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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

MARCH, 1895.

ART. I.—HERMAS AND THE FOUR GOSPELS.

PART III.

THE "Shepherd" is a work made up of distinct parts, in which the writer delivers his message "in many ways." A leading thought expressed in one part of it is apt to reappear with new features and accessories, and what has once been obscurely hinted at we may hope to find again in some fresh form or disguise. The thing most prominent in the book is its comparison of the Church to a tower; and this is given in some detail in the third Vision, and repeated with much amplification in the long ninth Similitude.

Whatever was meant in Vis. iii. by the four feet of the Church's seat, which are compared to the four elements (στοιχεῖα) of the world, the same thought was presumably present to the author when he wrote in Sim. ix.: "So they became four rows (στοῖχοι) in the foundations of the tower." If, in the one place, the canonical Gospels are hinted at as the "elements of the faith of the Church," it would follow that they are perhaps alluded to in the second place under the figure of the four tiers of stones which support the whole superstructure, which is ὁ κόσμος τῆς ἐκκλησίας (Origen), the spiritual analogue of the world. In rabbinic Hebrew the four *elements* are the four "yesodoth," or *foundations*. A reviewer dismisses the suggestion that the four rows do accordingly carry a reference to the Four Gospels with the remark that "it is of no importance to Dr. Taylor that Hermas himself furnishes a different explanation of the four rows." This "different explanation" is a step in the proof that the Gospels are referred to.

The following extracts from the ninth Similitude are from Mr. Harmer's version:

"2. And in the middle of the plain he showed me a great white rock rising up from the plain. The rock was loftier

than the mountains, being four-square, so that it could contain the whole world. Now, this rock was ancient, and had a gate hewn out of it; but the gate seemed to me to have been hewn out quite recently. . . . And around the gate stood twelve virgins.

"3. And there went up ten stones square and polished. . . . And the virgins laid the first ten stones that rose out of the deep on each other, and they carried them together, stone by stone.

"4. Those ten stones then were joined together, and they covered the whole rock. And these formed a foundation for the building of the tower. And the rock and the gate supported the whole tower. And after the ten stones other twenty-five stones came up from the deep, and these were fitted into the building of the tower, being carried by the virgins, like the former. And after these, thirty-five stones came up. And after these came up other forty stones, and these all were put into the building of the tower. So four rows were made in the foundation of the tower.

"5. 'I would fain know, Sir,' say I, 'what is this building of this tower, and concerning the rock and gate, and the mountains, and the virgins, and the stones that came up from the deep, and were not shaped, but went just as they were into the building; and wherefore ten stones were first placed in the foundations, then twenty-five, then thirty-five, then forty.'

"12. 'This rock,' saith he, 'and gate is the Son of God.'

"13. 'The tower . . . this is the Church. . . . For this cause thou seest the tower made a single stone with the rock.'

"15. 'But the stones, Sir,' say I, 'that came from the deep, and were fitted into the building, who are they?' 'The first,' saith he, 'even the ten, that were placed in the foundations, are the first generation; the twenty-five are the second generation of righteous men; the thirty-five are God's prophets and His ministers: the forty are apostles and teachers of the preaching of the Son of God.' 'Wherefore, then, Sir,' say I, 'did the virgins give in these stones also for the building of the tower and carry them through the gate?' 'Because these first,' saith he, 'bore these spirits, and . . . if they had not had these spirits with them, they would not have been found useful for the building of this tower.'"

The rock loftier than the mountains is the ancient prophets' "mountain of the Lord's house." It is large enough to contain the whole world (2), and the base of the tower covers it completely (4). The primeval rock represents the Son of God as pre-existent and older than the creation, and the "recent" gate represents Him as "made manifest in the last days of

the consummation" (12). The tower and its stones become *monolith* with the rock, in token that the faithful are one with Christ (13).

The likeness and affinity of the words στοῖχος, *row*, and στοιχεῖον, "properly *one of a row*," suggested that the *four rows* (Sim. ix. 4) and the *four elements* allude to the same thing, the general subject of both contexts being the tower, or Church. Having seen reason to think that the Gospels were referred to in the earlier passage, I was prepared to see an allusion to them in the latter, having regard to the writer's habit of reiteration. But he gives us to understand that the four rows mean something different, and makes no mention of the Gospel in interpreting them, except in connection with the last (15). The difficulty was too patent to be overlooked, and some time elapsed before I saw how to meet it. Its solution is contained in the complete answer to the question of Hermas: *Wherefore did the virgins give in these stones also for the building of the tower?*

The four rows are four "generations" of generations, or Ages of the World, from the creation of man to the writer's own time, the fourth and last being the age of "the preaching of the Son of God." There is, perhaps, some hidden meaning in the numbers ten, twenty-five, thirty-five, forty of the stones in the rows; but in the case of the first age the "Shepherd" agrees with the Talmud tract "Pirké Aboth," which reckons "ten generations from Adam to Noah." These are, according to Gen. v. 1-29, the generations of Adam, Seth, Enos, Cainan, Mahalaleel, Jared, Enoch, Methuselah, Lamech, Noah. St. Jude calls Enoch "the seventh from Adam."

Three of the rows of stones representing the generations which had passed away before and without "the preaching of the Son of God," we may ask, with Hermas, "Wherefore did the virgins give in these stones also for the building of the tower?" Why were pre-Christian, unbaptized people included in the Church as represented by the tower?

Before the patriarchs could be built into the Church of Christ, Christ must somehow have been revealed to them. "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day; and he saw it, and was glad" (St. John viii. 56). "Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; And were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; And did all eat the same spiritual meat; And did all drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of that spiritual rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ" (1 Cor. x. 1-4). Hermas christens the pre-Christians in his own way in Sim. ix. 16:

"'Show me still further, Sir,' say I. 'What desirest thou to know besides?' saith he. 'Wherefore, Sir,' say I, 'did the stones come up from the deep?' . . . 'It was necessary for them,' saith he, 'to rise up through water, that they might be made alive. . . . So these likewise that had fallen asleep received the seal of the Son of God, and entered into the kingdom of God. For before a man,' saith he, 'has borne the name of the Son of God, he is dead; but when he has received the seal, he layeth aside his deadness, and resumeth life. The seal, then, is the water: so they go down into the water dead, and they come up alive. Thus to them also this seal was preached, and they availed themselves of it, that they might enter into the kingdom of God.' 'Wherefore, Sir,' say I, 'did the forty stones also come up with them from the deep, though they had already received the seal?' 'Because,' saith he, 'these, the apostles and the teachers who preached the name of the Son of God, after they had fallen asleep in the power and faith of the Son of God, preached also to them that had fallen asleep before them, and themselves gave unto them the seal of the preaching. Therefore they went down with them into the water, and came up again. But these went down alive and again came up alive; whereas the others that had fallen asleep before them went down dead and came up alive. So by their means they were quickened into life, and came to the full knowledge of the name of the Son of God. For this cause also they came up with them, and were fitted with them into the building of the tower, and were builded with them.'"

Thus it is made out that the generations before Christ received *the preaching* (τὸ κήρυγμα) after their death, so that they *came to the full knowledge of the name of the Son of God.* Whatever, then, Hermas understood to be the Gospel is said to have been preached to them in its entirety. Thus much may be affirmed without fear of contradiction; for, to repeat words used in a previous number of the CHURCHMAN (March, 1894, p. 282), "the Gospel known to Hermas may have been single or multiple, documentary or oral." On this point let us now interrogate his narrative of the preachers' descent into Hades.

Some form of the account of the Lord's own descent to the underworld lies behind the words of the "Shepherd," including, doubtless, 1 Pet. iii. 18-20: "For Christ . . . went and preached unto the spirits in prison; Which sometime were disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was apreparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved *by water*"—δι' ὕδατος, as in Vis. iii. 3-5: "Because your life was saved, and shall be

saved, *by water*"; and Sim. ix. 16-2: "It was necessary for them to rise up *through water*, that they might be made alive." At all events, Hermas had received a tradition that Christ went and preached to the antediluvians or others of old time, and it occurs to his inventive mind to make the "apostles and teachers of the preaching of the Son of God" go down and do as He had done. Accordingly, we read, as above, that they preached to the successive Ages of the World, of which we are told that there were four, including their own. It being a recorded fact that God spake to men of old πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως (Heb. i. 1), we may suppose that the preaching in Sim. ix. 16 to the same persons after their decease varied in form from age to age, each receiving a revelation suited to its idiosyncrasy. For each age or "generation," then, there was a "preaching," or Gospel, and the generations of Hermas are four in number because there were four Gospels.

Turn now again to Irenæus, who writes: *As was the working of the Son of God, which was quadriform, such was the form of the living creatures, and such the character of the Gospel. And on this account there were four catholic covenants given to humanity*—"through Adam, Noah, Moses, and our Lord Jesus Christ, according to the Latin version, or through Noah, Abraham, Moses, and Christ, according to the Greek text of Irenæus. The Gospels in some order correspond to these, the last in order corresponding to the actual covenant" ("Witness of Hermas," p. 15). With the help of the two versions, it would be as easy to reckon five covenants as four.

Hermas divides the life of the world into four ages; he would have known how to make them five, or seven, or ten if it had served his purpose. But he reckons four only, and says that preachers of the Gospel preached to them after their decease; and nothing in the context forbids a reference to four Gospels corresponding severally to the ages, as Irenæus in the next generation makes the Four Gospels correspond to the "four catholic covenants" given to his four successive ages of humanity.

What has been said above at some length may be recapitulated briefly in the words of a footnote from "The Witness of Hermas to the Four Gospels":

"A study of the style of Hermas having led me to expect that his four στοιχεῖα would reappear somewhere in some disguise, the allusion to them in the four στοῖχοι seemed too obvious to be accidental. At first the writer seemed to say that the στοῖχοι had no connection with the Gospels. But afterwards it was seen that he was merely giving their interpretation in two instalments: first, they were the four cosmic

generations from the beginning (xv. 4); next, they had had the Gospel preached to them (xvi. 5), and it was this that qualified them to be four rows in the foundation of the tower (iv. 3), which was, therefore, in a sense, founded upon the fourfold Gospel."

The "rows" themselves are interpreted by Hermas, but their number is chosen arbitrarily, and he leaves the reader —not without suggestive data—to discover its significance. "Let him that hath understanding count the number."

C. TAYLOR.

ART. II.—THE CONSTITUTION OF POPE JULIUS II. ON THE SIMONIACAL ELECTION OF A POPE (*CUM TAM DIVINO*), AND ITS BEARING UPON THE PRESENT ROMAN CHURCH BRIEFLY CONSIDERED.

IN the year 1505 Pope Julius II. put forth a constitution on the simoniacal election of a Pope, which, from the universal conviction in the minds of the members of the Court of Rome that simony had reigned in the elections to the Papacy, at least from the period of Alexander VI., produced almost a feeling of consternation in the Curia. Its extreme imprudence at a moment when the Reformation was so nearly approaching, and the corruptions of the Roman Court had called forth the loudest protests from almost every kingdom in Europe, must be apparent to every reader of it. Nor were its dangers unrecognised by the officials of the Court, an eminent member of which published a commentary upon it, pointing out the facilities it would give for originating a schism on every occasion of an election to the Papacy. The writer of this commentary was Petrus Andreas Gammarus, "Auditor of the Apostolic Palace and Vicar of the Pope (Clement VII.) in the city of Rome." It was published there by Calvus, without date, and dedicated by its author to Clement himself, and by the publisher to Cardinal Alessandro Farnese. The perils which were opened by the decree were pointed out to our author by a certain great prelate (*quidam magnus antistes*), who declared that it gave a handle to anyone who might be planning a schism.

"Hearing this," proceeds Gammarus, "I took it in hand. I devoured it in a single reading. Its very first aspect terrified me. I read it again and again. I saw that a vast ground for innovation was underneath it, unless it could find a mild interpreter." Further on he writes: "This constitution opens the door to every worst Cardinal, and, indeed, to all the vassals,

of the Roman Church, enabling them to disturb its rule and to revolt from its authority. For they will all say that the Pope has been simoniacally elected. On this account many men of no light authority have held that the authority of this constitution ought to be done away with."

Unfortunately it has the indisputable character of an *ex cathedrâ* law, and declares itself to be an *in perpetuum valitura constitutio.* As such it is accepted by the modern Church of Rome, and is solemnly republished and enjoined at every election of a Pope and creation of a Cardinal. The commentator was not unreasonably terrified at the first aspect of this decree. For it places *simony* in the rank of a heresy, and the severe penalties it decrees of confiscation, degradation, testamentary incapacity and similar punishments, are identical with those assigned to heresy; and the method of proceeding against those charged with it is made by Pius V. identical with that adopted in heresy in its stricter sense—that is, by a "denunciation," either open or secret, and by an inquisitorial process. In one point the constitution goes even beyond the "Holy Office" in its severity, for it subjects to the same penalty not only those of the Cardinals who have taken an active part in the simoniacal election, but even those who, though remaining passive, have failed to protest against it—and gives the extraordinary power of appealing to a general council against the election, even to a single protesting Cardinal.

The "Heresy of Simony," as the Pope terms it, consists of "giving, promising, or receiving money, gifts of any kind, real property (*castra*), offices or benefices, promises or obligations, either personally or through another or others, in any manner and of any kind whatever." Every such act is declared to vitiate the election, and to deprive the person elected of every office or authority, any one of the Cardinals present being authorized to oppose and protest against the election. This he may do even after the enthronization of the new Pope, and after he has sworn obedience to him. He or they may, moreover, invoke the aid of the secular arm to aid them in their resistance, should the person elected endeavour to assert his claim. The next clause extends this deprivation to all the Cardinals who have been implicated in the simoniacal election, either by active promotion of it, or by failing to protest against it, and thus tacitly consenting to it; who forfeit thereby every title or rank cardinalitial or episcopal, and every dignity or benefice they may enjoy. Then follows a very stringent clause against all who act as agents, intermediaries, or subordinates in the matter of a simoniacal election, who are not only deprived of every office or rank they may hold, but condemned to the confiscation of all their goods, and incapacitated from making

a will, even if they should be the nuncios or legates of kings and princes. This clause may have been occasioned by the notorious fact that many of the greatest families in Rome were agents and abettors in the simoniacal election of Roderic Borgia to the Papacy.[1]

The following enactment enables the protesting Cardinals to summon a general council to determine the cause, notwithstanding any constitution or decree to the contrary of any preceding Pope or Council. Then follow the usual sanctions and warnings against any disobedience or resistance to the decree. Without dwelling on the earlier instances of simony in the elections to the Papacy, for which we have the testimony of the great Florentine poet—who places Nicholas III. and Boniface VIII. as chief among the simoniacal Popes, in the nineteenth canto of the "Inferno," putting in the mouth of the latter the words:

> Di sotto il capo mio son gli altri tratti
> Che precedetter me simoneggiando—

we pass on to the nearer period of Alexander VI., in which we are able to obtain the undisputed testimony of the greatest historians of Italy. Onuphrius Panvinius, who enjoyed the friendship of Pius IV. himself, has thus described to us the election of Alexander VI.:

"On the death of Innocent VIII., in his stead, in the Vatican, and by the votes of twenty-one Cardinals, in August, 1492, Alexander VI. was elected Pope. He is said to have obtained this high dignity through the blind ambition and avarice of certain Cardinals, who afterwards experienced from the ungrateful Pontiff the greatest perfidy. The principal of these was Cardinal Ascanio Sforza, bought, without doubt, by profuse bribery, in order that this man, the most wicked of all his order, should be proclaimed the best of Pontiffs; who by that suffrage obtained for himself the office of Chancellor."[2]

Among the most eminent of those who were thus corrupted were Julian della Rovere (afterwards Pope Julius II.) and Raffaele Riario, nephew of Pope Sixtus IV. The great historian Guicciardini affirms the truth of this narrative:

"Alexander VI.," he writes, "was elected to the Pontificate through the discord which reigned between the two Cardinals, Ascanio Sforza and Giuliano della Rovere, and much more, by an example new to that age, he procured it partly by open bribery, partly by promises of offices and benefices, which were rich and numerous."[3]

---

[1] See Guicciardini, "Historia di Italia," l. i.

