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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

MARCH, 1896.

ART. I.—THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE PENTATEUCH.

No. IV.—THE NARRATIVE OF CREATION (*continued*).

IN Gen. i. 4 we have an elliptical construction, rare even in the Pentateuch itself, but falling in well with the condensed form in which the thoughts of the writer are cast. Readers of English literature know how, in the poetry of Tennyson, a similarly condensed method of composition is adopted, thus proving the point on which I have already insisted—that condensation of style is not inconsistent with the highest form of poetry. It is also worth noticing that possibly the particular construction of which I am now speaking may be archaic in its character.[1] "And God saw that it was good" is in the Hebrew, וירא אלהים כי טוב. The more usual Hebrew construction would be כי טוב הוא. And we find that construction in chaps. iii. 7, 10, 11; xii. 11, 14, 18. All these six passages are from JE.[2] The construction "he saw," or "believed," or "knew," followed by כי, with an adjective, seems hardly to occur outside the Pentateuch. It is true that "praise the Lord for He is good" (כי טוב, without הוא) is found in post-exilic writings, as in 1 Chron. xvi. 34; 2 Chron. v. 13; and the critics may make the most they can of this fact. But it is to be observed (1) that the constructions are not absolutely identical; and that (2) so far as they are similar, they are as easily accounted for on the ground that post-exilic poets cast their thoughts into archaic form from long use and reverence as in any other way. There are one or two further considerations in regard to the use of the word טוב. In the first place, we have precisely the same construction as here in Jacob's song

[1] I say nothing of the well-known archaism חיהו ארץ in i. 24, quoted three times in the Psalms, because I am chiefly dealing with the question of *common authorship*.

[2] An intermediate construction is found in Gen. xxxiii. 13 (JE).

(chap. xlix. 15), thus corroborating the idea that it is characteristic of the earlier Hebrew. And the use of the word טוֹב (good) in reference to natural phenomena, is far more characteristic of the Pentateuch than of the later books, where the idea of moral goodness or usefulness is predominant. JE has it in Gen. ii. 12 in precisely the same sense as it is used in chap. i. (P). Even in that sense the Pentateuch and pre-exilic books usually have טוב בעיני, where the generally admitted post-exilic books have טוב לפני—another indication that P is not a post-exilic work.

The next word we shall notice is "he divided" (ויבדל). Considerably more than half the times this word is found in the Hiphil or causative voice are in the Pentateuch. Elsewhere it only occurs in that voice in Kings and Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, besides twice in Isaiah, and twice in Ezekiel. It occurs several times in Gen. i., and in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers. It does not appear in JE, but it appears *four times in Deuteronomy*, in iv. 41, x. 8, xix. 7, and xxix. 20 (Heb.). Now we are told that the Deuteronomist is in close affinity with the narrative of JE, on which the Deuteronomic narrative is said to be founded. Whence then comes this affinity in style between P and Deuteronomy? Is it more probable that P imitates the Deuteronomist, or that Gen. i. and Deuteronomy are by the same author? It is worthy of note that the Hiphil voice of the word in question only occurs in this chapter of Genesis, once in Exodus, once in Numbers,[1] and several times in Leviticus.

The next expression we have to notice is מתחת, followed by ל, meaning *under*, and denoting the position of an object relative to some other object above it. This phrase occurs twice in the Pentateuch, and three times in 1 Kings. Of the occasions in which it is found in the Pentateuch it occurs once in the passages assigned to P, and *once in those attributed to JE*, thus affording an indication of the common authorship of both of them. We might refer to the evident reference to the narrative of the creation in the use of the word רקיע (firmament) in Ezek. i. and Ps. xix.[2] But Professor Cheyne, with a single wave of the critical wand, has dismissed at least the argument from Ps. xix. for ever. In his "Bampton Lectures" he has boldly asserted the post-exilic origin of the whole Psalter.[3] It may not be altogether superfluous to observe (1) that this theory depends entirely on the unsupported assertion of

[1] The word is found in the Niphal voice in Num. xvi. 21 with a reflexive signification.

[2] Also Ezek. x. 1, Dan. xii. 3, and Ps. cl. 1.

[3] With some insignificant exceptions.

Professor Cheyne; (2) that in spite of the obvious temptation to suppress the awkward witness of the Psalter to the pre-exilic existence of the Law, he is here deserted by his brother English critics; and that (3) it is a little extraordinary that no authentic information should have come down to us concerning the hymns used in religious worship by so unique a people as the Jews, the more especially as such information has come down to us in considerable profusion in the case of other nations certainly not more remarkable in the world's history. But if Professor Cheyne is right, Ezekiel, the "father of Judaism," must have coined the word רקיע, and his dutiful son, the author of the Priestly Code, embodied it in his "dry and prosaic" account of the creation.

