purpose of giving this information to them, as it would not be beneficial to them or to others. The acceptance or rejection of this theory must largely depend upon the customary modes of expression in use at that time and amongst the Jewish people; it is not to be set aside without deep consideration, if we remember the strongly anthropomorphic language which pervades Scripture, and the accommodation everywhere made to the capacities and infirmities of men. At the same time, if the previous explanation appears unsatisfactory, or involved

in too dense a cloud of mystery, or rendered obscure by the technicalities of theological thought and terminology, the interpretation which meets the wants of the general reader seems to be that this secret was not in the commission intrusted to our Lord to impart, though the phrase used may be thought to go beyond this, and yet if we admit the doctrine that Deity assumed humanity, and not humanity Deity, the truth must be found somewhere in this direction.

There is one thing to be borne in mind which seems to have been much overlooked. A text which appears to contradict other texts, many other texts, perhaps all other texts, is one which requires very careful investigation, and calls on us to exercise patience before pronouncing a final decision as to its interpretation. This text is certainly isolated, and the one which affords anything like a parallel only increases the difficulty. Now, the mistake that is made in our day has been to take this exceptional utterance, which, to say the least, seems to be in perfect opposition not only to other texts, but to the whole doctrine of the Christology, as furnishing the rule to which all others must bend. We used to be taught that the unknown was to be arrived at by the comparison of the terms of the known; but this solitary case is set forth as the proof of a proposition which the whole testimony of Scripture negatives. Our duty should rather have been exercised in searching for a satisfactory solution of the single difficulty, and not in creating difficulties in a hundred instances where none existed. Either the solution lies deep down in the unfathomable depths of the ocean of Deity, that man's reason and ingenuity, whether influenced by motives orthodox or heterodox, cannot reach the point where Deity denies admittance to the inquisition of the creature, or the statement itself was intended to be a very plain and simple one, couched in language in use at the time, and perfectly intelligible to the minds of those that heard the words as they fell from the lips of the Lord. One thing is to be entirely repudiated in this inquiry, the endeavour that has been made to charge the Lord with error concerning the Scriptures, which the Catholic Faith holds to be the Word of the WORD, and then advances a text, confessedly in both ancient and modern times surrounded with impenetrable barriers, as proof of His ignorance, and urging that because He knew not one thing He might not, did not, know many more, and hence His testimony to the ancient Scriptures is null and void. Where can such a mode of argumentation stop? How can we know whether the Lord knew other facts, whether His word in anything is infallible?

There is an insuperable difficulty in the self-limitation theory as applied to the knowledge of the Old Testament

Scriptures. It involves the unthinkable proposition that our Lord voluntarily deprived Himself at the incarnation of the power to perform the very function which He came to exercise, namely, the unfolding of the mysteries of the Scriptures which testified of Himself. How could He explain all things, fulfil prophecies, and open the understanding of His disciples that they should understand the Scriptures, if He Himself had parted previously with the knowledge necessary to constitute Him an interpreter to others? But enough; it is useless for men to pull down the middle wall of partition between the infallible and the fallible, and, after removing the landmark which Scripture and the Church have fixed, to set up one of their own. It is open to anyone to try his ingenuity and craft at this trade, but where, after all these destructive efforts, will the Christian faith be? where the revelation of God? where our holy religion? where our eternal hope? And, above all, what will be done with Jesus Who is called the Christ?

F. TILNEY BASSETT.

Dulverton Vicarage, *March* 23, 1892.

ART. V.—MARRIAGE CUSTOMS IN BRITISH INDIA.

WHEN the British nation annexed the provinces of the country called British India, with a population of 280,000,000 of souls, a wise spirit of toleration guaranteed to the conquered races their religions, so far as they were not contrary to moral law, and their customs having the force of law regarding marriage and inheritance. Idolatry, polygamy, polyandry, divorce, adoption of children by childless persons, marriage at the age of puberty of both sexes, life-long widowhood, the levirate law of a younger brother taking the widow of his deceased elder brother—all these incidents are phenomena of every-day occurrence in one or other province of this vast empire amidst one or other section of the extremely heterogeneous community, divided by caste, religion, colour, dialect and ancestral customs, yet compelled to travel in the same railway carriages, to send their children to the same secular schools, attend at the same judicial courts, obey the same municipal law and pay the same taxes.

Under the long Pax Britannica the population has increased enormously, the area of cultivated land has reached its maximum. Of the three great scourges which keep down exorbitant population, war has ceased to exist; pestilence has been reduced to narrow limits and brief periods; famines occur periodically, but roads, railroads and heavy disbursements from the State greatly mitigate the evil, and the

thinning of the population in overcrowded regions has a good side for the survivors.

"Let the people alone in their social, religious and domestic affairs;" this is one of the great tenets of Oriental statecraft. Their ways are not our ways. Their Gods are not our Gods. Repress violent crime, keep the communications open, settle justly the disputes of litigants, stay the hand of the local oppressor: this is all that the people ask. In addition to this the British Government supplies education, hospitals, agricultural model farms, free trade, free culture of the soil, free press, free right of meetings, free locomotion from one end of the empire to the other, out of it and into it, and, as far as possible, restraint on the sale of intoxicating liquors and drugs.