[2] "In Vita Alex. VI."

[3] "Historia di Italia," l. i. See also Burchardus' "Comment." (an. 1492), Card. Bembo's "Hist. Venet.," and the Despatches of Valovi and Manfredi.

In the interesting and impartial "Life of Pope Julius II.," by M. Dumesnil, the bribery scene is thus described: "In a secret interview Roderic Borgia brought over Ascanio Sforza, by means of an argument too often irresistible in political life, to the renunciation of the Papacy. He promised, on his consenting to his own appointment, to resign in his favour the richest of his benefices, and especially the dignity of Vice-Chancellor of the Church which he enjoyed. Besides this, to convince him of his sincerity, he sent to the brother of the Duke of Milan by night four mules laden with money."[1]

Under the second, fourth, and fifth clauses of the law of Julius II., who by that very law admitted his own illegitimacy, the election of Alexander VI. was absolutely null and void, the Cardinals who failed to protest against it, no less than those who joined in the election, falling under the same disqualification as the Pope himself.

Julius II., who, as Gammarus significantly observes, "envied to his successors the arts which he had himself employed," carried on the example of his predecessor, and was elected to the Papacy, or rather bought it in the same manner.

"At the death of Pius III.," writes M. Dumesnil, "the situation was nearly the same as it was at the election of Alexander VI. The Cardinal of Amboise, convinced by the result of the previous Conclave that he could not reunite a majority of voices in his favour, no longer intrigued for the Papacy. He allowed himself to be easily persuaded by the Cardinal della Rovere (Julius II.) to give him his vote, and to support his candidature by means of the Cardinals he influenced. In exchange, Julius promised him to confirm him in his legation in France, and to add to it also the legation of Avignon, which, in fact, he did. . . . The Conclave opened on the 31st of October, 1503, and thirty-eight Cardinals took part in it. All had been arranged by anticipation, so that the same night the Cardinal della Rovere was elected in the scrutiny by a unanimity of voices. And so certain was everyone of his election that, as Burchard says in his 'Journal,'[2] 'the seal of the Fisherman had been actually prepared beforehand, that it might be placed on his finger immediately after his election'" (pp. 29, 30).

Two fatal grounds of disqualification are here added to the previous ones: twenty-six out of the electors were created Cardinals by Alexander VI., a disqualified Pope, and were incapacitated to elect; while the rest were under the same

[1] Dumesnil, "Histoire de Jules II.," p. 15 (quoting from the *Journal d'Infessura*).

[2] Cited by M. de Brequigny from the MSS. of the "Bibl. du Roi."

incapacity by their failure to protest against the election; while the Pope himself and the Cardinal of Amboise were under the still more serious disqualification of direct and notorious simony. Thus, the stream of the Papal succession, instead of purifying itself from its first pollution in its onward course, becomes more and more turbid and discoloured, until it reaches the Pontificate of Leo X., where it reaches its deepest dye, and renews the day of Gregory VII., when every office and dignity in the Church was bought and sold; when, as a writer of the period observed, "A minimo ad maximum nullus ordo vel gradus haberi poterat, nisi sic emeretur quomodo emitur pecus."[1] For Leo X., in his wholesale creation of Cardinals after the Petrucci conspiracy, openly sold the office to those who were able to pay. "Molti ne creò per danari," writes Guicciardini, "trovandosi esausto e in grandissima necessità."[2] We may observe here that the great Florentine historian, the devotee of the Medici family, was not likely to accept without the clearest proof a fact so discreditable to their house. That Leo X. not only inherited all the disqualifications declared in the Constitution of his predecessor, but seriously increased them, must be apparent to every impartial mind. We pass on from him to Clement VII., to whom our author dedicated his work. Notwithstanding this dedication, and the position which he held at the court of his patron, Gammarus finds that he labours under the sixth disqualifying clause of the Constitution of Julius. "But what," he asks, "if the Cardinals, before they elect, make a compact that all the benefices and offices held by the person to be elected are to be divided severally among the electors, would the person thus elected incur the penalty of the Constitution? This was done at the election of Clement VII., in the year 1523. It would appear," he replies, "that an election of this kind is simoniacal, and that the penalty of the Constitution has force in such a case."

It will be obvious that every successive Pope inherits the accumulated disqualifications of all his predecessors; and that every Pope and Cardinal from the day of Alexander VI. would, under the law of Julius, be incapacitated for his office, and become, in fact, illegitimate. Passing on, therefore, to the Pontificate of Innocent X.—a reign of luxury and sensuality recalling the worst features of the time of the Borgia and Medici Popes—we find that the "simoniacal taint," as it is called, was as visible in his election as in that of his predecessors. Ameyden, who was the intimate friend of the

[1] Andreas Parmensis in vitâ S. Arialdi Martyris.
[2] Guicciardini, "Hist.," l. xiii.

Pamfili family, assures us that he himself witnessed the terror of the Pope on the very day of his election on finding that a paper was missing from his pocket containing a simoniacal contract he had made with one of his electors.[1]

Whatever credit may be attached to this statement, the fact is indisputable that the election of Innocent X. was held by many theologians and canonists to have been uncanonical and void through the intrigues carried on in the Conclave; and that Cardinal Mazarine threatened to bring their conclusions before the world, and to make many revelations calculated to disturb the peace of the Pope. For this we have the high authority of the eminent historian of the Grand-Duchy of Tuscany, Galluzzi.[2] With these revelations, however, we have less to do than with the simony which reigned triumphant in Rome through the infamous Donna Olimpia Maidalchini Pamfili, the Pope's sister-in-law, whose reign is denounced even by that faithful devotee of the Papacy, Cardinal Palavicini, as the "*mostruoso potere d' una femmina in Vaticano.*" The more impartial contemporary chroniclers, Contarini and Giustiniani, describe to us the humiliating fact that every office and benefice up to the Episcopate itself was sold for large sums of money by Donna Olimpia—"that modern Agrippina," as the latter writer justly terms her—and that no office or dignity in the Church could be obtained but by bribing her with gifts proportioned to the value of the benefit conferred.[3] It will be unnecessary to pursue the Roman Pontificate through its later stages, inasmuch as Innocent X. is the *stirps* (speaking in a spiritual sense) of the whole of the later Popes. Through him the Cardinalate of every subsequent Pope was either immediately or remotely derived, as appears from an electoral pedigree drawn up by Giov. Batt. Sanuti, a Venetian Patrician and Bishop, and given by Palatius at the close of his "Fasti Cardinalium" (tom. v., pp. 159-160). We cannot but realize from these indisputable proofs the danger of suspending our faith, or believing that it was ever designed by its Divine Author to be suspended, upon a chain of mere human succession, which can never be stronger than any one of its separate links; which has been broken by countless schisms, and mended by as many forgeries; bought and sold by simoniacal purchases and contracts, verifying the old proverb, "*Omnia Romæ venalia,*" and its counterpart, "*curia Romana*

[1] Ameyden's memoirs of the Cardinals of his time, is to be found in manuscript in several of the Papal libraries. A copy is in that of the British Museum.

[2] "Storia del Granducato di Toscana," tom. vii., c. iv.

[3] See Professor Ciampi's "Innocenzio X. e la Sua Corte," p. 328.

non curat ovem sine lanâ." The "simoniacal taint" was so lightly regarded by the curialists that it became an open question whether the Cardinalate itself were a saleable commodity or not. The very promulgation of the Constitution of Julius proves that its severe penalties had become necessary, while the terror with which Gammarus regarded it was a clear indication that the universality of the evil had made the application of the remedy very difficult. The intrigues of the great Powers of Europe to influence the electors to the Papacy have introduced the "simoniacal heresy" in another form, and bribery has assumed a less direct, but more insidious, character. No election to the Papacy in any age of its long history, since the day of the establishment of Christianity, has ever been really a free one; and no Pope, at least from the period of Alexander VI., has ever had a clear title under the inflexible clauses of the Constitution of Julius II.

ROBERT C. JENKINS.

ART. III.—EXAMINATION OF GESENIUS' OBJECTIONS TO THE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH.

III.

ALTHOUGH, as admitted by the writer in Smith's Dictionary, Gesenius' classification of variations between the two codices (all of which are to be found in a very convenient form in Kennicott's great edition of the Hebrew Bible) is of very subordinate interest to the question of the age and origin of the Samaritan Pentateuch, it is yet worthy of consideration. Only it has to be remembered that where it is a question as to Hebrew grammar, or literary taste, or the spelling of words in a more or less contracted form, however interesting it may be to consider the relative æsthetic capabilities of Israelites and Jews in the age of Jeroboam and Rehoboam, it is an inquiry suitable enough for an academical thesis, but not a matter of supreme importance, and that questions of taste are proverbially incapable of being settled by disputation.

Still, there are certain points of great interest connected with it; and it has a very distinct bearing on what, when we have once recognised the antiquity of the Israelitish recension, becomes a most important question—the comparative weight to be attached to two distinct texts which were separated from each other between two and three thousand years ago.

Before entering on this inquiry, we may ask ourselves what, under such circumstances, we should expect to happen.

There is reason to think that the kingdom of Israel was not only larger and more powerful than that of Judah, but also more cultured. It is a painful but indisputable fact that high civilization and godliness are not always found united. There are sins, especially that of idolatry, that of licentiousness, and that of drunkenness, which have in the history of the world been too often combined with excessive luxury. The prophets who prophesied against Israel use language implying all these sins, and charging the people with them in very strong language. It is almost certain that they were a highly-cultured race in comparison with the people of Judah. One of their kings contrasts them as the cedar in Lebanon and the thistle—no doubt a gross exaggeration, but which implies the existence of some considerable difference of culture, as well as of strength, to give the insult any point at all.

The close of Solomon's reign and the commencement of Rehoboam's was a time of high literary development. Is it not evident that, with respect to spelling and grammatical forms, the copyists of the two nations would be likely to differ? Those of Judah would be conservative, those of Israel progressive. The Israelitish copyists would certainly correct or modernize archaic forms. If there were, as there are in the Pentateuch, certain forms of speech peculiar to the Pentateuch, and wanting in accurate discrimination, the scribes of that age in the more literary nation would be sure to correct them according to what was then modern usage. So they would solecisms, the omission of words which the sense required, incomplete forms, and a variety of such faults—as they would reckon them—in the manuscripts or fashions of writing of a former age. Even in our own printed Bibles we can find such alterations in the course of two hundred years. I have before me a Bible printed by John Field, "printer to the universitie" of Cambridge, 1668. In the first chapter of Genesis, I find "yeelding" for "yielding," "kinde" for "kind," and "cattel" for "cattle." Our modern printers, rightly or wrongly, prefer "yielding," "kind," "cattle." If in Gesenius' classification we should meet with such differences, we shall know how to understand them.

The Israelitish Pentateuch became that of the Samaritans. There are a few—very few—texts which the controversialists on either side could quote as bearing on their differences. We ought not to be surprised if we should discover that these texts had been tampered with on one side or the other.

And we should also expect that the Samaritan Pentateuch would not be praised by Jewish Rabbis of the Masoretic school.[1]

[1] See Kohn, "Pent. Sam.," p. 4.

Gesenius thinks their abuse of it strong evidence against it. It is more reasonable to think that if it had been as worthless as they affected to consider it, they would have let alone a few copies in the hands of a small number of poor families, and manuscripts at Nablous which no one who is not a Samaritan is now allowed to examine. Their violence shows what vitality there is in the Codex, and suggests the probability that in the long period, which hardly closed before A.D. 1000, during which the Masorites had the Pentateuch, like the rest of the Old Testament, in their hands for revision and punctuation, and compelled all Jews, under the penalty of excommunication, to adopt their revision,[1] the few words which bore on the controversy between the Jews and the Samaritans, as well as a good many words in other parts of the Bible which bore on the controversy between Jews and Christians, underwent correction at their hands. When we look at the texts we shall see reason to agree with Kennicott that in these passages the readings in the Samaritan Pentateuch were probably those which they received from the Ten Tribes, and those in the Jewish Pentateuch alterations subsequently made by the Jews.

The first and most obvious difference is, as already stated, in the character in which the two recensions are written. The ancient Hebrew character is known not to have been that square writing to which we give the name. Not only up to, but long after the Exile, this ancient character was used, and the other, unlike as it is, having been formed gradually from it, was not in existence. It was almost, not quite, identical with the old Phœnician and Moabite alphabet, as found on the Moabite stone. We have proof of this in ancient monuments of the eighth or seventh centuries before Christ, on coins of the Asmonæan dynasty, and of the time of the war between the Jews and the Romans.[2] The Samaritan character closely resembles this ancient Hebrew in its earlier development, before it began in the reign of Hyrcanus II. to change so much. As on the Moabite stone, every single word in the Samaritan is separated from that which follows it by a dot. The critics following Gesenius suppose, but apparently without any evidence, that in those early ages there was also continuous writing, without dots or spaces between the words; but that the other method of writing, still used by the Samaritans, existed in the earlier antiquity was well known before, and is now confirmed beyond a doubt by the Moabite stone.[3]

---

[1] Kennicott, "Dis. Gen.," p. 19.
[2] Herzog, B. ii., 382.
[3] "Moabite Stone," W. Pakenham Walsh, p. 29.

It must always be remembered that in these manuscripts of the Pentateuch in the ancient Hebrew character, the corresponding letters in the modern Hebrew and Samaritan alphabets are employed, but in the powers which they possess in the Hebrew, not in the Samaritan, language. They could not have been originally written for the use of Samaritans, as, if read by them as they read their own language, they would not at all express the Hebrew sounds. Since the originals, of which those in the hands of European scholars are copies, were written, the Samaritan language must have been formed. The pronunciation of the letters used in the Samaritan Codex is of necessity quite different from that of the same letters used in the Samaritan translation; unless we were to assume that the Masorites entirely failed to give anything at all resembling the traditional sound of the Hebrew words—a very improbable supposition.

The square character did not exist in the time of Hyrcanus II., 70 B.C.[1] The Pentateuch is held to have been the first part of the Bible translated into Greek, nearly three hundred years before Christ. At this time there must have been two recensions, both in some form of the Old Hebrew character. We know that the ancient Samaritan manuscripts, as seen by Origen and Jerome, were in the Old Hebrew character. The copies we possess resemble it; but, as they are in the character used by the Samaritans now, it is impossible to be sure that the copyists may not have modernized them. It is remarkable enough that the present Samaritan should be so like that found on the Moabite stone, and on other ancient monuments and coins. The contrast between the fate of that branch of the Old Hebrew alphabet which developed into the square character, and that which has continued so persistently in the Samaritan, is very striking. But it cannot be told with which of the Old Hebrew alphabets the Samaritan is most closely connected, whether with that of the Moabite stone or that of the Siloam inscription, or whether it is distinct from any of them, till the most ancient manuscripts have been examined. Nor can we be sure that the Hebrew writing in the two kingdoms was absolutely identical.

Between the Jewish and Samaritan Codices there are a thousand variations. The greater part of these variations would have been objectless where the language was not that of the people. Many of them it is inconceivable that any body of learned men like the Masorites would have intro-

[1] From a comparative view of successive alphabets, which I have seen in the British Museum, it is clear that the square character was developed out of the old Hebrew character, and did not make its appearance long before, if at all before, the Christian era.

duced. Philologists may like solecisms, ungrammatical phrases, false concords, unusual words, when they find them in ancient writings, and count it bad taste to correct them; but they do not introduce them. Their existence in one recension and not in the other proves the greater antiquity of the former, but proves also that both were written while the language was in familiar use, and undergoing change.