The word עשב (herbage) occurs thirty-three times in Scripture, of which fifteen, or very nearly half, are in the Pentateuch. Once more, save in the Pentateuch, it does not occur in any but the poetic books. It never once occurs in the later historical narratives (for in 2 Kings xix. 26 it comes in only as an extract from a prophecy of Isaiah). Therefore we have here yet another illustration of the "dry and formal" style of the priestly writer. Another instance of the arbitrary way in which the critical theories have been constructed is the fact that the word, besides occurring *four* times in Gen i., occurs also in Gen. ii. 5. Ordinary persons would see in this a sign that Gen. i. and ii. are a consecutive narrative by one author. But the new criticism has decided that the extract from the priestly author ceases with the first half of chap. ii. 4—an assertion to which we shall presently recur—and that the second half of chap. ii. 4, and thence forward, up to the end of chap. iv., belongs to JE. But we have not yet done with עשב. It occurs again in iii. 18 (JE) and ix. 3 (P), and also in Exod. ix. 22, 25; and x. 12, 15 (JE). It will be found in Deut. xi. 15, where the same phrase, "herbage of the field," is used as in Gen. ii. 5, iii. 18, but in a connection which irresistibly suggests the narrative of creation in Gen. i. Lastly, it occurs in Deut. xxix. 22 (A.V. 23)—that is to say, it occurs alike in the supposed fused narrative of the Elohist and Jehovist, in Deuteronomy, and in the Priestly Code, under circumstances which strongly suggest identity of authorship, or, if not, at least the *priority of the Priestly Code.* But the fact that עשב is *never once* used outside the Pentateuch in a narrative passage appears something like a proof positive that it is an archaic word, which, as such, became eventually the exclusive property of poetry.

In verse 12 the word מין (*kind* or *species*) is one of the words supposed to be characteristic of P, and therefore every

passage in which it occurs is unhesitatingly assigned to the post-exilic priestly author. We shall probably find hereafter that this hard-and-fast rule, rigidly adhered to, involves its framers in some unexpected difficulties. For the present, however, we content ourselves with remarking that on this principle the unexampled use of משפחה (family or tribe) in place of מין, in Gen. viii. 19, ought to lead to that verse being assigned to another author. But it is nevertheless unhesitatingly assigned to P. Moreover, the word מין occurs *also in Deuteronomy*.[1]

In verse 17 the use of the word נתן (to give), in the sense of to *place* or *set*, is almost entirely confined to the Pentateuch. Yet it is found in Gen. xli. 42, 48, Numb. xv. 38 (JE), as well as in P, another indication of unity of authorship.

We come next to the word שרץ (verb and noun), verse 20. Out of the Pentateuch it only occurs once in the Psalms and once in Ezekiel. It occurs repeatedly in Genesis and Leviticus. But one of the passages is Exod. viii. 3 (A.V. vii. 28). This is assigned to JE.[2] The word also occurs once in Deuteronomy (xiv. 19). We may observe that if the word only occurs in Ezekiel and the post-exilic writers, it ought to be a *late* word. But, as if to refute this hypothesis, it slips in most naturally in JE's account of the rapid multiplication of the frogs in the history of the plagues. And it is also found in a passage of Deuteronomy *parallel to one in Levit. xi.* The inference is, once more, that it is an *early* word, that the books which contain it were written about the same time and under the same influence, and it survived in the later poetical literature alone.

In verses 20, 21, we meet with the expression נפש החיה ("the living soul"). With the article this expression occurs, so far as I have been able to ascertain, *only* in P. נפש חיה, without the article, occurs also in JE (chap. ii. 7, 19). But it also occurs *without* the article in chap. i. 24, 30 (assigned to P). The expression in either form rarely, if ever, occurs save in the account of the Creation and of the Flood.[3] And the inference is that in both these accounts the writer, whether he be Moses or anyone else, is neither indebted to the Elohist, nor the

[1] Professor Driver, in his Introduction, has a curious note on this word. He quotes it repeatedly from P, and then proceeds, "*hence* Deut. xiv. 13, 14, 15, 18." But if P be posterior to Deuteronomy, how can the latter be deduced from the former ?

[2] Professor Driver has made a slip in his Introduction here. He has assigned Exod. viii. 3 (following the numbering of the English version) to JE. But elsewhere he includes the passage (Introduction, p. 123), among those assigned to P.

[3] Only in Ezek. xlvii. 9, outside the Pentateuch, as far as I have been able to discover.