Busybodies in Great Britain, male and female, who get a partial view of the subject, would like to try benevolent experiments on the people of a subject empire; they would, of course, resent any interference of Parliament with their own independent management of their own affairs, but they try to bring a pressure on the authorities in India to interfere for the correction of imaginary evils, and the two chief ones are the remarriage of widows, and the early age at which young couples live together and become parents of families. I have stated above that it was distinctly promised to the conquered races that marriage and inheritance should be left to time-honoured customs, and there is nothing on which Oriental people are more jealous and suspicious than interference with their females. No people would resent more strongly than Englishmen any attempt by a foreign nation to force upon them a change in regard to their marriage-customs and marriage-laws, and yet some few irresponsible persons try to air their crude benevolence, and endanger the permanence of an empire.

I quote the words of a very competent authority:

The marriage system of the Hindus was slowly and carefully elaborated, with a view to securing the *maximum* security to female life and female honour during the centuries of foreign invasion and internecine war which, with the exception of brief intervals, made up the history of India before the advent of British rule. After 150 years of comparative security under the Mogul emperors came the long and bloody anarchy from which the British came forth the rulers of India. For more than a thousand years the supreme need of women was not independence, but safety. To meet this supreme need the marriage system was developed into a powerfully constructed organization of protection, a system which endeavoured to give the *maximum* security to women as a whole, and which deliberately acted on the principle that their general safety must be insured, even at the cost of hardship to individuals among them. The Hindu marriage system assured two things to every female born within

the pale of the respectable community. It assured to every such woman the protection of a lawful husband, together with the *status* of a lawful wife; it also assured her of that protection and of that *status* as soon as she entered on the age of physical maturity. It held that these assured benefits to women as a sex were cheaply purchased by prohibiting the re-marriage of individual women who had been so unfortunate as to lose their husbands.

Such a system of protection, however urgent the historical need of it, would have rested upon a feeble foundation but for the aid of religion. Hinduism, with its matchless union of rigid strength and plastic adaptiveness, elevated what was a human expediency into a spiritual necessity, by placing the marriage system on the basis of Divine law. So far as appears from the Vedic texts, the marriage of a woman was optional in ancient India, and down even to the tenth century A.D. examples of ladies of adult years choosing their own husbands are recorded. During the long period represented by the post-Vedic Codes marriage became compulsory. Under the influence of mediæval and modern Hinduism, marriage was prescribed as the one indispensable religious ceremony in a woman's life.

There is infinite variety in the details of the marriage-customs amidst the different respectable castes in the different provinces of India. In the North of India, from the Indus to the Ganges, the practice is something of this kind: When quite infants children are betrothed to each other of the same age: cases of betrothals of grown-up men to baby girls are quite the exception, and polygamy among the respectable classes is exceptional also. About the age of six or seven the religious marriage takes place, but the bride remains in her parents' home. As soon as signs of maturity appear, the bridegroom is sent for, and carries off his bride with pomp and rejoicing to his own home. No registration of births or deaths takes place in British India. The fact of the birth of a female child does not transpire beyond the walls of the house. Maturity is supposed to arrive at an age much earlier than in colder climates, and girls aged twelve are often mothers without injury to themselves or offspring. These phenomena seem strange to Europeans. I have certainly inflicted punishments on husbands for cruelty to their wives, and listened to no assertion of marital rights. Such cases, however, are exceptional; in hundreds of thousands of cases no trouble arises.

The Legislature of British India has now passed a law that consent is not a good defence given by a person under twelve years of age: formerly the age was only ten. There is no harm in this law, but it will probably be inoperative, as the seclusion of respectable women will render proof of the offence very difficult, and the absence of registration will render the question of the age extremely doubtful. With considerable experience as a magistrate and criminal judge, and a very large sympathy

with the people, I do not see how any penal provisions will work, except when the circumstances are of exceptional barbarity and the sufferers and neighbours cry out; and such cases have occurred.

Public opinion has been roused in India, and there are many things which the native community in their tribes and castes can do—and certainly, as education spreads, will do—which it would be dangerous for an alien Government, based upon bayonets, to attempt to do. A rebellion or mutiny, such as had to be coped with in 1856, is not put down without frightful shedding of blood and suffering to the people, which it makes me, an eye-witness, shudder to think of. It is asserted that the Act of the Legislature passed a few years before the great Mutiny, authorizing the remarriage of Hindu widows, was one of the causes which led on to that catastrophe. The greasing of cartridges with the fat of animals was another cause. It is not what actually is done, but what an ignorant population fear is going to be done, that rouses suspicion and opposition. To this law about the age of consent there was violent opposition and most unreasonable, and it is possible that we have not heard the end of it.