In examining Gesenius' classification of variants, we must bear in mind that whatever else it may have settled, it did not, by the confession of his followers, and his own virtual admission, settle anything as to the origin and age of the Samaritan recension. And, as will appear in most of these cases, the variants are just what we might have expected to be the result of its being in the hands of the Israelitish, as distinguished from the Jewish, at a period of literary activity like that at the close of Solomon's reign. He divides the variants into eight classes.

I. Emendations attempted of a grammatical nature.

Several sub-classes of these he mentions: the supplying the quiescent letters which are known as "Ehevi"; the substitution of more ordinary for less ordinary forms of the pronouns; the completion of apparently incomplete forms in the flexion of the verbs, such as altering the apocopated, or short, future, into the regular future; the omission of certain letters, *Nun* and *Yod*, at the end of nouns, which have no signification, and may be paralleled by the change of "leaden" into "lead," or of "olden" into "old"; the alteration of such an expression as "The waters returned to go and to return" (Gen. viii. 2) into "The waters returned, they went and they returned," either phrase meaning "The waters returned continually," and expressing it equally well, but the latter sounding "quaint" in the ears of Gesenius; more common words substituted for obsolete ones; and gender in various ways made apparent in words and flexions where there is no distinction of gender in the Jewish manuscripts.

All these changes are in reality in exact accordance with what we have seen would probably happen with copies taken in the most cultured of the two nations at the time of their separation. The copyists, proud of their superior grammatical knowledge, would, whether in good taste or bad taste, make just such alterations. They would replace archaic forms by others more modern, fill up incomplete sentences, reject useless appendages, substitute more usual for less usual words, and generally modernize.

One of these sets of variants has to do with gender. Gesenius mentions some words which the Samaritan manu-

scripts make masculine and some which they make feminine, which in the Jewish manuscripts are the reverse or common. Of these one is the word for "young man" (נער), which in the Jewish Pentateuch stands equally for "damsel" in every passage but one where the word "damsel" occurs; while in all the other books of the Old Testament there is always the feminine termination *He* (ה) to distinguish "damsel" from "young man." The letter *He* (ה) is always added, everywhere when the word means damsel, except in the Pentateuch, where the distinctive feminine termination only occurs in one single text. The Masorites, by an arrangement of vowels and by means of the text or marginal reading, made the distinction apparent in sound; but, except in one text, the archaic form of the word is universal in the Pentateuch, and is found nowhere else. One of the complaints made by Gesenius and Kohn against the Samaritan Codex is that, in this respect, the form has been assimilated to the rest of the Old Testament, and the distinction recognised between a young man and a damsel. Gesenius refers to other cases in which the gender is not so clearly marked in the Jewish Pentateuch as in other books, but has been corrected, in bad taste as he thinks (and as no doubt every archæologist of the nineteenth century would think), in the Samaritan. There is no distinction in the Jewish Codex of the Pentateuch, in the majority of cases, between "he" and "she." The Masorites here, also, have made the sound different for "she," but the consonants are the same for both. This change respecting gender was introduced into the language before the Book of Joshua was written, and was, naturally, followed by the scribes in Jeroboam's day.

But how do the critics, who for a Pentateuch substitute a Hexateuch, and place the writing of it in different ages, part in the time of the Judges, or of the later Israelitish Kings, part in the time of Josiah, part in or after the Exile, account for the fact that in all these parts, in what they call "J. E.," or "the Jehovist," in Deuteronomy, and in what they denominate the "Priests' Code," there is this remarkable difference from all the other books which they make contemporaneous with them? How do they explain what, for the purpose of discrediting the Samaritan Codex, Gesenius notes, that this imperfection, this want of development of the idea of gender, this using the same word for young man and young woman, this identification of "he" and "she," should be so common throughout the Pentateuch and nowhere else? They speak sometimes, though as if they were treading on ice, of differences of style between "J. and E.," "J. E.," "the Deuteronomist," and the "Priests' Code." Will they produce one single grammatical distinction characteristic of any of those parts into which they

have divided the Pentateuch, to compare with these grammatical distinctions respecting gender between the whole Pentateuch and every other book from Joshua to Malachi? They have not done so yet.

The distinction in this respect between the Jewish Pentateuch and the rest of the Old Testament Scriptures, and also that between the Jewish and Samaritan Pentateuchs, is explained at once when the Pentateuch is admitted to have been written long before any of the other books, and revised by Israelitish scribes after the division of the kingdom five hundred years later. It shows that the transcribers of the Israelitish manuscripts were less conservative than those of the Jewish manuscripts, and than the Samaritans were when it came into their hands. But the preservation of archaic forms not to be found elsewhere in Scripture, in the Jewish manuscripts of the Pentateuch up to the present day, if it proves, as it does prove, for which reason it is noticed by Gesenius, the priority of the Jewish Codex to the Samaritan, is, at the same time, the most conclusive grammatical proof possible of the antiquity and unity of the Five Books of Moses.

II. Gesenius' second class of variations consists of glosses and interpretations received into the text. As, for instance, Gen. vii. 2, 9, where the words in the Jewish manuscripts are "man and his wife," while in the Samaritan manuscripts they are, as in our translation, and also in the Septuagint, "male and female." Nothing is in itself more probable than that at the separation of the kingdoms, as at the time of the translation of the Septuagint and of our own English translation, the idiom had changed. In fact, as in many of these cases the Septuagint agrees with the so-called Samaritan, there is absolutely no difficulty in the matter, and when it is said that there are such variants, all is said that need be said. There is no doubt that Gesenius is right in considering the variation just mentioned as a proof of the greater antiquity of the Jewish than that of the Samaritan Codex. The idiom in the Jewish Codex is that used when the Pentateuch was written; that in the Samaritan Codex is that which was used when it passed under the review of Israelitish transcribers in Jeroboam's day, five hundred years later.

III. "Conjectural emendations, sometimes far from happy, of real or imaginary difficulties in the Masoretic text." One of these is quoted in Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible" thus: "Genesis xxiv. 62, בא מבוא, he came from going (A.V., 'from the way') to the well of Lahai-roy, the Samaritan alters into 'in or through the desert' (LXX. *διὰ τῆς ἐρήμου*)." One thing is clear, either the Septuagint translators had both the Israelitish and the Jewish manuscripts before them as equal

authorities, and in this case preferred the Israelitish, or the Jewish manuscripts of three hundred years B.C. did not coincide with the Masoretic text. It is, in this case, immaterial which alternative we take. But it is well to reflect that this alternative has to be faced in each of the thousand cases in which the Septuagint agrees with the Samaritan against the Jewish text. There is no reason for always choosing the same horn of the dilemma. What Gesenius classifies as a conjectural emendation may in one instance be the genuine reading of the Jewish text as it existed B.C. 300, and in another the alternative reading of the Israelitish text, possibly an emendation, whether happy or not, in the days of Jeroboam, or possibly a mere mistake of the Samaritan copyists. Here, again, this whole class of variants is perfectly explained when the fact is recognised that the Samaritan text, so called, is the ancient Israelitish text.

Under this head he mentions Numbers xxiv. 17, where, in the Jewish Codex, there is the difficult word קרקר, which is translated "destroy" in our version and taken in the same sense in the Septuagint. For קרקר the Samaritan reads קדקד, which he calls an easier reading, but rejects. The sense of the Samaritan reading he gives thus: shall smite "the corners of Moab and the crown of the head of all the fierce."[1]

Though he rejects it, he says it has a great support in the parallel passage, Jeremiah xlviii. 45, where the prophet, commenting, as it were, on Balaam's prophecy, writes קדמד for קרקר. It is no doubt true that the emendations made in the Samaritan Pentateuch are not always happy; but it is still more true, as I hope to show further on, that they are not always the reverse, but sometimes very valuable corrections of the Masoretic text.

IV. Readings corrected or supplied from parallel passages. Of these Gesenius gives very few examples. One of them is Genesis i. 14, where he says that the words "to give light upon the earth" are inserted from verse 17. It is so also both in the Septuagint and the Syriac. He mentions, also, the phrase which occurs so frequently in the genealogies of the post-diluvian patriarchs in the Samaritan text, "and he died," which he considers as taken from the corresponding passages in the genealogies of the antediluvian patriarchs. There can be no doubt that the different copyists left it out of the one codex or inserted it in the other. Copyists are almost sure to make

[1] "Et (percutit) verticem omnium ferocium."

such mistakes. But, either way, what then? What does the omission or insertion prove?

V. "Whenever anything is mentioned as having been done or said previously by Moses, or when a command of God is related as being executed, the whole speech bearing upon it is repeated again at full length. These tedious, and always superfluous, repetitions are most frequent in Exodus." They are not by any means confined to Exodus. There are many instances of this peculiarity in Numbers and in Deuteronomy. But here we have a question of taste; and it is interesting to observe how different are the opinions of modern European scholars of eminence on this point. Kennicott, instead of being wearied like Gesenius by these repetitions, says that "especially in some cases we sorely miss this iteration. One speech which, in the Samaritan Codex, is found in Numb. xiii. 1, as well as in Deut. i. 20-23 (although the Hebrew text has it only in the latter place), was judged by Origen to be so necessary in the former place that he relates that he had translated it, and added it in the former place from the Hebrew Samaritan text."[1]

And with especial reference to the "tedious and superfluous repetitions" in Exodus of which Gesenius complains, Kennicott says: "But as to the Divine commands which were conveyed by Moses to Pharaoh, the Hebrew text is in great confusion, *valde turbatus est*, for it relates that Moses had received commands from God without mentioning that Moses delivered them; and, on the other hand, that Moses delivered commands to Pharaoh without its being mentioned that he had received them from God. One Divine command in Exodus xi., omitted in the present Hebrew text, so evidently ought to be inserted that the Hebrew text can hardly be explained without it."[2] In the Samaritan text the insertion begins at the close of Exod. xi. 2 with the words "and garments," which word is also in the Septuagint, and proceeds: "And I will give this people favour in the eyes of the Egyptians, and they shall borrow[3] them. And about midnight will I go out into the midst of Egypt. And all the firstborn in the land of Egypt shall die, from the firstborn of Pharaoh that sitteth upon his throne even unto the firstborn of the maid-servant that is behind the mill, and all the firstborn of beasts. And there shall be a great cry throughout all the land of Egypt, such as there was none like it, nor shall be like it any more. But against any of the children of Israel shall not a dog move his

[1] Kennicott, "Dissertatio Generales," p. 11. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 11, 12.

[3] I translate the word "borrow" in order to keep the passage in harmony with the A.V. Of course "ask," as in R.V., or "demand," is the true rendering.

tongue, against man or beast, that ye may know how that the Lord doth put a difference between the Egyptians and Israel. And the man Moses was very great in the land of Egypt and in the sight of the servants of Pharaoh, and in the sight of the people. And Moses said unto Pharaoh, Thus saith the Lord God, Israel is My firstborn, and I say to thee, Let My son go that he may serve Me, and thou refusest to let him go. Behold the Lord will slay thy son, thy firstborn." All this comes in the place of verse 3, and then follows verse 4, in which Moses repeats the prediction which God commanded him to speak to the people.

It is impossible to decide in such matters, mainly questions of taste, between Origen and Kennicott on the one hand, and Gesenius on the other. They certainly do not admit of being ruled by authority, nor do they in any way affect the question of the age and origin of the Samaritan Pentateuch, nor even the further question, for the settlement of which they are brought forward by Gesenius, of the value of the variants.[1]

VI. Emendations of passages and words of the Hebrew text which contain something objectionable in the eyes of the Samaritans on account of historical improbability, or apparent want of dignity in the terms applied to the Creator.

The most noticeable changes of this kind to which Gesenius draws attention are in the chronology of the patriarchs. There are three chronologies—the present Hebrew chronology, the Septuagint chronology, and the Samaritan. The chronology in our present Samaritan copies is not that which existed in those with which Origen was acquainted, which was much more conformable with the Septuagint.[2] It has been altered since Origen's time, and not on account of historic improbability, since as altered, whether by accident or design, it is not consistent with the history, the lives of some of the patriarchs lasting beyond the Flood. The Jewish copies have also been changed. Abul-Pharagi not only states the fact, but gives the reason. The object was to make it appear that the time had not yet arrived, in which, on the Cabbalistic interpretation of Gen. i. 1 that the world would last 7,000 years, Messiah ought to have appeared.[3] The corruption of the Hebrew text since the time of Jerome is certain, for he says that in every instance our Lord quoted from the Hebrew, and in no single case from the Greek where that differed from the Hebrew. And it is also certain that our present Samaritan

[1] Gesenius says that Houbigant refers to the example of Homer to justify in a literary point of view these repetitions. So idle are such questions about taste.

[2] Hale's "Chronology," vol. i., pp. 281, 282.

[3] *Ibid*, p. 279.

chronology differs from that in the time of Origen. It must be remembered that there is nothing in which copyists so easily make mistakes as in numbers. Of the Samaritan ages of the patriarchs, or rather of those as reckoned by the Ten Tribes, and the time of the birth of their firstborn sons, we can learn nothing accurately[1] till the ancient manuscripts at Nablous have been examined. When will some enterprising traveller induce the Samaritan priests to be as communicative of their treasures as the monks of Sinai?

Under this sixth class of objections Gesenius includes a passage which ought to have been quoted for the purpose of showing the value of the Samaritan text—Exod. xii. 40. The Jewish manuscripts read: "Now the sojourning of the children of Israel who dwelt in Egypt was four hundred and thirty years." This statement, as is well known, has created great difficulty, since St. Paul gives four hundred and thirty years (Gal. iii. 17) as the interval between the promise to Abraham and the giving of the law. But the Samaritan (supported by Sept. Codex Al.) has: "The sojourning of the children of Israel and their fathers who dwelt in the land of Canaan and in the land of Egypt was four hundred and thirty years." There is a disposition on the part of the critics to reject as an interpolation whatever helps the sense, and makes the history conformable to what we otherwise see it must have been. It is an exaggeration of a principle laid down by Griesbach, true enough in certain cases, but which, as now used, involves the absurd assumption that it is more probable that the writers of Holy Scripture—it is applied to no other writings—made mistakes than not, wrote bad grammar than not, mis-stated dates than not, and that of two readings the most palpably untrue is the most likely to be genuine.

The seventh class of variants, according to Gesenius, consists of "forms of words accommodated to the Samaritan dialect." This amounts when examined to very little. It is not words, but the forms of words, which are spoken of. These consist of changes occasionally of the silent letters of the Samaritan alphabet, the introduction into words of one of the Ehevi letters, especially of *Yod* and *Vau*, which has been already noticed under the first class, and in a few cases of their being dropped. The changes are very slight, and there does not seem any considerable difference between the first and seventh classes of the arrangement of Gesenius, or any reason why the alterations should be ascribed to assimilation to the Samaritan language when they can be so easily accounted for otherwise. But, in fact, considering that we know from the genealogies as

[1] Kennicott, "Dissertatio Generalos," p. 28.

seen by Origen, compared with those existing now, that the copies we possess have been changed from the originals, and that these copies were made by Samaritans, the wonder is that they have not been more tampered with. If, instead of the insertion or rejection of a *Jud* (Hebrew *Yod*) here, or a *Ba* (Hebrew *Vau*) there, we had found Samaritan words unknown to the Hebrew Lexicons in considerable numbers, it would not, under the circumstances, have been surprising; and as to the changes which are found, and which Gesenius considers as accommodated to Samaritan usage, he himself in the following words removes the force of any argument founded on them: "We may observe that in nothing do the manuscripts vary so much among themselves, some of them in many places retaining the pure Hebrew form where others incline to the native idiom, from which it is clear that the whole thing depends almost entirely on the pleasure of the scribes."[1]

Of course, this reduces the objection or the criticism to nothing, especially when we bear in mind that the actual manuscripts in the hands of European scholars are not only few (eighteen in all are those collated in whole or in part by Kennicott), but all of them copies by Samaritan scribes in or near the fifteenth century.