Jehovist, nor the author of the Priestly Code, but to sundry Babylonian traditions handed down among the Jews either orally or in a written form. As a matter of fact, we *know* that this was so in regard to the Flood, for the same tradition, though in a different and early Babylonian shape, has recently been discovered. We shall see hereafter that the early chapters of Genesis stand apart from the rest of the narrative, even of Genesis itself, by reason of their marked archaic character. And, as we have seen, we have also some ground for concluding that much of the language in which the narrative is cast is almost as archaic as the narrative itself.

Both the verb and the substantive רמש (in the sense of creep, creeping thing) are seldom found out of the Pentateuch —never, once more, save in the poetic works.[1] In the great majority of instances in which they occur the passages are assigned to P. But it occurs twice in JE—Gen. vi. 7 and vii. 23. It is found once more in Deut. iv. 18, in a passage which irresistibly recalls the language of Gen. i. Once more, then, we are face to face with indications of a common authorship of the Pentateuch.

Lastly, the word כבש (subdue) supplies us with a singular instance of the weight to be attached to the new criticism. The word is a somewhat rare one altogether. It occurs only *three times* in the Pentateuch, once here, and twice in Numb. xxxii. In verse 29 of that chapter it is assigned to P, but in verse 22, where it occurs in *precisely the same collocation*, it is assigned to JE. Therefore, it is plain that in that passage *P is quoting* JE. But if the one author quotes the other, neither their matter nor their words are independent. Where, then, are the *criteria* in this passage which enable the critics to separate the matter of the one author from that of the other?

It will, I think, be seen that if so many passages can be adduced from one single chapter in Genesis to show how incomplete and one-sided the supposed infallible critical analysis is proved to be, we are amply entitled to ask Christian men not to be in such a hurry as they have been to imagine that criticism has said its last word upon the question. It is true that Professor Driver argues (Introduction, p. 124) that not the *occurrence* of a word, but the *frequency* of its occurrence, is the sign of a particular author. He instances the use of εὐθύς by St. Mark, and remarks that the word also occurs in St. Matthew and St. Luke. But he forgets that in the latter case we are dealing with the *known*, in the former with the

[1] It does occur, however, once, in 1 Kings iv. 13. But there it appears to be a reminiscence of Gen. i., such as would naturally occur to a mind familiar with its contents.

unknown.[1] If some critic were to arise and deal with St. Mark as Professor Driver and those of his school have dealt with the Pentateuch, the occurrence of the well-known phrase καὶ εὐθύς in a passage assigned to the original Mark (or Ur-Markus, as the Germans would call it), when that phrase had been distinctly set down as a characteristic of a second writer of, say, the fourth century A.D., would be utterly fatal to the theory. For the hypothesis is that JE and P are not only distinct, but *so* distinct that their styles cannot possibly be confounded. We should not, therefore, expect to find in the former expressions characteristic of the latter. But not only is this frequently the case with the language of JE as compared with that of P in the chapter we have been examining, but our examination has proved that there are many indications of a *common authorship of the whole Pentateuch*. It is imperative, therefore, that the whole question should be reinvestigated, and from a different and wider point of view. I venture to repeat my firm conviction that, when such an examination has been fully carried out, the present critical analysis of the Pentateuch will be abandoned.

J. J. Lias.

Art. II.—ARMENIA.

CIVILIZED Europe is just now having its attention directed towards Armenia, and the utmost interest and pity are being felt for a people suffering sore persecution at the hands of the Mahommedan masters. It is an old story, Armenia having been the scene of such troubles for many years past. A system of unavowed persecution has been going on, with a view to crushing the spirit of the Armenian people, probably the strongest and most independent race now held in thrall by Turkey. Of late this persecution has driven the people into open revolt against their tyrants, and the first symptoms of disaffection have been met with the most cruel and unrelenting reprisals on the part of the Turkish Government. One result has been to call for concerted action from the leading Powers of Europe; and Great Britain, France, Russia, Germany, Austria, and Italy are all interested in putting an end to this great international and intolerable scandal. How long the struggle will last, and what the end shall be, it is impossible to say; but many things seem to point to the imminent disruption of the Turkish empire, and to the mystical drying up

[1] Professor Driver, too, in the passage to which I am referring, is dealing with the ordinary use of the common word משפחה. His argument will not apply to the uncommon words I have mentioned in the text.

of the waters of the Euphrates. So great an oppression of a Christian race on the part of the Mussulman power will, we must trust, not continue to be suffered; the conscience of Christian Europe will revolt against it.

Events like these naturally draw closer attention to the country, and it will not be out of place, therefore, in the present crisis to say something in this paper about Armenia, its people, its Church, and history.