What we *can* do is not in any way to lend assistance or countenance to a custom contrary to equity. Thus the very idea of attempting, by interference of the law, to enable a husband to capture his wife, or the person whom he alleges to be his wife, by the purely English process of "restitution of conjugal rights" or "specific performance of contract," is monstrous, and in Northern India would be impossible, though in the Court of Bombay a notorious case has lately occurred. Of course, if an injury has been done or a contract has not been fulfilled, there will be an action for damages, but nothing more. However, the benevolent enthusiasts want to go much further. They would propose to raise the age of consent much higher, or get rid of the Hindu system of marriage altogether, substituting the European practice of courting and free selection—the Syámvara of the old Hindu legends. They would add to the present law, which authorizes the remarriage of widows, a clause allowing the widow to retain after second marriage all the property of her deceased husband which she, under Hindu law, inherited. As regards her chattels and personal ornaments, the principle is fair enough, but as regards her land it would be unjust and impossible. Some go further, and would try in some way to protect the remarrying widow and her new husband from social ostracism and religious excommunication. This would be entering into an arena of contest which might lead to serious complications, and might endanger our empire. A more reasonable but equally im-

practicable suggestion is that a system of registration of births, the ordinary practice of an European country, should be introduced. The people would not understand the objects; it would scarcely be possible in the rural districts to enforce it. The strangest rumours spread like wildfire among an ignorant population.

I read with astonishment one proposal, contained in the petition of an English lady-doctor and five of her fellow-practitioners to the Viceroy, urging him to pass a law not allowing the consummation of marriage before the wife has attained the age of fourteen years. How could such a police regulation be carried out? We have only to imagine a similar law passed for Great Britain, fixing the age of eighteen or nineteen as the period. We can by law arrest marriage, but we cannot arrest sin.

"Where is the wisdom," writes one Hindu, "of driving a patient people to exasperation?" Let the subject in every form be brought before the educated Hindu, discussed in newspapers and pamphlets, but all action left to the people themselves. Imagine Great Britain passing under a foreign jurisdiction, and Great Britain is a small affair compared to the millions of British India; and imagine the foreign conqueror being struck by the fact that there was such a vast proportion of unmarried females, and ordering that all should be married at the age of twenty. If in British India there are twenty-two millions of widows, there is perhaps scarcely an old maid to be found.

To turn loose the informer, and to allow the native police to interfere in such cases, *proprio motu* would entail misery upon the people which it is painful to think of. The new law, therefore, forbids any subordinate magistrate, or subordinate police officer, to interfere, and it is probable, therefore, that it will be inoperative, or, rather, that prosecutions will be very rare; but the fear of punishment, the fear of a domestic scandal, the awakened conscience of fathers of families on the subject, will have a salutary effect. It is a remarkable fact, that this alleged cruelty to women is not resisted by the women of the family; all agree in throwing the chief responsibility for the existence and perpetuation of the present evils upon the women. "Our mothers, mothers-in-law, and aunts," writes Babu Nobin Chunder Sen, a deputy magistrate, "do their utmost to force the child to premature motherhood. I know that in the case of my own brothers I had to set my foot firmly down on the evil. . . . I found, however, my old aunt was secretly nullifying my wishes."

I now give a singular illustration of the assertion that similar circumstances produce similar problems. In a mis-

sionary report this year from Palestine, I read: "I think I may say that the one real difficulty that I have had here is on the marriage question. Three leading members of our Church endeavoured to promote a marriage between a blind man and a child of thirteen still connected with the Orphanage, and the matter still threatens to disturb the peace of the congregation. I trust the Conference will be able to fix upon an age (if this has not been already done) below which a girl may not be married in our Church. The Nazareth Native Church Committee recommends that no girl be allowed to marry until she is over sixteen." This is among Christians. I quote another report from a mission among pagans on the Congo in Equatorial Africa, indicating the germ of the same difficulty: "Last Sunday the uncle of a boy of eight said that he was anxious to send the boy's betrothed wife to the station to be brought up with him, so that they should be more on a par." From a missionary report of the S.P.G., 1890, comes the encouraging fact that "in Christian missions women are taught to be teachers, and that thus educated women have an independent career of their own, and are not obliged to marry at an early age: many of the best educated girls remain unmarried." Here we have a germ of healthy reform.

By a mere chance the Indian papers throw a light upon the possible difficulty of working the new Act to protect children in factories, which applies equally to the child-wife. "The limit of age for 'full-timers' in factories is fixed at fourteen years, and as very few native operatives know their children's ages, or even their own, the medical officer has, in passing lads and girls for work, to judge the age as best he can—generally, as in the case of horses, by examining their teeth. If he concludes that they are under fourteen, he reduces them to 'half-timers.' In one Bombay mill recently a number of girls were thus sent back as under age who were actually mothers, and several boys who were fathers were also reduced; and one of the latter was the father, it is said, of three children. The case of these lads is particularly hard, for, with a wife and child, or perhaps children, to support, life, on the pay of a 'half-timer,' must be a terrible struggle."

There are worse things even in England than the child-marriages of India. Why do the parents in our working classes allow their daughters under sixteen to marry lads of the same age? Because of those worse things.

How vast is the abyss of feelings, circumstances, and environment, which separates the Indian family from any strata of European society is evidenced by the fact noticed in the annual administrative reports of British India, that the increase or decrease of the import of manufactured cotton

goods, and the consumption of alcoholic drink, depends whether a particular year was considered by astrologers in India an auspicious one for the consummation of marriages, or the contrary. Whatever may be thought in Europe is the completion of the marriage contract, in India two elements are entirely absent, love and lust. Moreover, the new law can possibly affect only a portion of the population; the Mohammedans have no such custom, and the millions of the lower castes, who live by daily labour, have little or no marriage custom at all; as far as my experience goes, women in the lower classes were only temporary companions.