In examining this classification, I have taken it mainly from Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," but have subsequently compared it with the original work, from which, in some cases, I have quoted directly.

There remains one more class to be considered.

SAMUEL GARRATT.

ART. IV.—THE GROWTH OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.[2]

FROM time immemorial the Old Testament has been spoken of as a threefold compilation of Law, Prophets, and other Writings, a mode of regarding it which is at least as old as St. Luke's Gospel and the preface to Ecclesiasticus. It is hopeless to discover the origin of this designation, but it is also manifest that it is one which is so apparently appropriate as to be self-suggestive. For the difference between these several parts is independent of age, and is one of substantive matter. And yet, nevertheless, the difference, though marked and obvious, is not rigidly and exclusively exact, because there are portions of each section which manifest the peculiarities of the others. There are prophetical parts both of the Law

[1] Gesenius, "De Pent. Sam. Origin Indol, et Autoritate," p. 52.
[2] A paper read at the Exeter Church Congress, 1894.

and the sacred writings, and there are parts in the Prophets which are simply historical prose. That, however, which characterises all these divisions is their organic unity, which makes it impossible not to recognise them as a whole. We may speak of the Divine library of the Old Testament, and remind the English reader that the Bible of which he is so proud is nothing but *Biblia*, or a collection of books; but, for all that, the Old Testament is no less an organic whole than the Old and New Testaments are one Bible; and just as it is impossible to dissever the New Testament from the Old, or to deny its connection with it and its origin from it, so it is impossible by any process of dissection to disintegrate the Old Testament, and to resolve it into its component elements in such a way as to destroy its organic unity. The one is no less a fact than the other; and when you have broken up the several fragments and jostled them together, the skill of the operation may elicit our wonder and admiration, but it will not explain how it is that the parts are capable of forming a whole, or ever were supposed to do so. Because the fact that they can be so regarded is not due to any single writer, any more than it is to all the writers combined, but is the result solely of what they have written. The map may be dissected and broken up, but, after all, the pieces will form a map, and the map that they form is that of a well-known and recognisable country, and the form of the map was determined before it was broken up, and is not destroyed even by the process of dissection. The growth of the Old Testament, therefore, is a matter not so easy to determine as the ultimate form which that growth has assumed. The one is a matter of fact; the other—that is, the process of growth—must of necessity be largely a matter of hypothesis and conjecture.

There is a certain periodical which regales its readers by presenting them with portraits of celebrities in various stages of their existence from infancy to old age. On the supposition that the portraits so presented are facsimiles of originals taken at the time, the result is very interesting; but if the earlier ones are imaginary, the only result is that they amuse the reader, but may be very far from the truth. And certain it is that anyone who would try to depict Mr. Gladstone as he was seventy or eighty years ago without any contemporary sketch to draw from might most certainly *flatter* himself that he was illustrating the stages of his personal growth, but in all probability would do no more. Now, it stands to reason that unless we can come to some agreement as to the age of the several portions of the Old Testament, any investigations into the process and periods of its growth must be conjectural and delusive; and therefore it seems to me a safer plan to

indicate those points in the composition and growth of the Old Testament which we may be more or less certain in estimating, and in which age is not so much the determining element as is the substantive message and matter of the book or books.

Perhaps that part of the Old Testament about which there is least room for difference of opinion is that of the three Prophets, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. The integrity, indeed, of Zechariah may be open to question, but all three Prophets flourished, and are known to have done so, in the century or century and a half after 520 B.C. So far, therefore, we have solid ground to stand upon. What, then, is the testimony of these Prophets of the fifth and sixth century B.C. to the religious standard of their time? What was the spiritual growth of the Old Testament when they lived? Haggai bears unmistakable witness to the prescriptions of the Levitical code and to the office of the priests in applying them. Zechariah bears witness to the indignation of the Lord against Jerusalem for threescore and ten years; he speaks of it as a well-known fact. He says also: "The Lord shall yet comfort Zion, and shall yet choose Jerusalem"; that "the Lord shall dwell in the midst of Zion," and that "many nations shall be joined unto the Lord"; and he speaks of the coming of "the branch." All this is in the undoubted part of the Prophet's writings. Malachi bears witness to the observance of the Levitical law; he speaks of the covenant with Levi, and says that the Lord hateth divorce. He charges the people to observe the law of Moses in terms which imply that the fifth book of the law was regarded as by him, and he ends with the promise of the return of Elijah.

This, therefore, is a fair specimen of the growth which the Old Testament had attained when the last of the Prophets closed his mission. What, then, does this presuppose? It presupposes the existence of the Books of Kings, without which we should know nothing of Elijah, and the promise of his return implies something mysterious about his departure. The Temple worship, according to the prescriptions of Leviticus, which were undoubtedly in vogue, is presupposed. The mention of "the branch" by Zechariah recalls an earlier promise of Jeremiah, as that does the knowledge of hopes connected with the line of David, notwithstanding the failing condition of his throne. These three Prophets, moreover, are unintelligible without the presence of that in the national consciousness which implies familiarity with very special treatment on the part of God, and a very deep conviction of a national destiny. The writings of the post-Captivity Prophets would have been unmeaning and impossible had there not been

a corresponding preparative literature going before them, and a history analogous to the literature and capable of producing it. For instance, there had been a national calamity known as the Exile in Babylon, and, for some reason or other, it was regarded as enduring for seventy years, and was so spoken of by Jeremiah at its commencement, as well as by Zechariah at its close. It is certain, however, that Jeremiah was not the first of the Prophets, and that in this respect he merely followed in the wake of Micah, who said that "Zion should be ploughed as a field and Jerusalem become heaps"; and of Isaiah, who told Hezekiah that his treasures should be carried to Babylon, and his sons be eunuchs in the king's palace there. Isaiah also had certainly been preceded by Amos and Hosea, and possibly also by Joel. Hosea, however, is so full of allusions to the earlier history, and manifests so deep an acquaintance with the earlier national literature, that he must have had it in his possession, or must have been instrumental in producing it, which latter is a preposterous supposition. Hosea, also, is pervaded with one overpowering conviction—that, namely, of Israel's conjugal unfaithfulness—which implies not only his belief in the existence and reality of a relation between the people and the Lord, for the earliest intimation of which we must go back to the time and language of the Second Commandment, but also a knowledge on the part of the people that this conception was not the creation of the Prophet, but was based on facts of which their national history was the witness.

We may readily grant that the age of the several books recording these facts is uncertain and cannot be determined, and consequently the tracing of the process of growth must be more or less conjectural; but the point is, that here are the several books, and this is their relation to one another. The Chronicles may have been compiled in the third century—I do not say they were, but it is certain that they appeal to numerous authorities and throw much light on the national history. We may reject their statements or not, as we please, in certain details, but the broad features of the history, confirmed as they are by those of Kings, which must have been written at least two centuries earlier, are indelible and unalterable, and they are such as to form a running commentary on the works of the Prophets, though it is as manifestly improbable that they were written for that purpose as it is that the Prophets wrote to illustrate the record of the history. This is a mark of the organic unity to which I have referred.

Now, the growth of the Old Testament, in the present state of popular opinion, is a matter on which we must speak with great reserve, and until we are more agreed about it we cannot

with any certainty trace the process of growth; but the growth of a tree—that is to say, its present condition of shape, beauty, and magnitude—is something altogether different from the process by which it grew, and the several stages of its growth. But the growth of the Old Testament is like that of a tree—we can take note of its present condition, but the reconstruction of it at the various stages of its growth is a matter of pure conjecture, more especially when some call the bulk of the Psalms Davidic, and others Maccabean; when some regard the Pentateuch as the work of Moses and others as largely the work of Ezra; and others, again, in defiance alike of tradition and dramatic propriety, will have no Pentateuch at all, but only a nondescript and amorphous Hexateuch. The growth of the Old Testament is not like that of an architectural edifice, where the several stages are clearly marked by recognised and well-known distinctions of style, and where the unity of the original design is checked and modified by successive builders, and the final result is something very different from the original conception; but it much more resembles the natural growth of a tree, where, notwithstanding the essential diversity of stem, and branch, and leaf, and flower, and fruit, there is manifest one definite purpose from the beginning, and one and the same living impulse at work throughout, till the result is what we see in the full-grown tree. And it is an obvious fact that in the Old Testament, prophet, psalmist, and historian alike bear witness to a common national history and a common national faith—to a common relation to God—to common hopes and aspirations, and the uniform consciousness of failure and inability to realise them. And, apart altogether from our being able to fix the date of these various compositions, this is the definite and distinct message which they bear.

Let the Books of Moses be written when they may, it is undeniable that all the writers of the Old Testament are, so to say, pervaded with the consciousness of the law of God. The possession and knowledge of this law has made them what they are, and has differentiated them from all other writers. Even if it could be proved, which is the *ne plus ultra* of hypothesis, that the Exodus was mythical, certain it is that prophet, psalmist, and historian are possessed, as it were, with the personal memory of it. The recollection of bondage in Egypt, and the memory of deliverance therefrom, is engraven in the national consciousness and expressed in the national literature, and the effects of it, we may say, are stamped on the national character. The various writings are manifestly the production of various ages. It is not the process of growing that we can detect, but only the mature result in the thing

grown. All the writers are animated by one spirit, possessed by one conviction, inspired by one hope. The spirit is one which works from within outwards, and therefore exhibits itself in various forms; the conviction is the special relation in which God stands to Israel in consequence of His special election of the Fathers, as witnessed by a long series of events, and the hope is the inextinguishable hope of a glorious future in store for the nation. Unless these features can be obliterated from the Old Testament, it will ever remain what it is—a combined literature and history, replete with promises and aspirations, in themselves inexplicable, which no process of dissection or disintegration will destroy or explain, any more than it will reveal the principle of their growth. For even if we could arrive at any satisfactory conclusion *how* they were formed, we should still have to determine *why* they were thus formed. And this is the problem.

I may conclude with certain principles that seem to me to be valid and sound. There are certain known post-Captivity writings, such as Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther and Chronicles, which stand out in marked distinction from the others. We may certainly claim an earlier date for all the other books, except possibly some few of the Psalms. Amos and Hosea are manifestly writers of the eighth century B.C. From the evidence of their works we may reasonably infer that much of the early history had been recorded, and presumably in the form in which it has come down to us. Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel speak for themselves as to date, except so far as the traditional death of Isaiah is adopted as the model for the treatment of his writings, and these writers all presuppose a knowledge of the early history for which they are presumably indebted to the same sources as ourselves.

I do not touch on the vexed question of the Pentateuch, firmly as I am convinced and strongly as I feel about it; but this we may say, that unless the Fourth Commandment has been greatly altered both in Deuteronomy and Exodus, and unless it was not originally included in the Decalogue, either of which conditions is absurd, we may be certain that the first chapter of Genesis was in existence when it was given, and to whom may it be so reasonably referred as to "that shepherd who first taught the chosen seed—In the beginning, how the heavens and earth rose out of chaos"? and if the first chapter, who shall say how many more? And, lastly, to whom can we so reasonably look as to the chief actor in the Exodus for our knowledge of the incidents of that deliverance, and for those of the wanderings, continually as their minute accuracy is being revealed by the course of modern discovery; while for

the bulk of the national history, its graphic and life-like character points very clearly to the contemporaneous sources for the narrative. More than this we cannot certainly discover, but must rely only on hypothesis and conjecture, which, however fascinating and seductive, we are forbidden to mistake for science or the foundations thereof.

As to this, at least, we may be certain and sure, that the Old Testament existed before the New, and that whatever the unknown secret of its growth, it possessed sufficient vitality to prove the germ out of which sprang the New Testament, with its yet more glorious, luxuriant, and beneficent growth of foliage, flower, and fruit.

STANLEY LEATHES, D.D.

ART. V.—EVOLUTION AND THE DIVINE FATHERHOOD.

PART II.

IT will be in the mind of those who may have perused the preceding pages that we considered such hypotheses, with respect to the introduction of the Divine Fatherhood into the normal course of evolutionary development, as seemed to exhaust the possibilities of the case. The conclusion at which we seemed to arrive by a process of logical reasoning was that none of these hypotheses would bear examination; that they carried on their surface their own confutation. One last desperate resource remained, in the assumption that the Divine Parentage belongs not so much to the race as to the individual; that in each human birth a fresh miracle occurs, and a distinct Divine intervention constitutes the new-born infant directly a child of God. I endeavoured to show that such a hypothesis is wholly out of harmony with the first principles of evolutionary science, and that our Author, if he accepted it, would be involved in this curious inconsistency, that while inveighing against a theological habit of rejoicing in "gaps," he himself would be under the necessity of postulating a "gap" in the history of each individual man as the very condition of his being a *real man*. It is needless to point out that such a postulation would be equivalent to an abandonment of the theory of evolution, and a reversion to the discarded theory of a direct creative act as originating the human species. Nay, more wonderful still, it would involve such a creative act as necessary, not for the production of the species, but of each individual contained within it. This is surely to be

prodigal of the supernatural, and prolific in the gratuitous multiplication of "gaps"! Even a credulous Orthodoxy might well stand aghast at such an unlimited supply of miracles.

But can the theologian accept such a theory, even if the evolutionist has his predilections sufficiently under control to enable him to do so? Does every human spirit come forth fresh from the very Being of God, untainted with impurity, and unbiased by hereditary tendencies in the wrong direction? We of the Church of England do not profess to think so. Does anyone think so? This daily, hourly miracle always occurring, involves too much. The phenomena of the case do not permit our credulity to accept it. That a child of God, *by remote descent*, may become so degraded, as the result of the folly and sin both of himself and his progenitors, that the Divine in him should scarcely be discernible, mastered and obscured as it is by the grossest animalism, is a thing that we can understand. But to expect us to believe that a pure spirit, fresh from the very heart of God, should promptly accommodate itself to the moral condition of a root-eating savage in Southern Africa or of one of Stanley's forest dwarfs —this is asking more of us than common-sense will warrant us in conceding. It cannot be!

I make no apology for having thus condescended to details and attempted to criticise the only hypotheses which seem to me capable of presenting themselves to our minds as a solution of this problem. I can indeed believe that some will be disposed to reply: "I have no hypothesis. I don't profess even to guess how it may have come about; I am content to know that Nature teaches me Evolution, while Revelation teaches me the Divine Fatherhood." But surely this is neither faith nor science. If I am a man of science, I am bound to ask, How can these things be? If I am a man of faith I am bound to have some idea how my faith can be harmonized with fact, otherwise my faith becomes superstition. To believe two apparently inconsistent propositions, without making any attempt to reconcile them, is to be guilty either of indolence or cowardice.

It seems difficult to believe that we can be asked to accept any of the hypotheses that we have discussed in the name of science. And, indeed, we are not. Science, and particularly evolutionary science, as such, knows nothing of the Divine Fatherhood, nor seeks to know. Those whose lead we follow in these speculations as to the origin of our race are not even sure that God is, much less can they affirm or even admit the existence of a paternal relation on His side towards the human race. And it is evident that Professor Drummond recognises no such factor in the production of man as he is. If such a

stupendous spiritual change as we have been attempting to contemplate had at any time happened in the course of human history, its moral consequences must have been of the most definite character. Instead of a doctrine of the "fall" of man, we should have to believe in a doctrine of the "rise," or shall we say, using the Professor's chosen word in a somewhat different sense from that in which he employs it, an "Ascent of Man"? We might, perhaps, be reminded of a familiar proverb about certain objects that "go up like a rocket and come down like a stick!" for this splendid and supernatural uprising of a favoured tribe of simians has been followed by a very disappointing sequel; but, at any rate, there would be no need to seek about for explanations of the dawn of moral ideas in the evolutionary experiences of the race. The Divine seed would at least carry so much of the Divine character with it as to create a conscience and impose a sense of moral obligation.