Let us, first of all, ascertain the exact locality. Armenia is a country of about 500 miles in extent in both directions, lying in a south-easterly direction between the Black Sea and the Caspian Sea. It consists for the most part of lofty plateaus, in whose higher elevations are found the fountain-heads of the Tigris, Euphrates, and Araxes rivers. These mountain systems all show evidence of volcanic origin, and many of them exhibit extinct craters. The hot mineral springs and the frequent earthquakes that have taken place over the region tell the same tale. The loftiest mountain in the country is Ararat, which rises to an elevation of some 17,000 feet; it dominates the land, and, indeed, has given its name to the entire district. If we look at Isa. xxxvii. 38, where we are told that the two parricides who slew the Assyrian king "escaped into the land of Armenia," we shall find that the word in the original is "Ararat." A most unnecessary change was made by the translators of the Old Testament, which, however, is corrected in the Revised Version. This is the only place in the Bible where we find the word "Armenia," and, as we have seen, it has no right to be there. But is there no other Biblical reference to a country which bordered so closely on other historic lands as Assyria and Media, and lay not so very far from Syria and Northern Palestine?

In Gen. x. 3 we read of Togarmah, a son of Gomer, and brother of Ashkenaz and Riphath. As a geographical term, Togarmah has always been connected with Armenia, and a reference to Ezek. xxvii. 14 and xxxviii. 6 will bear out this view. The people here intended, according to Grimm, are the ancient inhabitants of Armenia. This learned authority derives Togarmah from "two elements—*toka*, which in Sanscrit is 'tribe,' and Armah (Armenia)"—a view that may well be accepted, says Rawlinson.[1] This latter writer goes on to say: "The Armenian tradition which derived the Haikian race from Thorgau, as it can scarcely be a coincidence, must be regarded as having considerable value." And he points to another clue, that of language: "The existing Armenians, the

[1] Rawlinson's "Origin of Nations," p. 183.

legitimate descendants of those who occupied the country in the time of Ezekiel, speak a language which modern ethnologists pronounce to be decidedly Indo-European, and thus so far the modern science confirms the Scriptural account."[1] We may find a further connecting-link in the character of the trade carried on, according to Ezekiel, with Tyre: "They of the house of Togarmah traded for thy wares with horses, and war-horses, and mules." Now, according to ancient authorities, these mountain valleys, in consequence of the vast number of horses raised there, gave the character to the country of *σφόδρα ἱπποβότος*. We learn from Strabo that the horses of the district were held in high estimation as "the celebrated Nisæan breed."[2] It remains to be said that the Armenians themselves have from the earliest times associated their race with the house of Togarmah.

A name that has also come to the front during the present troubles as a designation for the district is the beautiful title "Anatolia," *i.e.*, the land of the rising sun, a title which finds its equivalent in the Levant or the Orient, these being general terms for those lands lying to the east of the Mediterranean Sea.

The country there is populated by a branch of the great Indo-European family, most likely a reflux wave of those Phrygian settlers who originally passed into Europe from Asia.[3] It was remarked of old by Eudoxus that the Armenians resembled the Phrygians in their language (*τῇ φωνῇ πολλὰ φρυγίζουσι*).[4]

Modern Armenia is divided between Russia, Turkey, and Persia, and between these rival powers has endured much persecution and misery. Her Christian population has always suffered evil things at their hands, and this present outbreak is probably an effort to attain to some kind of autonomy, and get free at least from the oppressive yoke of the Moslems.

Of all the races in this western portion of Asia, the Armenians alone have shown any capability of rising superior to their environment and promising better things, and their powerful character must sooner or later, unless the people are exterminated, exercise a marked influence in determining the fortunes of this part of the world. Their intellect is characterized, according to Mr. Tozer, by great depth and sobriety; their upper classes are known throughout the Turkish empire as leading bankers and merchants.[5] But, indeed, they are to

[1] Rawlinson's "Origin of Nations," p. 183.
[2] See article in Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," i., pp. 108, 109.
[3] See Herodotus, vii. 73.
[4] See Bevan in "Dictionary of the Bible," iii., pp. 1527.
[5] Tozer's "Church and Eastern Empire," pp. 84-7.

be found everywhere, from London and Manchester in the West, to Madras and Calcutta in the East. The leading cities of Europe — Paris, Amsterdam, Vienna, Dresden, Genoa, Venice—own among their most respected and influential traders men of Armenian birth. Out of the four millions of Armenian people, scarcely half the race are to be found dwelling in their own country.

The Armenians are described as a tall people, of a dark-brown complexion, quick and intelligent. The women are handsome and remarkable for their fine black eyes. They are very industrious, and given to weaving rich fabrics of silk and wool, as well as carpets. Their houses, however, as Mr. Tozer describes them, are anything but comfortable or a credit to their civilization, being chiefly built of clay and rough stones, with an outer court for their animals and an inner one for themselves.