This social subject is naturally regarded from different points of view. I close my paper by recording two.

My eye fell upon lines describing the Indian child-wife of a man of good caste and easy circumstances as "a stranger to all the comforts of home, excluded from all that is cheery and interesting, cut off from the delights of social life as *we understand it in happy Christian England.*" Such were the sentiments of an evangelical gentlewoman of the upper middle classes, with a certain amount of culture, and an income sufficient to allow her to dress smartly and go to tea-parties in some small social circle, but entirely untravelled, and imperfectly acquainted with the ethnology of the world. No doubt to many of such a class it is a matter of wonder what pleasure in life a woman in India, China, or Japan can have, and yet it is an equal subject of wonder to Oriental women what pleasure a European woman can have. The wife of a rich Hindu received in her apartments an English lady, and she was dressed in silks and jewels, and the lady asked her why she dressed so grandly when no one could see her. Her reply was that she dressed to please the eye of her husband, and she asked what persons the English lady dressed so finely to please.

A learned Brahmin communicated to an English periodical his views on the policy of the law allowing widows to remarry. He remarked that from the unavoidable waste of male life there was always an excess of females over males. If, therefore, widows, who had had their chance, were allowed to enter the marriage market a second time, there must be more and more old maids to "disturb the order and serenity of society." His second point was that, even if husbands could be secured for all widows without unjustly compelling other females to remain spinsters, this would entail a calamity upon India, already overcrowded, by a great increase of the population, and cause famine and disease from the insufficient supply of food. He remarks that we cannot satisfy the desire of the widow without being ungenerous to the unmarried girls and

their legitimate aspirations, and we cannot meet the wishes of both without sacrificing the interests of the community. His third point is that perpetual widowhood is from economic reasons the fate of the widow; the State should interfere and forbid the remarriage of the widower. It appears that in the Rajput Reform Association widowers above the age of fifty are bound down by their caste rules not "to make fools of themselves by repairing a second time to the altar of Hymen." This in his opinion is an encouraging sign of the times. It certainly will increase the number of old maids, and be a check on the increase of the population.

ROBERT CUST.

ART. VI.—THE ARGUMENT OF THE "AURIUM PIETAS": ITS USE AND ABUSE.

THE freedom, not always reverent, with which recent criticism has been applied to the deepest and most sacred mysteries of our faith, cannot but bring to our mind the principle of the *aurium pietas* as it was recognised in earlier ages, and is still maintained in the Roman Church; though its meaning has by modern controversialists of that Church been extended to doctrinal developments instead of being limited to the reverent and pious treatment of the mysteries of the faith as "once delivered." We may observe, first, that this kind of argument has no connection whatever with the practice of the *disciplina arcani*, in which, by a conventional agreement between Christians, the true nature of the elements of the Eucharist was concealed from the uninitiated, a practice as inconsistent with the Divine command, which required the Passover rite to be explained even to the youngest who were capable of understanding it, as it is to the openness and sincerity which the principles of Christianity require in regard to all its institutions. This conversion of the Christian Passover into a "mystery," never to be alluded to but in dark figures of speech or parables, was one of the many causes of the animosity of the heathen, and of their charges against Christians, as though they partook of some unhallowed and revolting feast, instead of celebrating a simple and beautiful memorial, real rather in its effects upon the heart and life than in its own inherent power. With this conventional practice the principle of the *aurium pietas* has no affinity.

This latter rather represented the spirit of reverence and of pious reticence with which those great mysteries of our faith which stand around the supreme truth of the Incarnation, or any of their consequences, were approached by the faithful in

an earlier age, and offers an important lesson to those of our own who are too apt to approach them with other feelings and dispositions, and to treat them as ordinary subjects of critical investigation and of ingenious speculation and conjecture.

It is thus that the greatest of the mysteries of the Incarnation, the apparent conflict of attributes, arising out of the union of the two natures in Christ, has been recently treated, and the limits of that mysterious union been defined and, as it were, mapped out, a course as inconsistent with the piety of the more advanced disciple as it is injurious to the faith of the weaker one, who accepts the cardinal truth of his religion with all its mysteries, and finds in the practical application of it their best solution.

Perhaps the earliest direct assertion of the principle of the *aurium pietas*, and certainly the most influential in its later history, is the passage of St. Augustine (De Nat. et Gratiâ, c. 42): "Except the blessed Virgin Mary, regarding whom, on account of the honour of the Lord, I wish to enter into no question when we make mention of sin (for how do we know what amount of grace was given her to overcome sin in every case, who was thought worthy of conceiving and bearing Him whom we know to have had no sin?)—except this Virgin, if we could collect together all holy men and women and ask them whether they were without sin, would not they cry out with one voice, 'If we say that we have no sin we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us'?" It appears, however, that the assertion of the sinlessness of the Blessed Virgin originated with Pelagius himself, who insisted upon it in the case of all the saints of the Old Testament, as well as of the Virgin Mary. St. Augustine, in his reply, does not absolutely assert it, as his adversary had done, but merely shelters himself under the *aurium pietas*. He does not like to think of sin in connection with one from whom the Sinless One was in His human nature derived. The Roman defenders of the "Immaculate Conception" have followed in their contention rather the dogmatical assertion of Pelagius than the pious reticence of St. Augustine. The words of the latter, which have been forced into their service, cannot by the most strained interpretation mean more than that, though unwilling, like Pelagius, to declare the sinlessness of the Virgin, he is yet from a natural feeling of piety, arising out of her singular prerogative as the mother of our Lord, unwilling to think of her in connection with sin.