But here again we find no trace of any such theory in these charming pages. Instead of anything of the kind, we have a most eloquent tribute to "motherhood" as the parent, not only of our race, but of that "altruism" which, more than anything else, tends to lift our brutality towards the Divine. A mother's instinctive love towards her progeny, faithful even unto death, is the most impressive illustration of those forces provided by Nature for inducing that "struggle for the life of others" which, along with "the struggle for existence," is joint factor in that evolutionary process which has made the human race what it is. That "love" which "is the fulfilling of the law," and, therefore, which carries all morality in its own pure breast, finds its genesis, according to our author's teaching, not in any sudden introduction of a Divine element into our nature, but in the evolution of the mammalian form of animal life, and the consequent development of a mighty instinct of affection, upon which the preservation of the helpless young, and thus the maintenance of the particular species, may be said to depend. There is no "gap" to be bridged by a Divine intervention in the Professor's system between the primeval simian, totally innocent of a single moral idea, and the most consummate of moral philosophers. The distance between an Aristotle and an ape is not greater, probably, than the distance between the ape and protoplasm; evolution has carried us over the one interval, why should she not also have spanned the other? If our intellectual capacity and our moral consciousness can be thus explained, surely it is not necessary to introduce a miracle so vast in order to account for our religious convictions. These, too, may easily enough be accounted for by the operation of the same great force that

has called into existence both intelligence and morality. That man should be a religious, as well as a moral and intelligent animal, is not the least surprising, nor is it necessary to found on that very explicable fact the conclusion that, in some way, in which other animals are not, he is of Divine descent.

Professor Drummond does not enter into the great subject of the evolution of religion, yet he is so consistent an evolutionist that it can scarcely be questionable whether or not he is prepared to follow his principles on this higher plane. But in a very remarkable passage at the close of his volume he gives no uncertain sound as to his conviction with respect to the actual relation of Evolution to Christianity. "Up to this time," he says, "no word has been spoken to reconcile Evolution with Christianity or Christianity with Evolution. And why? Because the two are one. What is Evolution? A method of creation. What is its object? To make more perfect living beings. What is Christianity? A method of creation. What is its object? To make more perfect human beings." This has an uncomfortable air of "undistributed middle" about it, which is scarcely relieved by the reference to love as the great operative force in both Christianity and Evolution which immediately follows. To many of us the connection between Evolution and Christianity lies in the suggestion of a sharp contrast rather than of a hidden identity.

To many of us it seems that the Great Incarnate, bridging the "gap"—or, shall we prefer to say, spanning the *chasm?*—between the spiritual and the material, between heaven in its purity and earth in its sin, between the Divine and the human, came to assure us that we are not orphans, even if we are prodigals. We have a Father and a home, however far we may have wandered. He came, as it seems to many of us, to restore a life that had been forfeited, but to restore it to those who were capable of receiving it, only because of a certain native and essential congruity between themselves and the Life-giver. "Whose is this image and superscription? . . . Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's!"

Christianity seems to us to reply: It bears the primal stamp of the Divine! It has been rudely handled, and the wear and tear of life's friction have done much to obliterate what God hath stamped upon it, and the pitiless powers of hell have exhausted all their malignant skill in the endeavour to obliterate that which the finger of God has traced. But it is with such coins, none the less, that the heavenly treasury is to be filled; and the great Champion of humanity has undertaken to stamp afresh upon the marred face the glory of that image of the Divine which He has in Himself exhibited. It

is of God; "we are all His offspring." "Render unto God the things that are God's."

Not such, as it seems to some of us, is the answer of Evolution. Whose is this image? we ask; and the reply comes: If we are to be guided by genealogical considerations, it is the image of an anthropoid ape. In the long course of his historical development all has gone on with regularity and smoothness. There have been no "gaps," and no need for the postulating a Divine generation in order to fill them up. He is of the earth earthy; he belongs to the Cæsar of universal law. Render to the inexorable order of Nature that which belongs to Nature; let Cæsar have his due!

> "Thou makest thine appeal to me:
> I bring to life, I bring to death:
> The spirit does but mean the breath:
> I know no more." And he, shall he,—
>
> Man, her last work, who seem'd so fair,
> Such splendid purpose in his eyes,
> Who roll'd the psalm to wintry skies,
> And built him fanes of fruitless prayer,
>
> Who trusted God was love indeed,
> And love creation's final law,—
> Though Nature, red in tooth and claw
> With ravine, shriek'd against his creed,—
>
> Who loved, who suffered countless ills,
> Who battled for the true, the just,—
> Be blown about the desert dust,
> Or seal'd within the iron hills?

Our author would demur to this, and stoutly deny that this is the answer that Evolution gives to the question. He would probably retort: "*Are* God and Nature then at strife?" Is Nature anything else than a name that we give to the Divine method of procedure? To this we entirely consent, provided that the definite give place to the indefinite article. The ordinary course of Nature is *a* Divine method of procedure, but, we submit, *not for the production of the Divine.* To affirm this would surely be to deny that there is a difference in kind between the animal and the Divine. It is to affirm that as the human has been evolved out of the animal, so the Divine may ultimately be evolved out of the human, and God be created by the mechanism that He has set in motion.

And if Evolution cannot produce the Divine, and develop a mere animal into a son of God, neither can it, as a system, take any cognisance of the Divine when it has, by a direct intervention, produced itself. It can breathe no whisper of hope, based upon a primal relationship between man and God; for it knows of no such relationship. And therefore it has in

itself no presage of the eternal. You cannot evolve eternity out of time, any more than you can evolve the Divine out of the human; and therefore I must confess my inability to follow our author in one of his most eloquent and characteristic passages: "Evolution has ushered a new hope into the world. The supreme message of science to this age is, that all Nature is on the side of the man who tries to rise. Evolution, development, progress, are not only on her programme—these *are* her programme. For all things are rising, all worlds, all planets, all stars, all suns. An ascending energy is in the universe, and the whole moves on with one mighty idea and anticipation. The aspiration in the human mind and heart is but the evolutionary tendency of the universe becoming conscious."

Are these things so? Are all planets rising? What about our own fair satellite? She floats in the air a poor burnt-out cinder; does she suggest to the scientific mind no mournful presage of what this world of ours is one day to be?

Suns are probably cooling down, and new suns are being kindled out of the collision of wandering stars, that once may have been as full of promise as is this world of ours. Upon our own planet "a thousand types are gone," grander, some of them, in form, and huger in size, and mightier in strength than any of its present puny inhabitants. The mastodon and the megatherium have vanished; the bison has almost followed suit; and the stately giraffe, the exquisite zebra, and the gigantic elephant are doomed. Probably they are entering on the last century of their lease of life. "Change and decay in all around I see," and, if Evolution is my only teacher, I may well ask: "To what purpose is this waste?"

Of course, Professor Drummond, whose Christian faith and character must command the most sincere respect of all that know him, feels the difficulty that we have propounded all the less, because his belief in the regenerating power of Divine grace is so strong. I have no wish to challenge his consistency here, or to ask whether he does not recognise, at this point at any rate, a "gap" which calls for a special Divine interposition. A Christian, like a poet, is born rather than made, though, also, like a poet, he may become a very much better and completer Christian by a process of self-culture. But, because we are wholly at one with our author here, we cannot shut our eyes to the gravity of the issue, if the inexorable demands of scientific truth constrain us to abandon all belief in the universal Fatherhood of God. Let me state the case as it presents itself to me.

I find myself in the world, the product of forces regulated by law. These forces and laws are ordained of God, and yet

they are distinct from God, as a machine is distinct from the mechanician who contrived it, though it may reflect his idea.

God is not my Father, though indirectly He may have made me, by setting to work the machinery by which I have been manufactured. God is not my Father, for I am lineally descended from one of the lower animals; and of that animal God was not the Father. Nor has there been any break in the long history of my evolution, at which a Divine intervention could have taken place, that should have constituted me a son of God. I am worse than an orphan, for I disown my brute parent, and I cannot claim a Divine. I am altogether accounted for; my intellectual and moral nature, as well as my physical constitution; magnificent possibilities are no longer concealed under the mystery of my being; there is no longer any greater mystery hanging around me than hangs around my dog; the wish of "the Preacher" has at any rate been fulfilled in me—his humiliating wish—that the sons of men "might see themselves that they are beasts." God is not my Father, and I am not His child; therefore sin loses what, in my more ignorant days, I thought gave it its exceeding sinfulness. I am not much concerned about the machinery by which I was produced, nor do I feel any personal relation with the "Architect of the Universe," who devised and set it in motion. God is not my Father, and therefore I owe Him no love, nor can I blame myself for being unlike Him. What can He expect from the descendant of an ape? And this shows me that all the tall talk about the brotherhood of man is sentimental rubbish. Was there any brotherhood between our simian ancestors? The brotherhood of man is a corollary from the Fatherhood of God, and both must be swept away together as the baseless fabric of a poetical fancy. God is not my Father, and, therefore, for me, at any rate, the fantastic dream of immortality is a mere delusion. At what point, I pray you, in my evolution did I become possessed, in the person of my nondescript ancestor, of an "immortal spirit"? Was this, too, evolved? What! the infinite evolved from the finite? And, if my favoured ancestor, of about a million generations ago, was singled out by Heaven to be thus endowed, what happened when he and his sons insisted on forming matrimonial alliances for a dozen generations with those who, while their peers in other respects, had no pretension to the possessing of this gift? What can I hope of such a diluted and attenuated immortality? You blame me for my earthliness, you quote John Bunyan's parable of the muck-rake, but I have no connection nor affinity with anything but earth. If God were my Father, your reproach might be called for; surely I now have a stronger claim on your compassion.

You bid me use my will. I really am not sure that I have one! What seems will in animals is only automatic action under the inflexible compulsion of necessity—could moral freedom be evolved from this? You warn me of terrors in the future, but I cannot see that I have anything to do with the future. I know nothing of that River Ocean that girds this world around. If indeed such there be, and I have to launch forth upon its dark waters, my chances of shipwreck will be no better, no worse, than those of my fellow-voyagers.

"Nunc vino pellite curas
Cras ingens iterabimus æquor!"

The picture is a ghastly one, but that does not prove that the scientific theory is wrong. If Evolution be the true story of the world, I fail to see in what particulars this is other than the true story of the human heart. If, on the other hand, both Reason and Revelation constrain us to assign a Divine fatherhood to the human race, I equally fail to see how, while we affirm it, we can entertain anything beyond a very modified and restricted theory of evolution—such a theory, indeed, as I have not yet seen presented.

W. Hay M. H. Aitken.

Art. VI.—A LITERARY SERVANT OF THE CHURCH.

THE SOCIETY OF BARUCH.—AN EXPLANATION.

WHEN, in the August number of the Churchman, 1893, a short article appeared advocating the formation of a society of laymen who would develop the journalistic and literary work of the Church, a certain amount of criticism arose. This criticism I do not propose to answer, but desire to elaborate the argument for the existence of some such society as that of Baruch. To take the scheme clause by clause as sketched in that number would prove tedious, so the following explanation is confined to those sections quoted below:

"(*b*) To consider it a mission to correct by letter to the editor or otherwise any mistakes as to the history, resources, and aims of the Church of England that may appear in any printed publication.

"(*c*) To make a duty of supplying the local press with reports of meetings and news notes referring to Church work.

"(*g*) If there be any ancient or specially beautiful church within easy reach of the layman's abode, he is to interest himself in it, to learn its history, and to bring its monuments and

beauties before popular notice, and, where possible, to write about the edifice, and to offer himself as a guide to visitors and tourists.

"(*k*) To stimulate the study of English literature, shorthand, and rhetoric, among Sunday-school teachers and temperance workers, in order to add to the sources of information upon which these workers feed."

The organization which is to unite those who desire to carry out the spirit of these clauses is to be essentially practical and businesslike, and not speculative or theoretical. Hence it follows that arguments advanced in its favour should be of the same nature, and, where convenient, should be drawn from experience.

Errors in the Press.—Those of us who regularly read papers circulating among Radical working-men, Nonconformists, Secularists, and Romanists, have been unable to resist the impression that there is a peculiar readiness on the part of the editors to accept any available material reflecting upon the ministers and supporters of the English Church. Occasionally these paragraphs are nailed, and the unwarranted insinuation robbed of its force. As a rule, however, the Church loses by default. Such papers have dished-up any utterance, passage from a book, or incident of whatever nature which will discredit the Church. But where one case is taken up, twenty sow seeds of prejudice.

The Society of Baruch, by its members and officers at the central office, would take up these objectionable paragraphs, send them to the aggrieved parties, and so put them in the way of obtaining justice. When dealing with personal attacks, the operations of the society would be of a private character; but when correcting historical or financial errors in the press, full publicity would be given to the society's work. In this department, authorities and official records would be the basis of operation.

Frequently erroneous reports of meetings are published. Here is an instance:

A meeting of about two hundred people gathered in a schoolroom to consider what steps should be taken to avert a School Board in Enfield. Only a small number voted on the resolution which was put, declaring that steps should be taken to avert a Board. The resolution was lost, the numbers being: Ayes, 39; noes, 44—majority, 5. In a hostile report the result was put as follows: "After a severe struggle by the vicar's friends, the meeting went solidly in favour of a School Board," conveying the impression that the entire assembly were in favour of a Board. The report was characterized by other misleading statements, which need not come under notice here.

The great question the Church has to decide is whether the reading public is to swallow unveracious matter. Are we to say, "Yes; it cannot be stopped"?

The Local Press.—With reference to the local press, attention was called to the meagre interest displayed by Churchfolk in helping its efforts to reflect the life of the locality, by a correspondence in the *Church Times* some time back. The facts then adduced, coupled with my own professional experience, and some remarks that fell from speakers at the London Lay Helpers' last annual meeting, compel us to the following conclusions:

(1) That Church people are behind other branches of religious life in recording their interests for the benefit of the public, and in local journalistic enterprise.

(2) Local editors get every help from Nonconformists in placing news and information before their readers, whereas they obtain little or none from Churchmen. When clerical information is sent, it is generally so out of form for publication that it often has to be recast. This entails trouble, and at times impatience.

(3) Editors are always on the look-out for religious news, and will always insert properly-composed reports and items.

The truth of these conclusions can be verified in the reader's own parish.

The Society of Baruch would use its best endeavours to secure someone in every parish who would make it his peculiar business to assist local editors in their often unthankful and arduous duties.

Popularizing Ancient Churches.—Many a worshipper in an abbey or grand parish church knows little or nothing of its history and structure. If he is a Sunday-school teacher, or other lay-worker, it is probable that he has wished for interesting subjects and thoughts to bring to bear on his work—fresh illustrations for a lesson or address; new subjects for the Church Institute social debates; some new way of interesting young people in Church history, architecture, and our glorious past; some fresh point to put before working men to enkindle their imaginations. Such ideas have doubtless been present in the minds of many who have undertaken some branch of social usefulness.

The Society of Baruch might compile a list of laymen throughout the country who were interested in archæology, parish lore, and ancient churches, who would give their knowledge to the Church at large. Secretaries of guilds, clubs, and teachers' societies, would be able to write to the office, and be put in communication with well-instructed men who would for their expenses provide useful and instructive evenings in

dealing with these subjects. Such men exist scattered all over the provinces unknown and unasked for. Let a Sunday-school teacher take his lads round the interior of their ancient parish church, explaining simply everything of note, and he will be surprised how much he learns himself, and what pleasure he imparts to his scholars. The supporter of the Church will go further than this. Why should he not ask the nearest Radical, Socialist, or democratic club for permission to conduct a party of their members over the church in the same way? Why should we not all understand each other better?