The history of this people is on the whole a sad one. Armenia has never won the place which would seem to belong to it as one of the most ancient nationalities of the East. From the fall of the Sassanidæ or later Persian empire in the seventh century, the country was fought for by the Eastern empire and the Saracens. For a brief period—859 to 1045—it was ruled by a native dynasty of able princes—the Bagratidæ. The kingdom was then conquered by the Byzantines, and they made way for the entrance of the Turks into Asia Minor. From this time forward the country became the prey of Mahommedan rulers, until at length the largest portion of it was incorporated in the Ottoman empire, under whose régime it has groaned ever since.

It remains to say something on the subject of the Armenian Church and its literature. The religion of Armenia before its evangelization seems to have partaken of the nature-worship so common in the East. The character of the Anatolian religion, its essence, says Professor Ramsay, "lies in the adoration of the life of nature—that life subject apparently to death, yet never dying, but reproducing itself in new forms, different, and yet the same. This perpetual self-identity under varying forms, this annihilation of death through the power of self-reproduction, was the object of an enthusiastic worship characterized by remarkable self-abandonment and immersion in the divine, by a mixture of obscene symbolism and sublime truths, by negation of the moral distinctions and family ties that exist in a more developed society, but do not exist in the free life of nature."[1] This was the form of heathen worship, in a measure refined and sublimated by contact with Greek

[1] See the *Contemporary Review*, October, 1893, p. 565.

culture and philosophy, that Christianity had to meet in its first efforts to evangelize the country.

Tradition gives the honour to St. Bartholomew and St. Jude of being the first Christian missionaries to the Armenians, but it is a tradition feebly supported. It is also on record that Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, towards the close of the second century, wrote an epistle to the Armenian Christians, who were under the authority of Meruzanes, a native bishop. The historic founder of the Church of Armenia was undoubtedly St. Gregory the Illuminator, who flourished in the opening years of the fourth century, and from whom it has been called the Gregorian Church.

The story of Gregorius is a strange one. He was born A.D. 257 at Valashabad, the capital of the province of Ararat. They were days of persecution, and the infant child was saved from death when the rest of his family perished in the massacres ordered by Tiridates III. He was taken to the Cappadocian Cæsarea, where he was baptized and brought up a Christian. When grown up to man's estate he returned to his native country, where his life was again threatened by the king. The sufferings he endured survive in the legend of "the twelve tortures of St. Gregory." An evidence that Christianity already existed in the country may be found in the tradition that, when cast into a noisome pit, his life was preserved by the ministrations of a Christian woman. As the result of his labours, Gregory was at last permitted to baptize the king and his court in the Euphrates, and a general destruction of the idol temples followed.

We must always associate the name of the great evangelist who won Armenia to the faith with the thought of light. It was the name he gained for himself—Gregory Lusavoritch, *i.e.*, the Illuminator. In his day he told of the great vision he had witnessed of the descent from heaven of One grave and majestic, whose presence was of light. On the spot where the revelation came to him he built a church, and called it the Church of Etchmiadzin, *i.e.*, the descent of the only Begotten One. The place continues to be sacred in the eyes of the Armenians, and boasts of the oldest monastery in the world. It is believed to be rich in MSS., which may yet see the light.

In the year 302 Gregory was consecrated first Primate of the Armenian Church by Leontius, Bishop of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia. After having presided over the Church for thirty years, and arranged for its future episcopal government, and having founded many schools and churches, Gregory, as was the custom in those days, retired from office, and spent the close of his life in seclusion. He was succeeded by his son. When Gregory heard of the decrees of the Council of Nicæa, it

is recorded that he burst into an exclamation of thanksgiving in the following words: "Now let us praise Him who was before the world's worshipping the most Holy Trinity, and the Godhead of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, now and ever, world without end"—words which continue to this day to be added to the Creed when recited in the Armenian Church.[1]