In a more limited sense, and in the case of all the departed saints of God, we share in some degree this feeling. We cannot bear to dwell on their errors and faults; we prefer to read panegyrics of their virtues rather than severe judgments on

their failures. But this sentiment does not lead us to pronounce them either actually or comparatively perfect. Our silence is rather the offering of piety than the assertion of faith. The "grace given her to overcome sin" cannot refer to original sin, which could not be thus resisted by grace, so that, even if taken as a declaration of sinlessness, it cannot be received as covering original as well as actual sin.

We come next to the remarkable passage in St. Epiphanius, which exhibits the *aurium pietas* in a new form, but still in connection with the Blessed Virgin. Arguing against the heretics, who depreciated the dignity of the Virgin (whom he terms Antidicomarianitæ), he endeavours to trace her history, after her commendation to St. John and residence with him. Finding no mention of her in the after-life of John, he is betrayed into a wild kind of reverie in regard to her future history. In this, by a curious application to her of Rev. xii. 13, he begins to doubt her death: "I do not altogether determine this matter, and say not whether she remained immortal, nor yet do I establish the fact of her death. For Scripture transcending herein, the human mind has left the matter uncertain, on account of that venerable and exalted vessel, and has not ascribed to her any carnal relation. Whether she is dead or buried we know not; in any case she had no union with flesh."[1]

This strange passage must be read in strict subordination to the object the writer had in view, which was to denounce as impious the belief that the Virgin had any other children. Instead, however, of establishing the truth of the perpetual virginity, it formed the foundation of the legend of the Assumption, which grew up into a doctrine in the Eastern Church, and passed thence into the Western. Epiphanius' chief argument is derived from the *aurium pietas*. He proceeds to denounce, in his usual embittered language, the impiety of those who hold the contrary doctrine, and his reference to Rev. xii. 13 is designed to prove that the Virgin—like the woman who brought forth the man child—was hidden in the wilderness from the wrath of the dragon. At a later period, when the whole of this chapter was transferred to the Virgin, and the old interpretation, which referred it to the Church, was entirely superseded, the "hiding of the woman in the wilderness" was made the foundation of the Assumption legend, and the belief that, like Moses, her body was not found upon earth, led to the idea that she was translated, like Elijah, to heaven. This wild improvisation of history is perhaps the greatest instance in all antiquity of the abuse of the principle

[1] Hæres, 78, cap. 11.

of the *aurium pietas*, and the inevitable danger into which it leads.

Its introduction as a theological argument instead of a mere restraint of speculative pious opinion must be attributed to Scotus and his followers, by whom the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception was first put forth before the world. Destitute as that dogma was of Scriptural, synodical or patristic authority—for never was a *consensus* on any doctrine of the Church so universal as that which we find against this—it formed the strongest argument of the Immaculists, and as it appealed to the imagination rather than to the judgment, to the feelings rather than to the understanding, it has been the only real foundation of that most indefensible doctrine from the day of its first discovery by Scotus, until it was promulgated as a doctrine of necessary faith by the late Pope in the Bull *Ineffabilis*.

The Dominicans boldly resisted this application of the principle to the doctrine they so vigorously and (as far as argument can effect) so successfully repudiated. Foremost in this opposition was the great Cardinal Cajetan, to whom the question was referred for solution in the Lateran Council by Leo X. "This root," he writes, "is supported by zeal, but not according to knowledge. For it would lead away from the faith to many devious paths. According to this so-called rule of piety, we might believe to-morrow that the Virgin was conceived by the Holy Ghost, and yet under Christ. . . . We might believe that she was God and man, and yet under Christ. . . . And many other similar erroneous things might be deduced from such a kind of piety" ("De Concept.").[1] Such was the protest of the cardinal, or, rather, of Leo X. himself, and of the Lateran Council, to which it was addressed. But Pius IX. entertained no such reasonable views or prudential considerations. He boldly pronounces—not what God *has* done or *has* revealed—but what He ought to do and reveal. "*Decebat*," "*prorsus decebat*" are his words of dictation to the Almighty; and as he could not find the doctrine in the Scriptures, it was enough for him to determine that it ought to have found a place in them. That this is a flagrant instance of the abuse of the principle of the *aurium pietas* must be clear to everyone whose eyesight is not suffused by the belief in the papal infallibility, which ought, in point of time, to have preceded the Bull *Ineffabilis*, rather than to have succeeded it. For it supplied a much better reason for the reception of the new dogma than any of those alleged by the Pope, in which history and tradition are falsified almost in every sentence.

[1] De Concept. B. Virginis, Opusc., tom. ii., tract. l., c. v.