Rhetoric.—The study of rhetoric or elocution is very necessary in these days of outdoor lay-preaching, and the giving of addresses in Sunday-schools. But the possession of eloquence degenerates into "wind-bag" if there is no fund of knowledge behind. Our national literature is now brought within the scope of all. The study of English literature, if only in the form of grasping Stopford Brooke's Primer, is a great help to every worker who desires to show that our Church moves with the times.

The Society of Baruch would make it its business to stimulate such a study in every possible way consistent with its churchmanship. The idea of such an organization ought to be judged comprehensively, and not piecemeal. It would desire to gather into active service many who as yet do nothing, and to provide a rallying ground for youth, energy, enterprise, and loyalty.

L. V. Biggs.

Art. VII.—FREEMASONRY AS KNOWN TO THE WORLD.

King Solomon sent and fetched Hiram out of Tyre. He was a widow's son of the tribe of Naphtali, and his father was a man of Tyre, a worker in brass; and he was filled with wisdom and understanding, and cunning to work all works in brass. And he came to King Solomon, and wrought all his work. For he cast two pillars of brass of eighteen cubits high apiece; and a line of twelve cubits did compass either of them about. . . . And he set up the pillars in the north of the temple: and he set up the right pillar and called the name thereof Jachin, that is, He shall establish: and he set up the left pillar and called the name thereof Boaz, that is, In it is strength.—1 Kings vii. 13-23.

FREEMASONRY is a principle which has existed in all stages of civilization. The state in which we know it, of a vast brotherhood of amateur masons, who are not really builders, but who, as everybody is aware, have adopted the signs and symbols of the building craft to express their own secret principle, is, as far as we know, about two-and-a-half

centuries old. The first instance of a gentleman or amateur being accepted into one of the lodges of the old building crafts is that of Elias Ashmole, the antiquary (afterwards Windsor Herald to King Charles II.), who, along with Colonel Mainwaring, was entered at Warrington in 1646. It is believed that there are now more than 10,000 lodges, and more than 1,000,000 members.

The conception of Freemasonry implies, like the Christian Church, cosmopolitan or universal brotherhood, and was impossible to the ancient world, or until the brotherhood of man was taught by Jesus of Nazareth. But the principle of sacred moral and religious societies on the one hand, and the principle of brotherhood of the building craft on the other, are as old as civilization itself; and it is of these two that speculative Freemasonry is the modern representative. The principle of moral and religious societies is represented in ancient times by the Pythagoreans and the Eleusinians among the Greeks, by the Essenes amongst the Jews, and by the Carmathites and Fedavi, who were the mystic Rationalists of the Mahometans.[1]

But the true historical precursors of our modern brotherhood of Freemasons were the mediæval building corporations, who may themselves have a remote connection with the East; while amongst the Romans there were collegia, or skilled fraternities for the same purpose. These Roman collegia had an exchequer, an archive, patrons, religious ceremonies, an oath, a benefit and burial fund, and a register. Their officers were masters, wardens, recorders, and censors, and they instructed their apprentices to a certain extent in secret. There can be no doubt that such fellowships existed for centuries in Gaul and Britain, and it is probable that they deposited in these countries the tradition of their ideas and habits. And again, at a later period, there was a distinct invitation sent from the West to the building corporations of Byzantium; the reforms of the Emperor Leo, who was zealous in breaking down Christian idolatry, inclined the Masons to avail themselves of the opportunity. The European building societies themselves, however much they owed to the traditions of the Roman skilled fraternities, and of these building societies from the East, were independent and original growths; of these the most distinctive type is found in the Steinmetzen (stonemasons) of Germany. The *liberi muratores*, or Freemasons, grouped themselves round the monasteries. As architecture developed, and with increasing wealth, the Church gradually undertook larger and nobler works, these societies of craftsmen gradually assumed a more definite and more

[1] The historical details are from the "Encyclopædia Britannica."

durable form. The taste and science of Gothic architecture were to a large extent the possession of the Bauhütten, or wooden booths, where the stone-cutters during the progress of the work kept their tools, worked, held their meetings, and probably also took their meals and slept. Hence our modern institution of the lodge. In the twelfth century there are distinct traces of a general association of these lodges throughout Germany, acknowledging one set of craft laws, one set of secret signs and ceremonies, and to a certain extent one central authority in the Grand Lodge of Strasburg.

The Jewish and Arabian symbols, which were so popular in these crafts, are supposed to have been introduced by Albertus Magnus early in the thirteenth century. But the traditions may have come from the East long before; and as we are tracing the history of societies that considered their own special principles and ritual secret and sacred, we can put no limit as to the antiquity of these traditions. In any case, to all societies of builders, the account of the construction of the Temple at Jerusalem by the most famous of all builders, King Solomon, has always been of the profoundest interest. And that is the reason why I have placed the account of Solomon's chief contractor, Hiram of Tyre, and his skilful mystic performances, at the head of this paper.

The privileges which one of these ancient German lodges was able to give to its masters, speakers, and journeymen were chiefly a share in the administration of justice, in the election of officers, in the banquet, and in works of charity. There was a solemn initiation; and instruction was given to all apprentices in both architecture, and its allegorical meaning. When an apprentice had served his time and finished his year of travelling, he was entitled, if of good character, to receive the Password and Salutation. He took an oath of secrecy on the Bible and other sacred symbols, and drank the loving cup. The three great lights, the hammer or gavel, the gold, blue, and white colours, the sacred numbers, 3, 5, 7, and 9, and the interlaced cords, all had their traditional meaning.

The atmosphere of these mediæval building societies seems even at an early date to have been favourable to liberty of thought and religious toleration. Hence they were prohibited at the Romish Council of Avignon in the year 1326.

The authority of the Grand Lodge was recognised at the great assemblies of Ratisbon and Strasburg in 1459, the statutes of which received imperial confirmation. It was legally destroyed by an imperial edict in 1741.

England had imported much of her lodge organization and learning from Germany. The causes which led to the introduction of the new class of members, the amateurs, those who

are ordinarily known as Freemasons, and which gradually converted operative into speculative masonry, were inevitable.

In the first place, the old secrets of Gothic Masonry became obsolete through the spread of the Classical and Renaissance architectures. Inigo Jones and his patron, Lord Pembroke, had been studying these on the Continent, and brought them to England. Inigo Jones was patron of the Freemasons from 1607 to 1618. He invited several Italian artists to join the body.

Secondly, the disorder of the Civil Wars prevented meetings, and tended to disorganize the Masonic connection.

Again, the growing spirit of the Reformation in religion gave men a freedom of speech which superseded the secret freedom of the old craftsmen. Toleration was soon a political fact.

Fourthly, science took a new departure from the time of Bacon. The interrogation of nature was preferred to legend and allegory. The glorious outburst of science fostered the idea of a new humanitarian society, and at the same time kept up its direct connection with the old, and with a past that was lost in the mists of antiquity, by adopting the ancient symbols of fellowship. It was under this impulse that a General Assembly of Masons was held in 1663, at which the old catechisms were revised, and a series of new statutes passed.

The reconstruction of London after the fire, the building of St. Paul's Cathedral, and the patronage of the immortal Sir Christopher Wren, kept up the interest in the movement; and at last a formal resolution was passed that the Masonic privileges should no longer be confined to operative masons.

The modern phase of English Masonry may be said to have begun in London on June 24, 1717, when the four London lodges, having erected themselves into a Grand Lodge, named their first Grand Master. The leading spirits were the Huguenot, Desaguliers, the well-known popularizer of natural science, and James Anderson, a Scotch Presbyterian minister, who compiled the Book of Constitutions. From this time, new lodges could only be formed by warrant from the Grand Lodge. In 1721, the Duke of Montagu was elected Grand Warden. About the same time, the Committee of Charity was formed, which has since raised and expended very large sums for the relief of distressed brethren, and built the Boys' and Girls' Masonic Schools at Battersea Rise and Tottenham. In the latter part of the eighteenth century, the ancient York Lodge of practical Masons put in a rival claim to be Grand Lodge, or Supreme Authority. The schismatics were known by the red colour of the Royal Arch Degree, the orthodox by the blue of St. John of Jerusalem. In 1813, a union was at last brought about by the Queen's father, the Duke of Kent,

by her uncle, the Duke of Sussex, and by the Duke of Athole, between the rival Grand Lodges of London and York, and they were henceforth known as the United Grand Lodge of England.

Such is a brief sketch of the history of Masonry as known to the world, and it is a history of which Masons may well be proud. It is well known that the fraternity is famous for the celebration of the brotherhood of man and for the cultivation of universal goodwill. Whatever may be the case in foreign countries, in our own Freemasonry has always gone hand in hand with religion. It has emphasized the great Christian virtue of brotherly kindness, uniting men of different ranks, and often opposite views, in mutual esteem and respect. It is impossible, in writing for readers who are not Freemasons, to particularize its moral aims; it is sufficient to say that none who join it can fail to be impressed for good.

Freemasonry asks all its members to cultivate in all the relations of life, whether in Masonry or without, that spirit of brotherhood. Too many are the divisions which separate us in many ways in the complex civilization in which we live. The temper which they learn in their craft they will do well to extend to all the children of the Divine Father of mankind. The proud look, the cold hand, the unfeeling heart, the angry tongue, the quarrelsome disposition, are altogether unfitting to those who have learnt the lessons of the association.

Too little is thought in these our times of the fear of God. Much of our life seems spent without any reference to Him. The recollection of His presence alone can curb our wayward wills, and nerve us to high resolves and wholesome activities. It is one of the glories of English Freemasonry that in all their ways Freemasons acknowledge God.

And there is another thought which the ideals of Freemasonry suggest. In these days of universal hurry, we do not stop long enough to consider whether our words are wise and our actions well-considered. Dash and vigour, and the qualities that excite admiration and amusement, are the most popular—not the quiet ways of calm deliberation and serious thought. If Freemasons can by word or example increase the respect for wisdom and understanding, and make men desire those great gifts for themselves, they will be conferring a benefit on the general character of society. "Happy is the man that findeth wisdom, and he that getteth understanding; for the merchandise of it is better than the merchandise of silver, and the gain thereof than fine gold."

Fidelity is another principle which cannot be too highly prized. We are living in an age of restlessness, unsettlement, and change. Principles are easily abandoned, and friends

shaken off. The old virtue of faithfulness to our convictions and loyalty to our friends is greatly to be desired and honoured. The world is too much given to gossip, and few indeed are able to hold their tongues, even about secret things, if they can raise a laugh. *A talebearer revealeth secrets, but he that is of a faithful spirit concealeth the matter. A faithful man shall abound with blessings; but he that maketh haste to be rich shall not be innocent. The Lord preserveth the faithful.* The very fact that the secrets of Masonry are so well kept is a perpetual witness to us of this high quality.

Seriousness and dignity again greatly add, at fitting times and on proper occasions, to the impressiveness of life. Nothing is more tedious than the perpetual jester. Every household should have its own little forms of courtesy and ceremony to smooth roughness and difficulties, and to banish insolence, rudeness, contempt, and excessive familiarity.

Lastly, the craft is by all the world accepted as an example of wise and well-thought almsgiving. There always will be misfortunes, miseries, and failures in the world. There always will be sickness, suffering, and poverty. Any institution which keeps our hearts warm towards the unhappy must earn the gratitude of mankind. It is not only in their own schools and charities that Masons are interested. They are inspired by a general spirit of benevolence towards all sound schemes of philanthropy. And, truly, there is abundant field for the loving-kindness and self-denial, not only of Masons, but of all the benevolent. It is one of the well-known impulses of the members of that great and world-wide confraternity to let their light so shine before men that they may see their good works, and glorify their Father which is in heaven. "*He shall establish:*" "*In it is strength:*" these two ancient mystic sentences of the mighty craftsman, Hiram, have a message for Freemasons which crosses the long sequence of the centuries. If all our works are indeed begun, continued, and ended in the fear of God, He will indeed establish and secure them, and be their strength and their sure protection. "Establish Thou the work of our hands upon us: yea, the work of our hands establish Thou it." "Be Thou our strength every morning: our salvation also in the time of trouble!"

WILLIAM SINCLAIR.

Reviews.

La Foi en la Divinité de Jésus-Christ. By Père Didon. Paris: Librairie Plon.

IN the Lent of 1892, the eloquent Dominican preached a series of sermons at the church of the Madeleine, in Paris, on the divinity of our Lord. They created immense interest. Large numbers flocked to hear them; and verbatim reports were hawked in the streets. After a lapse of two years these sermons appear in the volume before us, during which time no doubt they have been undergoing a certain amount of revision. Père Didon is now universally admitted to be one of the very foremost of living French preachers; and these sermons are undoubtedly his most successful series. It is interesting, therefore, to take them as a type of what is best in modern French preaching, and to compare them with productions of the English pulpit.

The sermons are of the evidential type. The preacher assumes that his congregation is not actively religious, which indeed, to judge from appearances, was the case. Therefore he endeavours to inquire, in a studiously simple and, as it were, impartial manner, into the present state of (French) disbelief in Christ's divinity, the causes for it, how they may be refuted, and, finally, the practical means of believing. With regard to the style, it should be remembered that they were delivered without manuscript, of course, coming as they did from a Frenchman and a Dominican. Thus they bear in them both the excellences and the defects of "extempore" sermons. For though no doubt they have undergone revision to a certain extent, they still bear manifest traces of the method of their delivery. We note the long passages, built up of co-ordinate sentences; the repetition of the same idea in slightly varying words; the manner in which a thought is worked out through a sequence of involved phrases. On the other hand, there is the rush and vigour of impassioned argument and hortatory appeal, varied every now and then by peculiarly brilliant phrases and sentences, couched in that epigrammatic form which seems the inherited right of all educated French writers—epigrams which are as apt and as pregnant with recollection as a line from Pope. These sermons, in common with those of many modern French preachers, such as Lacordaire and Gratry, have a peculiar charm. They miss the ordered diction and the educated melody of our greatest English sermons; they have not in the same degree the spirit of reverence and piety; nor, it seems to us, do they reach the same standard of either scriptural or scholarly excellence. But there is a fire, a glow of thought, a sparkle of phrase, a clear, glittering logic, which renders them fascinating and, due regard being had to their Romanist character, useful reading for an English clergyman.

As a fair specimen of the matter of our author's sermons, it may be of interest to give the last in his book, which is entitled "Practical Means of Believing in the Divinity of Jesus." We give a full summary:

To be a Christian is to believe in Christ. That is the foundation-stone on which is to be raised all the structure of doctrine, dogma, and good works, and which is at last to raise us to the threshold of eternity. Therefore it is of the most primary importance to know within ourselves what answer we would give to the question, "What think ye of Christ—whose Son is He?" We are conscious that the answer *should* be: "God's." So our question is, in other words: "What are the practical means of believing in the divinity of Jesus? Do such means

exist? What are they? Do they depend on our will and our own energy?"

There *are* practical means, which are in our hands, and which it depends on us to employ. Just as science and philosophy, education and art, have their methods of proceeding, so faith has hers. Nay, more, there is this great difference. The methods of science and philosophy, art and education, are not within the reach of everybody; everybody cannot aspire to be a great man of science, or a clever doctor, or a renowned artist. But the means of believing belong to all; everyone can and ought to aspire to be a Christian. Human things are the affairs of a few; the things of the Gospel are the privilege of all.

Before we examine the practical means of believing in the divinity of our Lord, let us not exclude that influence, divine, invisible, and sacred, which surrounds man, and which is called in theological language "grace." We cannot analyze its action, or trace its method. "The Spirit bloweth where it listeth." But we must, to speak reverently, co-operate; and how?

I. Whoever aspires to believe in Jesus Christ with an intelligent and well-founded faith, must at the outset put himself into personal connection with Jesus Christ as a real and historical personage. Jesus Christ, Son of Man, has affirmed, declared, and taught His Divine Sonship; we must put ourselves into direct relationship with Him who has proclaimed these marvellous things. In the first place, we must know not even the Jesus of dogma, whom the Creeds contain in their sublime formulas, but the Jesus of history, living, acting, preaching, teaching, founding His work and His doctrine on His death and sacrifice—the Jesus of the Gospels. How can we be acquainted with a man belonging to history if we have not read his memoirs?