Among those who immediately followed Gregory in his good work of building up the Church in Armenia may be mentioned Mesrobes, Moses, Eznik, and Isaac. Mesrobes was born in 354, at Hasecasus, now Mush. In 386 he took orders, and devoted himself with zeal to destroying the last remnants of idolatry in Armenia. He is chiefly known, however, for his labours in creating a native Christian literature. He supplanted the old Syriac tongue with a vernacular language, and for that purpose originated an Armenian alphabet. He established schools in all directions, and sent his scholars to study at Athens, Constantinople, Alexandria, and even as far as Rome, from which places they brought back with them copies of the Holy Scriptures and the works of the Fathers, as well as heathen writers. One result of this was a Hellenizing movement, similar to that which repeated itself more than once in the literary history of the country. Among treasures thus preserved was Tatian's "Diatessaron," which was originally translated into Latin from the Armenian Commentary of St. Ephraim, and published at Venice in 1875 by Dr. Moesinger, Professor of Theology in the University of Salzburg.[2] Aided by scholars of a kindred spirit, Mesrobes succeeded in having the sacred Scriptures translated into the Armenian tongue. Chief among these scholars was Moses Khorenensis, "called by his countrymen the father of history, the poet, and the grammarian." After studying in nearly all the learned schools of the West, Moses returned to Armenia, where he died in 488, his age being represented as equal to that of his Hebrew namesake. Many of his writings are still extant, including his "History of Armenia," his "Homily on our Lord's Transfiguration," and his Hymns. This history, says Professor Stokes, "embodies almost the only remains of pre-Christian Armenian literature we now possess, and preserves for us many of the songs and traditions retained at that time in popular memory."[3] It may be added that Moses did much to fix the character of the Armenian liturgy.

[1] Mr. Malan published a translation of the "Life and Times of St. Gregory" from the Armenian of Vartabad Matthew.

[2] See Professor Hemphill's "Diatessaron," p. xx. *et seq.* A more complete translation has since been made from an Arabic version with the assistance of experts by the Rev. J. H. Hill, B.D.

[3] Article on Moses in "Dictionary of Christian Biography." According

One of the most learned of the ancient Armenian scholars was Eznik, who chiefly distinguished himself by his noble protest against the Persian viceroy, Mihr-Nersh, when he sought to Zoroastrianize the Church. He wrote "The Destruction of False Doctrines," which is still extant in the Armenian original, and has been translated into French, and a portion of it into German. The whole work, according to Lipsius, "is divided into four books: the first combats the Gentile doctrine of the eternal Father, the second the Zoroastrian religion, the third Greek philosophy, the fourth the Gnostic sect of the Marcionites."[1]

The last Primate of the stock of Gregory was St. Isaac—Sahag the Great, as he is called, who reigned over the Armenian Church for the long period of nearly half a century, and died in 441. His long patriarchate was marked by many leading events, culminating in the destruction of Armenia as an independent nation, when it was reduced to subjection by the Sassanidæ. He assisted Moses in revising the Armenian liturgy, which remains unaltered to the present day as the Divine Service of the Gregorian Church. It is chiefly a compilation from the liturgies of St. Basil and St. Athanasius.

The principal characteristics of the doctrines and ritual of the Armenian Church may be thus summed up: At baptism, infants are sprinkled and dipped three times, and Confirmation is administered immediately afterwards by the priest. The Eucharist is celebrated with the unmixed cup and leavened bread. The latter is dipped in the wine before administration. Both species are given to the laity. Extreme unction is administered to the clergy only, and that after death. The Eucharistic Service is said in the old Armenian tongue, but in preaching the vernacular is used. Children are communicated; no figures or crucifixes are allowed in the churches; a plain cross, however, with the figure of our Lord painted on it, stands on the altar. A sanctuary lamp is always burning, and the cope is worn at all services. The secular clergy are allowed to marry, but only before ordination. The Sacrament is reserved in the churches, but no genuflexions are allowed on entering or leaving the church; no one, however, can enter the sanctuary without first removing his shoes.

There is some difficulty in ascertaining correctly the confessional standpoint of the Armenian Church. It is accused of holding the Eutychian heresy, and denying the twofold

---

to the American missionary, Dr. Dwight, a very ancient MS. copy of the history still exists written on parchment in the Armenian college at Tiflis.

[1] Article on Eznik, "Dictionary of Christian Biography."

nature of Christ. A good authority, Dr. Neale, in his "History of the Eastern Church," denies the truth of this charge, and says the Church is orthodox. Certainly there is no trace of Eutychianism in its acknowledged formularies. The error seems to have arisen in a curious way—in rejecting, through jealousy, it is said, the enactments of the Council of Chalcedon, which condemned the Eutychian heresy. It is stated that this was done at the Synod of Dovin, or Thevin, in 536; but in the second volume of Tschamtschean's "History of Armenia," published in 1785, it is clearly shown that this is a mistake, and that no such dogmatic utterance of only one nature in Christ was made.[1] There are other vouchers for the orthodoxy of the Church, such as Professor Felix Neve, of Louvain, and in England the Rev. George Williams. On May 13, 1885, the Rev. C. G. Curtis printed in the *Guardian* a remarkable letter from M. Baghos Dadian to the Archbishop of Paris, in which he says: "The Armenian Church has constantly recognised Jesus Christ to be true God and true man, and consequently the two natures in the one Person—the Person of the Word." Thus it has at all times rejected the opposite errors of Nestorius and Eutyches. He traces the chief cause of the mistake to the ambiguity of the Armenian word for φυσις, which means more properly *personne*.