But as we have given a few instances of the misapplication of the principle in question, we may well pass on to consider how far it can be legitimately applied for the protection of the great truths which all Christians hold in common. Though the principle itself finds no place in the creed or in the outward evidences of Christianity, it must have a place in every well-regulated and religious mind, as constituting the greatest moral support of the mysteries of our faith, the strongest outpost of their defence in every pious heart. The great mystery of the Incarnation in all its features of beauty and wonder needs not only our faith and admiration, but our silent and reverent adoration. When we accept it, we accept with it all those ineffable mysteries and difficulties of reconciliation which it involves, nor are we called upon to draw lines of definition or distinction between the human and the Divine nature, whose union is beyond the scrutiny even of the angels who ministered to it. So long as we preserve the reality of the human nature of our Lord, and save our faith from so crushing out the humanity as to leave it no place or function in the Divine system, which is the fatal error of the Monophysites, and, on the other hand, escape the perils of Arianism, which would do equal injury to the Divine nature of our Lord, we are not called upon to draw lines of distinction or rules of limitation in regard to this supreme doctrine.

The mystery of the Incarnation is best cleared up in its practical application. The three great portions of the creed are best learned and reconciled in the life of the disciple. The principle of the *aurium pietas*, applied so as to preserve the reverence and the reticence which belong so inseparably to a subject which, seen nakedly and merely externally, would rather lead to a captious criticism and to the ever-recurring question, "How can these things be?" will thus become a shelter and protection even to the weakest faith, and an indispensable safeguard during the storms of controversy and the wild excesses of criticism which must fill every heart with anxiety, and threaten the fulfilment in a spiritual sense of our Lord's prophecy that the "powers of the heavens shall be shaken."

The question of the knowledge of our Lord and of its limitations in regard to His human nature is one of those in which the principle for which we are contending ought to be anxiously kept in view. On only one occasion (St. Mark xiii. 32), in regard to the day of final judgment, our Lord set a limit to His knowledge as the Son. On only one occasion does He distinctly declare the authorship of a particular Psalm, and assign it to David, for His general references to the Book of the Psalms do not fix the authorship of the entire collec-

tion. The references to Isaiah may relate to the second prophet of the name—the "Isaiah of the Captivity," as modern Jews designate him—or to the great prophet of the reign of Hezekiah. No serious difficulty can present itself to the pious reader in a case like this.

Nor can the adaptation of our Lord's language to the popular ideas of those whom He was addressing be regarded as indicating any limits to His Divine knowledge. "Cristo non venne al mondo per insegnare geografia," as Bishop Pannilini affirmed in the assembly of Tuscan bishops at Florence in reference to Pope Zachary's decree against the antipodes and the condemnation of Galileo.

Next to the great central truth of Christianity, and gathered round it as outposts of the citadel of our faith, are all those subordinate truths which are so long and unnecessarily being made the subjects of bitter contention and controversy—the authority and structure of the Word of God—the place of the sacraments in the Divine system, the office of the prophets and saints of the former and later covenant, and the degree of reverence to be assigned to them. Here the principle of the *aurium pietas* may well find recognition in the religious mind.

Finally, let us remember that the spirit in which we approach religious subjects is the true measure of our qualification for entering upon their study and examination. The Word of God can only become fruitful in the "honest and good heart." These words propose to us a moral qualification which too many of the critical explorers of a later day make no effort to acquire. And the result of their elaborate researches and unrivalled ingenuity presents a very Babel of tongues, conclusions which are constantly superseding one another, and proving "the diviners mad, turning the wise men backward, and making their knowledge foolish." The *aurium pietas* of the faithful and less learned disciple is thus offended and scandalized, the search after Divine truth is reduced to mere prying of an earthly and unholy curiosity. Well may we strive to live in the spirit, while we utter the words of that comprehensive prayer: "Turn away mine eyes from beholding vanity, and quicken Thou me in Thy way" (Ps. cxix. 37). We cannot live on the husks of ever-changing theories; in the hunger of our souls we need the "bread of life" to quicken us.

R. C. JENKINS.

Notes on Bible Words.

No. XXII.—"INTERCESSION."

THE primary meaning of ἐντυγχάνω is *to light upon, meet with, a person* or *a thing*. Secondly, *to go to*, or *meet a person for consultation* or *supplication*. Acts xxv. 24: "about whom (περὶ οὗ) all the multitude have dealt with me" (ἐνέτυχόν μοι), R.V.: "made suit to me."[1] Hence, *to entreat, pray:* ὑπέρ with gen. of pers., *to make intercession* for anyone; the dat. of the pers. approached in prayer being omitted, as evident from the context (Grimm).

Rom. viii. 27: "He maketh intercession for the saints"; 34, "also maketh interc. for us."

Heb. vii. 25: "to make interc. for them," εἰς τὸ ἐντ.[2]

Rom. xi. 2: ἐντ. τῷ Θεῷ, "maketh intercession to God," R.V., "pleadeth with God" "*against* Israel," κατά; accuse one to anyone. (Cf 1 Macc. viii. 32, etc.)

ὑπερεντυγχάνω, *to intercede for* one, is found in Rom. viii. 26.

(Six times in N.T. Not found in Sept.)

The noun ἔντευξις, an interview; a conference; a *supplication* (Diod. xvi. 55, Jos. "Antiq.," xv. 3, 8), is found in 1 Tim. iv. 5, "prayer," and ii. 1, plur. "intercessions."