But we must be careful how we read them. There are three ways of reading a book—with a critical mind, with the imagination, and with the conscience. When we read with our intellect, it is to criticise, such as an essay; when we read with our imagination, it is to amuse ourselves, such as a novel; when we read with our conscience, it is to make us better men. That is how we must first read the Gospels, with our simple understanding and our conscience. Then, at least, you will be able, if nothing else, to say with Rousseau: "If the life and death of Socrates were those of a sage, the life and death of Jesus were those of a God." When we have read, re-read, and read again the Gospels under these conditions, we shall be in relation with Jesus Christ. Of course, one does not know what will follow; but we shall be in touch with the human being who solemnly declared His divinity. Does He deserve belief in that statement—yes or no?

That brings us to the second condition.

II. The knowledge of the person of Jesus Christ, by reading the Gospel carefully and with the conscience, is the first step, but it is not enough. For notice: Many of the contemporaries of Jesus were put into contact with Him, heard Him preach to the crowd, saw Him heal the sick, and yet what a difference! Some believed in Him and became His disciples, others remained indifferent, or even became His adversaries.

What does this variety of attitude arise from? Why are some enlightened and some blind? We do not know what passes in the soul, but we do know, for Christ has told us, what is the method of believing in Him. "If anyone wishes to come after Me," He often said to His disciples and the crowd, "let him take up his cross and follow Me." To follow Jesus is to believe in Him. There is no doubt about this. Whoever wants to follow Jesus must believe what His Master says about Himself, and consequently in His Divine Sonship. But Jesus teaches as a necessary condition of arriving at that faith the renunciation of your

personality, sacrifice symbolized in carrying the cross. Do you think that that narrows the way? If you suppose that it is easy to be a true Christian, undeceive yourself. Jesus does not want common-place people in His train. The selfish, the satisfied, the stubborn, have no place in the following of Him who said in terms which disguise nothing: "If anyone wishes to come after Me, he must give up *himself*." Do you wish that?

You must notice that the more powerful and active one's personality is, the more difficult it is to surrender it. There is a historical proof of that. In the time of Jesus there were men of power, there were wealthy people, scientific men, yes, and "holy people," who said to each other, "we are perfect"—the undying race of Pharisees. Jesus appeared. Power rejected Him, opulent families disdained Him, the doctors despised Him, the perfect people were the most pitiless of all. Who did believe in Him, then? Why, the poor Galileans—the people who didn't know very much about the law, and observed still less; men without letters, without power, without sanctity, the Galileans. Peter, John, James, Bartholomew, Matthew—a publican!—all these are the humble folk who recognised Jesus. And why? Because they were practised in self-effacement; they had so poor a personality that it was little trouble to surrender it.

Ah, brethren, it is the hardest lesson we have to learn, to give up self, to deny our own desires and passions; but it has to be done. The gate is narrow, and, as Jesus said, it wants violence to open it even. The kingdom of heaven is not a kingdom of invalids, but of brave men. Only the valiant can gain it—we might say the violent.

Is there any plan by which this denial of self can be facilitated? Yes, there is. There would not be, if it were left to man. If man were left to his own energy, given up to his own aspirations, he would never arrive at faith. The secret, irresistible action of the Holy Spirit is needed. Let us again turn to the teaching of our Lord Himself. In one of His mysterious and profound sayings He said, "No man can come unto Me, unless the Father draw him." Who is the Father of Jesus? God, most certainly. And in every man there is an influence, however much he may struggle against it, which does its best to induce him to good, to high and pure things. What is this? It is the movement of the Father, who is drawing every creature to Himself; and if to Himself, then also to Jesus, who is the realization, under human form, of the ideal of God. Yes, if man, in spite of all his imperfections, is drawn towards the noble, pure, and perfect, whither will his steps lead him? To Jesus, Son of God.

Yet there remains the sacrifice of that same tyrannical personality of ours. What will give us the strength for that sacrifice? Once again Jesus had spoken the secret of believing, "*Repent* and believe the Gospel." He speaks to the conscience, for it is the conscience which plays the chief part in the act of faith. It is easier to appeal to the heart than to the head in these things, just as it is easier for the surgeon to get to the heart than to the brain, for the brain is encased in a box of bone, whereas the heart is easily pierced. And the word of Jesus is eternally true, "Repent and believe the Gospel." The chief obstacle to belief is an impenitent heart. A man who does not reproach himself will never believe. Who is the hardest man to convince? The clever man? the sinful man? the ambitious man? Not these necessarily—no; but the man who says, "I am a good man; I can lay nothing to my charge."

On the contrary, when you hear a man, whoever he is, of whatever age, temperament, culture, whoever he is, so long as he is struck by the invisible action of God—when you hear him tell you, "Listen, I don't make myself out any better than I am; I am, like many, a poor wretch,

but I repent"—that man, I affirm, is at the gate of the kingdom of God; to-morrow he will be on his knees before the crucified One.

Gentlemen, when you have realized in yourselves that admirable and heroic poorness of spirit, and not daring to raise your eyes towards heaven, you strike your breast and say, "Lord, have mercy on me; I am but a publican"—when you have done that, at the first cry you will believe in Jesus, the Son of God.

It is true that the end of the sermon is taken up with an apostrophe to Mary Magdalene, the patron saint of the church; but we think that if care were taken to sift the false from the true, the jaded preacher would derive much freshness of insight and of expression from reading sermons such as these. W. A. PURTON.

Christian Doctrine: A Series of Discourses. By R. W. DALE, LL.D. Hodder and Stoughton.

This is an admirable volume. Dr. Dale has in previous years given us the fruits of his study of Christian doctrine in certain special directions, as, for example, in his well-known book on the Atonement, which may fairly claim to rank as a theological classic. But in the present work we seem to have presented to us, in clear and simple language, the result of Dr. Dale's matured thoughts upon the body of Christian doctrine as a whole. These discourses give us, in brief compass, the summed up teaching of a lifetime.

In a book like this, which deals with problems so difficult and so diverse as "The Existence of God," "The Humanity of our Lord," "The Trinity," and others of similar complexity, it is always easy to find points of disagreement. These, however, it is quite unnecessary to emphasize; one is glad to discover how much there is on which entire agreement is possible. The twelve discourses which make up the main contents of this book are noteworthy for their impressive and reverent treatment of the great central truths of Christianity.

One of the primary lessons which it is Dr. Dale's object to inculcate is this—that a belief in the truths of Christianity is something very different from an intellectual assent to certain theological propositions, being rather an actual living-out of the inner spirit of Christ's life and teaching. Very strongly, therefore, does he maintain, in his first discourse, that even "God's existence is made certain to us—not by reasoning—but by experience." And elsewhere he goes on to say that it is just because philosophical theists cannot realize this great fact (*i.e.*, that, even in the most vital of all questions, "*experientia* docet"), that they of all men seem least able to receive the truths of the Gospel. To a large extent, this is unfortunately true; but I do not consider it wise to lay such stress on the argument from experience as Dr. Dale thinks it necessary to do, because it has a certain tendency to make the truths of Christianity depend, for their ultimate acceptance, on individual emotions. Doubtless, Dr. Dale has stated a truth, but it is only a half-truth. In reality God's existence is made certain to us *both* by reasoning *and* experience, which, linked thus together, form a solid foundation for belief.

In his second discourse—upon our Lord's Divinity—Dr. Dale dwells upon that curious mental phenomenon we sometimes observe in the case of pious and thoughtful people, who, from a misdirected reverence, are so profoundly impressed with the Divine in Christ's life as to blind themselves to the fact that, after all, He was a very man, often tempted and tried; often anxious, sorrowful, weary, hungry, even as we are; though sinless through it all. Ruskin, in his own unrivalled language, has noted this fact, and comments thus:

"Our preachers are continually trying, in all manner of subtle ways,

to explain the union of the Divinity with the Manhood—an explanation which certainly involves first their being able to describe the nature of Deity itself, or, in plain words, to comprehend God. They never can explain, in any one particular, the union of the natures; they only succeed in weakening the faith of their hearers as to the entireness of either. The thing they have to do is precisely the contrary of this—to insist upon the *entireness* of both. We never think of Christ enough as God, never enough as Man; the instinctive habit of our minds being always to miss of the Divinity, and the reasoning and enforced habit to miss of the humanity. We are afraid to harbour in our own hearts, or to utter in the hearing of others, any thought of our Lord as hungering, tired, sorrowful, having a human soul, a human will, and affected by events of human life, as a finite creature is; and yet one half of the efficiency of His atonement, and the whole of the efficiency of His example, depend on His having been this to the full."[1]

On pp. 152, *sqq.* (discourse on the Trinity) there is some characteristic criticism of philosophers who endeavour—very unsuccessfully, according to Dr. Dale—to prove that the doctrine of a Divine Trinity, so far from being a dark, insoluble mystery, from which even faith recoils dismayed, is a necessary factor in any carefully constructed theology. In the view of such thinkers there must be, by an eternal necessity, a Trinity in the Divine life. Dr. Dale is evidently indulging in a sly hit at Hegel here, though he does not actually mention any name. To Hegel's mind Christianity, in the fact that it regarded God as a Triune personality, showed its severely rational character; and this thought was undoubtedly one that formed the keystone of the Hegelian philosophy, which, when all is said and done, remains, and is likely to remain, the high-water mark of human thought.

The sublime truth that God is immanent in His world finds, as Dr. Dale justly says, its highest and purest expression in the Christian doctrine of the Trinity. Only one must take care not to forget that, while He is indeed immanent in the world, He also eternally transcends it. "In the Father," we read (p. 164), "God personally transcends the life and thought of man; in the Son, God is personally revealed to man; in the Spirit, God is immanent in the higher life of man." This is excellently put; the very brevity and conciseness of the clauses lend weight to the truth they struggle to express.

I have left myself little space to speak about Dr. Dale's interesting and thoughtful discussion of the Atonement—that pivot of Christian theology, on which its whole fabric revolves. The writer's main contention may be given shortly in his own words: "God does not redeem us merely by revealing His love; He reveals His love by redeeming us. The revelation comes through the redemption."

The "notes" appended to the discussions are printed together at the end of the book—a good plan, in many ways. One only hopes the reader will not practise the art of skipping *here*, for he will assuredly miss much of permanent interest. Among the most instructive of these excursuses are those which deal with Primitive Beliefs and the Creeds of the Church (Dr. Dale speaks with sincere admiration of the great creeds of Christendom); nor should the note upon our Lord's knowledge be passed by. We are on delicate and debatable ground here; but the topic is handled with skill, notwithstanding the fact that one or two of Dr. Dale's conclusions may well be contested on more grounds than one.

E. H. BLAKENEY.

February, 1895.

[1] "Modern Painters," vol. iii.

Short Notices.

Lex Mosaica ; or, The Law of Moses and the Higher Criticism. Edited by R. VALPY FRENCH, D.C.L., etc. Pp. 652. Eyre and Spottiswoode.

THIS important work is a thorough exposition of the crude and arbitrary guesses of the theoretical school of criticism, and contains a powerful defence of the traditional view.

The preface is by the late Lord Arthur Hervey, Bishop of Bath and Wells.

Professor Sayce writes on the Archæological Witness to the Literary Activity of the Mosaic Age ; Professor Rawlinson on Moses as the Substantial Author of the Levitical Code of Laws ; Professor Douglas on the Originality of the Deuteronomical Code ; Canon Girdlestone on the Period of Joshua ; Dr. Valpy French on that of the Judges ; Mr. Lias on Samuel and Saul ; Dr. Watson on that of David and Solomon ; Dr. Sharpe on the Northern Kingdom ; Dr. Stuart, of Aberdeen, on the Southern Kingdom ; Professor Stanley Leathes on the Eighth Century ; Dr. Sinker on the Seventh Century ; Mr. Spencer on Ezekiel and the Priestly School ; Dr. Watts, of Belfast, on the Post-Exodic Period; while a summary of the whole is given by Principal Wace.

A sentence may be quoted from Professor Watts : "It is difficult in reviewing these charges against the sacred record and its authors to avoid the impression—an impression ever deepening the more thoroughly the charges are investigated—that the critics, instead of analyzing the facts with which they profess to deal, and deducing from the analysis their theories, entered upon their task under the bias of foregone conclusions, to which the facts must be made to conform."

The work is a valuable handbook of this momentous controversy ; and there can be little doubt as to which side sound reason inclines.

Analytical Concordance of the Bible. By Dr. ROBERT YOUNG. Sixth edition. Pp. 1186. Price, cloth, 24s. ; half-morocco, 28s. ; morocco, 40s., etc. Edinburgh : Geo. Adam, Young and Co.

This magnificent work represents herculean labour and proved scholarship. Valuable as Cruden's work was, Dr. Young's far surpasses it. The words are arranged according to the original which they represent in Hebrew or Greek, which is an immense help to those unacquainted with Hebrew and Greek. The Hebrew and Greek words are printed in the original characters at the head, and with the pronunciation in English letters. The proper and geographical names take their alphabetical place, with the latest information, and are not relegated to a separate portion.

At the close of the work are about one hundred closely-printed pages containing the most recent results of Eastern investigation in connection with the Bible, as well as some scholarly and useful maps in connection with the manuscript. There are also a Hebrew and English Lexicon to the Old Testament, and one in Greek and English to the New. No clerical library can be considered complete without this admirable concordance ; and there could not be a better present to clergymen, superintendents, and teachers.

The Expository Times. Vol. V., 1893-94. Pp. 568. Edinburgh : T. and T. Clark.

This volume is essential to an understanding of current modern theology. In it is concentrated the opinions of the most eminent theologians of the day.

In Leisure Time. By W. S. MAVOR. Elliot Stock.

The author of this booklet of verse, a popular physician at Cheshunt, in Hertfordshire, writes with a certain charming grace and lightness of touch. Such trifles as "Inversion" and "The Seasons" are the product of a refined and delicate singer. Dr. Mavor appears at his best in "Zalencus," which he rightly describes as

> Culled from the pagan history of old;
> A simple narrative; as simply told.

His "Odes to the Muses" will not appeal, we imagine, to the "man in the street," but the general reader will find much that strikes home in "Alas," "Gratitude," and "On this Picture." The religious tone of many of the poems is very high.

Whispers from the Throne. By WINIFRED A. IVERSON. Elliot Stock.

This charming volume of devotional poetry contains many pieces of real beauty. The children's poems, "An Invitation," "Lord Jesus and the Children," and "Room for Jesus" are full of a tender simplicity which is, perhaps, the prevailing note of the collection. Some of the phrases in the longer and more ambitious poems are very striking, though it is when singing of the "shadows" which have fallen on the lives of devout Christians that the writer is at her best. "Shadows," "From Dark to Light," and "I know" are instances of this.

A Flat-iron for a Farthing. By Mrs. EWING. S.P.C.K. Pp. 282.

Old-Fashioned Fairy Tales. By Mrs. EWING. S.P.C.K. Pp. 169.

These are two additions to the cheap reproduced series of Mrs. Ewing's fascinating works.

Elizabeth Jane Whately: Reminiscences by her Sister. Seeley and Co. Pp. 146.

An interesting record of an interesting and most useful life and work.

Chrissie's Endeavour. By PANSY. Sunday School Union. Pp. 275.

This original and earnestly-written story, distinctly American in tone and language, will be read with pleasure and profit by English girls of all classes.

Mother and Son. Home Words Library. By EMMA MARSHALL. Price 1s. 6d. Pp. 156.

This simple and life-like story, told in Mrs. Marshall's usual attractive way, cannot be read by old or young without interest, and will be valuable either for the lending library or the Mothers' Meeting. The illustrations also are decidedly above the average.