From the original National Church of Armenia, the head of which has the title of "Servant of Jesus Christ, by the Grace of God Catholicos of all the Armenians, and Patriarch of the Holy Convent of Etchmiadzin," there sprang subsequently two branches—the Jacobite, or West Syrian Church, and the Uniats, the latter acknowledging the Papal supremacy. The dispersion of the Armenians led in early times to the establishment of two subordinate patriarchates, one at Constantinople, to take charge of the Armenian Churches in Eastern and Southern Europe, and the other at Jerusalem.

The Anglican Communion has never had any official dealings with the Armenian Church, but there have been from time to time acts of individual courtesy and Christian consideration. Thus, when Henry Martyn died, in 1812, a lonely stranger at Tocat, his remains were interred, by order of the Catholicos Ephraim, with the greatest possible respect. In the cathedral church at Etchmiadzin lie the remains of Mr. Macdonald, British Envoy at the Persian Court, and a memorial tablet was allowed to be erected to his memory. As lately as 1891 two English clergymen, at the request of the Archbishop of Canterbury, visited the heads of the Armenian Church to learn something of their spiritual wants, when an earnest

[1] See Hefele's "Church Councils," vol. iv., p. 145.

entreaty was made that the English Church should do something towards helping them to educate their priesthood, as had been already done in the case of the Chaldæan Christians.

We learn from the "Handbook of Foreign Missions" that the American Presbyterians have been for many years busy in Armenia, with a view to extending a knowledge of Gospel truth among the inhabitants. They have been working in the country for about half a century, and have built many churches and schools. They have also four colleges for higher education. In connection with this mission there are about 11,000 adherents. This work has been much interfered with by the present disturbances. What seems to be really wanting, however, is a movement towards elevating and purifying the native Church itself; but all efforts in this direction must be suspended until we know what is to be the fate of this unfortunate country. Just now there seems to be a danger lest Armenia itself, with its venerable church, should be wiped out of existence as an independent nationality through sheer brute force and cruelty. As a recent article in the *Spectator* says: "It is, as we conceive, quite one of the chances of the present day that the ancient Armenian people, who are as Aryan as the ancient Persians or ourselves, may pass from the face of the earth, dying finally of Turkish violence and European betrayal."[1]

J. A. Carr, LL.D.

Art. III.—THE NATURE OF THE CHURCH CATHOLIC.

THE discussions which have been so rife during the last year or two concerning the unity of Christendom, and the kind of action by which union might be promoted amongst the separated bodies of Christians, have necessarily involved assumptions as to what the nature of the Church is; and they have also stimulated inquiry into the authority and the truth of such assumptions. We in England may be said to have inherited two principal definitions of the Church of Christ. 1. The Church is defined by some as consisting of the aggregate of those Christian communions which have preserved a valid succession from the Apostles, and which may, on that account, be regarded as representing the one Catholic Church of the earliest ages. 2. It is defined by others as consisting of all the persons, belonging to any communion, whom God sees to be truly converted and to have the right character of

[1] *Spectator*, November 30, 1895.

believers in Christ. These persons are sometimes said to constitute the "invisible" Church—not that they are themselves invisible, for they are as visible as their fellow-Christians—but because they are a select portion of those who outwardly profess to be Christians, and no man can claim to see with certainty who they are that belong to this select portion. The view of the Church which I am about to advocate, as having advantages for present thought and action over these two, and as the true Apostolic view, may be thus summarily stated:

The Church is a Divine structure, consisting of Christ the Head, and of men as His ideal members: this ideal Divine organism is not identical with any existing society or combination of societies, but is the order and life which all Christian societies and their members imperfectly and inadequately represent, and into which it is appointed to them to grow, and the spiritual reality which binds them all in one.

The difficulties which make it hard for any Christians to apply their doctrine of the Church to the actual circumstances of Christendom are so well known that I need only touch upon them briefly. The Roman Catholic position has the advantage—so highly estimated as an attribute of doctrine at the present time—of being the most definite. The Church of Christ is the Papal Church, and the definition of the Papal Church is that it is governed by the absolute authority of the Pope. A Roman Catholic might hold that view with entire comfort if there were no other Christians besides Roman Catholics in the world. But what is he to make of the non-Papal Christian bodies—of our poor Church of England, for one? At the opposite pole, the view of Evangelical Protestants—that the Church of Christ consists of all truly converted Christians in every communion—has also a certain simplicity. I need not dwell on the arguments which may be brought against it: the chief real difficulty which besets it in our day goes to the heart of it. The belief in a class of converted Christians, separated by a change of nature from the fellow-Christians who look so like them, has almost ceased to be a living one. The Congregtionalist inherits the doctrine that he and the fellow-members of his congregation know themselves and each other to belong to such a class; but it is hard for him to hold it. He will protest that he does not pretend to decide who are true believers and who are not; but he would also prefer not to have to answer the question whether there is a division between the true and the nominal believers—in fact and in God's sight—so deep that all on one side of it belong to the body of Christ, and all on the other side of it are separate from Christ. Anglican Catholics have their own difficulties. Making much of succession, they cannot help