In that delightful book, "The Ascension and Heavenly Priesthood of our Lord," by Prof. Milligan, recently published (Macmillan and Co.), remarks on "Intercession" are suggestive. Thus, Dr. Milligan writes, p. 151:

> By examining it in its different contexts it will at once be seen that the verb does not mean simply to pray. It means to deal or transact with one person in reference to another, either making a statement "concerning" him upon which certain proceedings ought to follow, or asking something "for" him or "against" him. Petition is, indeed, the general result of such action, and hence the phrase passes easily into this meaning when there is anything in the connexion to give it that particular force. When, however, it stands alone, without anything to limit the interpretation, it ought to be understood in a much wider sense, as including the whole series of transactions in which one person may engage with another on behalf of a third. . . . It may be matter of regret that the English language seems to possess no better word than "intercession"[3] to express the action of our High Priest in heaven after He had presented His offering to the Father. For this, however, there is no help, and all that can be done is to impress upon the inquirer the fact that "Intercession" is a much wider word than prayer. We are to understand it of every act by which the Son, in dependence on the Father, in the Father's name, and with the perfect concurrence of the Father, takes His own with Him into the Father's presence, in order that whatever He Himself enjoys in the communications of His Father's love may become also theirs.

Many who, like ourselves, cannot follow the learned Professor on every point, will enjoy and profit by this work.

---

[1] ἐνέτυχον τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ ἐδεήθην [αὐτοῦ, Sap. viii. 21: ἐνέτυχον τῷ βασιλεῖ τὴν ἀπόλυσιν . . . αἰτούμενοι, 3 Macc. vi. 37.

[2] Clem. Rom., 1 Cor. 56, 1.

[3] Prof. Milligan says: "The gain would be great could we speak of 'interacting and 'interaction,' but it is impossible to do so."

Short Notices.

UNDER the title *Two Present-Day Questions* (published by Messrs Macmillan), Dr. Sanday has given some useful counsel on, first, the progress of Biblical Criticism, and, second, the Social Movement; and the leading thought in discussing both questions is the same—Don't be in a hurry! A really great danger to which Christian opinion is exposed, at the present moment, is "of a premature insistence upon partial and insufficiently-tested solutions of those questions and difficulties with which the inquirer is confronted." Thus, as to Biblical Criticism: "The rate at which we have been moving for some time past," says the Professor, "is the utmost that can be at once sound and salutary." Far better is a "steady, deliberate, well-considered advance than the feverish haste for results and 'conclusions.' It is more important that our results when they come should be sound than that they should come quickly." Truly and wisely said. To note the readiness, even eagerness, with which many accept the latest thing out, and the positive tone in which revolutionary "conclusions" are thrust upon the Church, is very sad.

Six Sermons on the Bible, a right welcome little book, is published by the S.P.C.K. In a prefatory note the Rev. T. Howard Gill mentions that the Sermons were preached in the Parish Church of Tonbridge. They were addressed specially to the people, and they are now published, as they were originally delivered, "in the hope that they may help to confirm some whom recent utterances have tended to unsettle." Bishop Barry, the Dean of Canterbury, Canons Elwyn, Girdlestone, and Bernard, and the Rev. J. E. C. Welldon, are the Preachers. We strongly recommend this conservative book.

Three small volumes under the title of *The Gospel History for the Young*, by Dr. W. F. Skene, Historiographer Royal for Scotland, were reviewed in this Magazine when they appeared a few years ago, and we are glad to see that these "Lessons" or "Lectures" on the Life of Christ, delivered to the senior class in a Sunday-school, have been published in a cheap form in one volume (Edinburgh: David Douglas). This ably-written book stands alone, we think, as regards the extent to which the Gospel narrative is illustrated from the views, customs, and institutions of the Jews set forth in the Jewish writings. Dr. Skene's book, evidently a labour of love, is sure to do good service.

A second series of Dr. Almond's sermons is welcome: *Sermons by a Lay Headmaster* (Swan Sonnenschein and Co.). In his preface, the Headmaster (of Loretto School) explains how it was that he felt himself constrained to criticise some sayings of Dr. Cheyne, and certain portions of Dr. Driver's "Introduction." His criticisms are acute and well worth reading. We quote one passage from an excursus on the Davidic Psalms:

I wish to make some remarks on Professor Driver's criticism of the 51st Psalm, from the point of view that "the speaker" is, "perhaps," "the nation." He says (p. 367, *note*) of Psalm li., "A confession written on behalf of the nation, by one who had a deep sense of his people's sin during the exile (composed from a prophetic point of view, Isa. lxiii. 64; lxxvii. 12). That the title cannot be correct appears especially from the inapplicability of verse 4 to David's situation (for, however great David's sin against God, he had done Uriah the most burning wrong that could be imagined; and an injury to a neighbour is in the Old Testament a 'sin

against him, Gen. xx. 9; Judges xi. 27; Jer. xxxvii. 18, al.); and the assumption that the subject is the nation is the only one which neutralises the contradiction between verse 16 and verse 19; the restoration of Jerusalem would be the sign that God was reconciled to His people (Isa. xl. 2), and would accept the sacrifices in which He had now no pleasure." The remainder of the note is the sheerest guess-work, but I have quoted all the arguments. To which I reply:

1. The passages from Isaiah referred to bear no sort of analogy to the Psalm. And in other parallel passages, *e.g.* Lamentations i., it is perfectly clear that "Zion" is personified. Where a prophet says "I," without explanation, he always means himself, *e.g.* Jer. ix.