The Ancient British and Irish Churches. By WILLIAM CATHCART, D.D. Pp. 347. Baptist Tract Society.

This learned book, which, from its form, contains a good many repetitions, gives the latest results of investigation on that most interesting subject, the earliest form of Christianity in these islands. Book I. deals with the Ancient Britons; Book II. with the Ancient Irish; Book III., Conversion of the Picts; Book IV., The Mission of the Scots to the Anglo-Saxons; Book V., British and Irish Presbyters and Bishops; Book VI., Some of the Doctrines and Observances of the Ancient British and Irish Christians on Sin and Salvation, Atonement and Conversion, Justification, Life and Intercession, the Lord's Supper, and Purgatory.

Wherever any evidence is found which might make for Baptist views it is pointed out, and the evidence seems sometimes not a little strained; but the book gives a valuable mass of interesting information.

The new numbers of the Penny Pocket Library of the S.P.C.K. are *The Legend of Montrose*, by Sir Walter Scott; *The Pilot* and *The Spy*, by Fenimore Cooper; *The Ice Prison* and *The Mutiny on the "Albatross,"* by Moore.

THE MONTH.

THE most significant event of the month has been the issue, by the *Church Times*, of a manifesto by the President of the English Church Union (Lord Halifax), which is an ardent appeal for definite corporate reunion with Rome. Lord Halifax assumes (1) that the Roman claim for supremacy is in the main right ; (2) that the Reformation was directed against a state of things which has long passed away, and that there is nothing in the decrees of the Council of Trent that is antagonistic to our formularies ; (3) that Dr. Newman and Dr. Pusey were right in explaining all our documents in a Roman sense ; (4) that the true historical Church of the Reformation is represented by the English Church Union ; and (5) that the main differences between the Church of England and the Church of Rome are now those of sentiment and *esprit de corps*. Henceforth we are all to labour night and day to explain everything away, and to undo the work of the Reformation by corporate reunion with the Pope. If the Pope will only recognise our orders, all will be plain sailing. We cannot expect the Pope to retract, but he and we will both submit to God.

What an unreal world it is in which many of us live ! To an amiable dreamer, like the President of the English Church Union, in whose eyes the facts of history assume the shape in which they appear in this manifesto, any imagination is possible. But we have to remember that he is the head and mouthpiece of an earnest and enthusiastic body of 34,800 communicants, who have the most influential part of the religious press at their command, and who, far from disavowing his policy, will absorb it. The followers of Dr. Newman, who are now popularly known as Ritualists, have often repudiated with decorous indignation the charge of Romanizing. And now their own revered and beloved leader in the face of the whole world proclaims a policy of Romanizing beyond which it would be impossible for any Romanizer to go. His position will be indicated by the following verbatim extracts. We are almost ashamed to insert words which, to the ordinary English Churchman, appear nothing short of treasonable ; but in Lord Halifax's case they are nothing of the kind ; and they are simply the frank, honest, open transcript of the mental and religious atmosphere which he breathes, and which others have not an equal courage to avow :

THE RELATIONS OF CANTERBURY TO ROME.

" Canterbury was the daughter of Rome. At Canterbury the church outside its walls, which sheltered the remains of the Kings of Kent and the Archbishops, was dedicated to Saints Peter and Paul. It was another Pope, St. Vitalian, who sent St. Theodore to Canterbury, the Archbishop to whom is due the definite constitution of the English Church.

" It was to Rome that the eyes of our Anglo-Saxon forefathers turned, as the seat of the Bishop whose help and assistance, and the authority of whose see was acknowledged by all the Churches of the West ; and if they thought of the ancient British Church which they succeeded, they would only remember that the members of that Church had formally refused to associate themselves with their conquerors, over and above the fact, which in this day is hardly doubtful, that the ancient British Church, like that of Gaul and of Spain, has nothing to prove—on the contrary, the evidence all goes the other way—that it was not itself the daughter of Rome. That there is a long way from all this to the centralization which later on developed itself in the Western Church, requires no insisting upon, any more than that the relations now described do not involve all that some modern writers belonging to the Roman Church have tried to see in them. On the other hand, when, for controversial purposes, it is attempted to discover an origin for the English Church other than that of

Rome, or to prove that England from the earliest times down to the sixteenth century was not united to Rome by the closest links of an external unity and a common faith, those who are acquainted with the facts are tempted to doubt either our honesty or, at least, the trustworthiness of our historical methods.

"Such, then, was the unity of the Church of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that unity lasted for 1,500 years. For 1,500 years men might talk of the Church of England, of the Church of France, of the Church of Italy, or the Church of Spain, but all knew that each was but a part of a greater whole; that as there was but one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one Eucharist, so there was but one Church; and in the West all looked to Rome as the great central see, grouped round which the different national Churches of the West were supported in the profession of a common faith, by the link of an external authority which, binding them to itself, bound them also to one another."

NO FURTHER NEED FOR THE SCHISM OF THE REFORMATION.

"In weighing its consequences, then, and in apportioning its guilt, which is essential if right is to be done in the present day, a just balance must be struck, and an even measure apportioned to both sides in the quarrel; and in this connection there are two things which it is very necessary to remember. One, that the protests made in the sixteenth century against the abuses of the Church, whether doctrinal or practical, were directed against a system which has long ceased to exist. That system disappeared after Trent, gradually and silently as it had arisen. Protestant protests were directed not against the system defined at Trent, but against a previous state of things which it is now difficult to reproduce."

RELATIONS WITH ROME.

"I proceed to the consideration of the relations between England and Rome. Surely there is no one, if he thinks what it would be to see the Western Church once more united, her schisms healed, and peace once more existing amongst her members, but must long for the day when the Church of England, our own branch of the Church which we love so well, should again be united in bonds of visible communion with the Apostolic see and all the Churches of the West. What would we not give to be able to make our confessions and our communions abroad as we do at home! Who can endure the sense of being separated from those with whom in all essentials of belief and sentiment we are one? And why should we not see the day of such a happy reconciliation? It was never the intention of the Church of England to depart from the rest of the Catholic Church. What is there which should make her desire to remain in her present isolation, which should make such a renewal of her ancient relations with Rome impossible? She accounts herself a portion of the Visible Church, estranged rather than divided from the rest of Catholic Christendom. Her articles expressly assert the authority of the universal Church in controversies of faith, and in the institution of rites and ceremonies."

POSSIBILITY OF EXPLAINING AWAY THE VATICAN COUNCIL.

"But at this point I am conscious that an objection will be made. You have mentioned many things, it will be said, but you have omitted one which, in connection with this view of a reunited Christendom, is perhaps the most important of all. You have said nothing of the effect of the Vatican Council upon the prospect of a reunion which shall embrace England and the East. It is not for me on the present occasion, nor am I the person to endeavour to show how doctrinal and theological difficulties are to be accommodated. There are many questions besides those involved in the decisions of the Vatican Council which will need, before

peace can be secured, to be considered and discussed. Explanations may do much to remove many misconceptions which prevail on both sides. Even in regard to the Vatican Council, it appears not impossible that mistakes and exaggerations as to its scope and consequences may have been made, and that as time goes on explanations will emerge which may make the difficulties it seems to involve less than they have sometimes appeared. It is certain that the explanations given by Bishop Fessler, the Secretary of the Council, with the approbation of the Pope, were by no means such as some who have pressed for the definition approved. If by Papal infallibility it is only meant that the Pope is infallible when acting as the head of the whole Church, and expressing the mind of the Church, and after taking all the legitimate and usual means for ascertaining that mind, in determining which the authority and witness of the Bishops, as representing their respective churches, must be paramount, and then only in regard to the substance of the deposit handed down from Christ and His Apostles, it would seem that the difficulty of a possible agreement is not so insuperable as it has been sometimes represented. Certainly, it is not such as to preclude all endeavours to find possible terms of peace on other matters. In any case, till it is proved to the contrary, let us nourish the hope that such explanations are possible."

THE MOVEMENT OF DR. NEWMAN THE TRUE EXPONENT OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, AND TO BE RECOGNISED BY ROME AS SUCH.

"I say also that while it is a reason for prudence, for being careful lest we do anything which might endanger the cause we would seek to promote, for doing all we can, in the first instance, to leaven public opinion, and for striving by all means in our power to dispel prejudice and to awaken greater desire for union, it is not a reason for abandoning the hope of reunion as one which can never be realized. Events go fast in these days; much that seemed impossible yesterday is accomplished to-morrow; and just as it is not fair to judge the Roman Church by the superstitions and abuses which at various times have been tolerated by her authorities and disfigured her communion, so neither is it fair to impute to the Church of England the blame of opinions, and a state of things which are diametrically opposed to her authoritative profession and formularies. Much has been amended already; much more will be amended in the future. Time is required to test the value of inferences which may be drawn from the condition of any religious body at a particular moment. It is not the Church of England of to-day, but the Church in all ages and in all countries, which requires indulgence in such matters. No one, I think, who knows anything of the history of the Church of England, especially during the last sixty years, can doubt that the difficulties alluded to are essentially temporary and accidental; that a generous view of the position of the Church of England is really the true one. After all, there is a logic in facts which cannot be ignored. It has not infrequently been said that nothing but the Catholic Church can produce a Sister of Charity. The revival of the religious life among women within the limits of the Church of England is a fact, and has to be accounted for. Again, it has been said by most distinguished and competent critics that the Oxford Movement, apparently successful in much, had failed in what was perhaps its most essential principle—the vindication of the spiritual claims of the Church of England as against the civil power. I reply again, in view of the relative position of the Church as a spiritual power, able to assert herself, and to vindicate her doctrine and ritual against the encroachments of the State, let the contrast between the condition of things at the time of the Gorham Judgment and at the present speak for itself."

DIVINE FUNCTION OF DR. NEWMAN'S MOVEMENT TO ACHIEVE CORPORATE REUNION.

"For ourselves, we are convinced that the great religious revival in England, . . . which has now advanced another stage by the more recent restoration of the Catholic Ritual prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer, . . . can be intended by Almighty God for no other issue than the restoration of the whole body of the Anglican faithful, whether at home, in America, or in our scattered missions throughout the whole world, to corporate reunion."

PRACTICAL IDENTITY OF ENGLAND AND ROME.

"Let me recapitulate our position again. It is essential there should be no mistake about it. In the words of a recent writer, which leave nothing to be desired, 'We wish for union with Rome; we wish for nothing so much, but such a desire on our part involves nothing inconsistent with a sincere and loyal allegiance to the Anglican Communion. We are convinced on the one hand that there is nothing whatever in the authoritative documents of the English Church which, apart from the traditional glosses of a practical Protestantism, contains anything essentially irreconcilable with the doctrines of the Church of Rome. We are, indeed, members of a body not in communion with the Holy See. We deplore the isolation, and desire to do our best to heal the breach between us. That breach is none of our making. It is not one for which even our spiritual forefathers three hundred years ago were solely, or even mainly, responsible. Political tyranny on the part of those at home, the undue assertion of ecclesiastical power on the part of those abroad, as well as the practical corruption of the Church at large, forced us into it. We regret it, indeed, but we could not help it. The fault was on the side of the authorities of the Roman Church as well as on ours. We are ready to admit our part of it. It remains for them to admit theirs. So far as the Church of England is concerned, there has been no schism in the strict and historical sense of the word. We have never renounced communion with Rome. There is nothing in the formal teaching of the Church of England which in the least degree implies the existence or the desirability of such a separation; on the contrary, it is distinctly repudiated. Priests in Roman Orders may minister, members of the Roman Communion may communicate, at our altars. We desire from the bottom of our hearts to be allowed to make our own confessions to, and to receive our communions from the hands of, the Roman clergy abroad. What we cannot do is to make any surrender inconsistent with truth and justice. If, then, we are asked to acknowledge, not formally, but in effect, that we have neither priests nor sacraments, the reply is clear—that our present Episcopate is in all respects the true and lineal descendant of the Apostolic mission in this land. If we are required to renounce communion with the Church of England on the ground that she is heretical, we reply again that there is nothing in her authorized teaching which is not taught in the pulpits and catechisms of the Roman Church itself. It is not by demands such as these, which are inconsistent with loyalty to our own communion and to our Episcopate, that the day when the two Communions will be made one, to the infinite joy of Christian hearts, and, as we trust, to the incalculable blessing of millions of our fellow men, will be brought about."

EXPLAIN TO THE UTTERMOST.

"'We must explain to the uttermost,' the Cardinal said; and on the Anglican side it is needless to mention the names of Bishop Forbes, of Brechin, of Bishop Hamilton, of Salisbury, who concluded his aspirations for unity contained in that charge which will ever make his name famous, with the words, when speaking of the Pope, 'Non ille nobis cedet sed

nos unâ cum illo cedemus Deo'; of Bishop Gray, of Capetown, who declared that every sacrifice short of truth should be made for the cause of union; and last, but not least, of Dr. Pusey, of whom Mr. Ambrose de Lisle, himself a Roman Catholic layman—who, to quote his friend and mine, the late Rev. H. N. Oxenham, concentrated the life-long devotion of his talents, his energies, and his prayers on the work of promoting the reunion of the separate Churches in one faith and fold—did not hesitate to say, 'That it was not possible for any Catholic to read what Dr. Pusey had written without being convinced that the Church of England holds, either implicitly or explicitly, the main great verities of Catholic doctrine, and that if ever, in the good providence of God, the divisions which now rend asunder the Christian Church are healed, that glorious result will be more due to the services and exertions of Dr. Pusey than to any other man living.'"

THE POPE CAN DO MORE THAN ANYBODY ELSE TO DISPEL THE DIFFERENCES OF THREE CENTURIES.

"It does seem to me that if the present Pope were, so far as England is concerned, to inaugurate such a policy by taking steps for a complete investigation into the subject of Anglican Orders, it might lead to a renewal of relations which might eventuate in nothing less than the reunion of Western Christendom. Certainly the recognition of the validity of the Orders conferred by the English Church would not of itself bring about reunion: many other grave and difficult questions would remain behind. At the best it would only put the Anglican Communion in the same position as regards the Roman Church as that occupied by the great Communions of the East; but no one can doubt that such a recognition, though it would not be everything, would be a step, and a great step, in the direction of unity. Nothing tends to keep up the irritation between Rome and England so much as the apparent denial of the validity of our Orders and Sacraments. That question out of the way, the whole relation between the two Communions would be put on quite a different footing—a footing which would facilitate other negotiations in their turn. I shall not believe such a step impossible. I say a step, for it is folly to suppose that we can hope to sign a concordat between Lambeth and the Vatican to-morrow. A new national attitude in regard to the relations of Christian bodies has to be taken up. The misunderstandings and prejudices of three centuries have to be dispelled. But I am convinced that no one can do so much as the Pope himself in this direction. I could even conceive an overture from Rome to England of such a character as might almost transform the whole national attitude in regard to the Roman Church and the question of reunion with the Holy See."

AN HONEST AND COURAGEOUS AVOWAL.

"Meanwhile, on our side the main point we have to insist upon at the present time is that reunion is to be worked for, prayed for, that the present is an opportunity which, once lost, may never occur again. Do not let us be afraid to speak plainly of the possibility, of the desirability, of a union with Rome. Let us say boldly we desire peace with Rome with all our hearts. Public opinion will never be influenced if we hold our tongues. It is influenced by those who, without any concealment, have the courage of their opinions. It is the interest of the whole Church of Christ, it is the interest of political order, it is the interest of the human race that these estrangements in the Christian family should cease. The cause is good, we have no need to be ashamed of it. Let us frankly avow it to be our own. One thing above all others let us do. Let us take the opportunity of the appeal made by the present Encyclical to assure Leo XIII. that we, at least, are grateful for his efforts—that he may rely upon a sympathetic answer to any appeal he may make to the Church of England."