2. A "sin," in the Old Testament is always against God. The most closely parallel cases are those of Abimelech (Gen. xx. 6) and Joseph (Gen. xxxix. 9). David doubtless had these in his mind, as well as Leviticus vi. 2, and other passages of the Law. Of the passages quoted by Professor Driver, Gen. xx. 9 is the speech of a heathen about a contingency which has not happened. And if it were the speech of a seer about a thing which had happened, it would be nothing to the point, more especially when read in the light of verse 6. Judges xi. 27 is a loose expression, also about a thing which had not happened, in a bragging message from Jephthah. Jer. xxxvii. 18 is irrelevant on the Davidic hypothesis, but if it were otherwise relevant, the quotation of such a passage as this, as bearing on the authorship of Psalm li., is simply frivolous: "Moreover, Jeremiah said unto King Zedekiah, What have I offended against thee, or against thy servants, or against this people, that ye have put me in prison?"

3. The "contradiction" between verse 16 and verse 19 exists only in the critic's mind. The meaning clearly is, whoever wrote the Psalm, that at present God wished for no sacrifice, but that the time would come when sacrifices would be acceptable. Now, on the supposition that the Psalm is written on behalf of the nation, I fail to see how the supposed difficulty is met. During the exile, the expression, "else would I give it thee," would have been meaningless. During the monarchy, the suspension of sacrifices at any other time would have been as contradictory to verse 19 as in David's time. In fact, David's time is the only one where there is no difficulty. Before the temple was built, sacrifices were an occasional thing. But after its consecration by Solomon they became a regular thing, except when God's worship was overthrown. Verse 19 is especially fulfilled, 1 Kings viii. 62.

4. The "restoration" of Jerusalem is never mentioned in the Psalm. What is referred to is the building of Solomon's Temple and Solomon's walls.

A little book which is likely to be very useful is *Why I belong to the Church of England*, by the Rev. T. Howard Gill, M.A., Vicar of Tonbridge; six sermons couched, it is modestly stated, in simple language, and laying no claim to originality; nevertheless, suggestive and telling (Elliot Stock).

Helps to the Study of the Book of Common Prayer (Henry Frowde: Oxford University Press Warehouse) will prove generally acceptable. It is well arranged, full and clear, and as to size, handy. Many of the notes will be quite new, we think, to a large number of students. Here is a specimen from "The Communion of the Sick":

3. *But if a man*, etc. The Sarum Manual directed that in cases where the sick person was desirous to receive, but incapable, the priest should say to him: "Brother, in this case true faith and good will are sufficient for thee; only believe and thou hast eaten."

We have received from Mr. Murray the July *Quarterly Review*. The articles on Professor Freeman, Pitt's War Policy, The Porson of Shakesperian Criticism (Theobald), and Professor Ramsay's Asia Minor, are well up to the usual *Quarterly* standard. That on Freeman, which is severe, was intended, one is glad to know, to be published in the great writer's lifetime. It is very able. We are not altogether satisfied with the paper on Cardinal Manning. The advice which is given to Mr. Rudyard Kipling, whose Tales are sharply criticised, is well-founded and wise. "Disestablishment," "Hymns and Hymn-writers," "Trinity College, Dublin," and "Politics and Ethics," make up a well-varied and interesting *Quarterly*. The last-named article is a review of Mr. Lilly's new book.

The third edition of that standard work, the *Variorum Reference Bible*, just sent to us by Messrs. Eyre and Spottiswoode, is a most comely and convenient volume. It contains the Apocrypha, edited by the Rev. C. J. Ball, a separate issue of which will give us an opportunity of comment later on. A Bible student may reckon himself very fortunate if he can obtain this volume and also duly use it. The Queen's Printers' publications are always of the highest as to execution in every respect.

The Rev. J. J. LIAS requests us to insert the following:

I owe Professor Driver an apology for a misquotation which was quite unintentional. I have represented him as saying that Ezekiel had "transferred unconsciously" to the past "the associations of the *future*," whereas I ought to have written "present." I cannot explain the mistake, except as being an unconscious substitution of one word for another. Professor Driver's book lay before me as I wrote, and I had no intention of misquoting him. My argument in regard to the improbability of Ezekiel being mistaken in his facts is not affected by the error, but in a note I refer to the passage as unintelligible. Of course, in its proper shape the passage is intelligible enough.

THE MONTH.

THE General Election is over, and Mr. Gladstone has a majority of 41. What will he do with it? The figures are:

Conservatives	...	268	314
Liberal Unionists	...	46	
Gladstonians	...	274	355
Anti-Parnellites	...	72	
Parnellites	...	9	

The polling has been the heaviest on record. The Unionists have gained a clear majority of votes in Great Britain as a whole, and a very large majority (71) in England. Mr. Gladstone's majority in Midlothian was reduced in a most remarkable way.

Ulster is hopeful and determined.

A splendid series of successes in the Midland Counties is due to a large extent to the vigorous eloquence of Mr. Chamberlain.

At the Canterbury Diocesan Conference the Archbishop referred, in a very practical spirit, to the influence of the Press.