being impressed by the prestige of the Roman Church, which —if the question of corruption of doctrine and practice be put aside—must be admitted to hold the best position in Christendom as representing the old undivided Church. Many Anglicans, as we know, have been disturbed by doubts whether a Church openly rebelling against the see of Rome and excommunicated by that see, like our own, may not have cut itself off from the Church Catholic. If they fall back on doctrine and practice, and are convinced that the pretensions of the Pope are extravagant, and that in many other things Rome has wandered far from the ways of the primitive Church, they seem to be constituting themselves judges, and to be approaching dangerously near to the position of the Protestant bodies which care nothing for succession, but are ready to maintain, as they do with various degrees of plausibility, that each of them is the most faithful representative of Apostolical Christianity. These Protestant bodies must be a perpetual difficulty to the High Anglican of to-day. He knows something of them, and he is constrained to confess that they seem to be endowed with every Christian quality. The Protestant communities have learning, saintliness, zeal; they abound in good works; the devotion they show to Christ is rewarded with remarkable successes in the converting of the heathen; but they have not the Apostolical succession; therefore, they do not belong to the Church Catholic—that is, to the body of Christ. What can this mean and imply? Will Christ say to them, "I never knew you"? If not, what sort of relation have they to Christ? Is the spirit of Christ given as freely outside the Church as within it?—to those who do not belong to His body as to His members?

To the philosophical observer, contemplating Christianity from the outside, there is no problem in the multitude and variety of the Christian communions. He is familiar with the tendencies to variation, and can trace with more or less of sureness how each of these bodies began to diverge, and by what causes it has been led to become what it is. It may interest him to make out how much there is of common Christianity in the creeds and sentiments and practices of all these sections and subsections of Christendom. But we Christians are not so free. We inherit this name of the Church; and the idea of a One Church clings to our Christian minds, and refuses to be over-powered and extinguished by all the divisions which force themselves on our notice. This tenacity of the idea of the Church depends, as we may see, on our belief in *Christ*. All who believe in Christ as at the Father's right hand are obliged to think of Him as the Elder Brother of a family, the head of a body or society, the King of

a commonwealth. The One Lord gives a necessary unity of some kind to those who belong to Him.

And this is precisely the view of the Church which we find in the New Testament. The Church there is a dependency of Christ. The unity of the Church is not derived from any circumscribing line. It depends on Christ the Head.

All Christians, including the Roman Catholics, in their appeal to the past and to authority reach back and up ultimately to the New Testament. In this volume we find the words of Christ and His Apostles, the history of the beginnings of the Church, the rock whence we were hewn, the hole of the pit whence we were digged. The Roman Catholics claim, indeed, that the Church has been developed, and that this development has been under Divine guidance, and that the Church of to-day enjoys the advantages of delegated Divine authority as much as the Church of the Apostolic days—a claim which represents, in a perverted form, what ought to be the universal faith of Christians; but this claim does not bar the appeal to the New Testament as preserving for us the original and essential principles of Christianity and of the Church.

Going back, then, along the lines of the historical Church till we cross the threshold of the New Testament, we come upon the Church as the Apostles found it, and left it. At the close of the Apostolic age there were a number of societies scattered over the cities of the Roman world, the members of which had accepted Jesus the Crucified as Lord and Saviour, and had been moved by a Spirit which they believed to have come from heaven, from the Father and the Son. They had all been baptized into the name of Jesus—that is, into the name of the Son and the Father and the Spirit. They had received the Gospel, directly or indirectly, from the Apostles, or Envoys, of Jesus Christ—the Twelve and St. Paul—and they were under the absolute authority of the Apostles. Every society had for administration and guidance under the Supreme Authority elders or overseers appointed by the Apostles, and in general some ministers or servers also to do practical work. All these societies counted themselves branches of one body, as being all united to Christ, the one Head, and as being moved by the same Spirit. In addition to the one baptism by which every member was received into the body, all the members were accustomed to meet regularly for fellowship, and at their regular meetings they partook of a sacred ceremonial meal—the same in all the societies—which fed a common union to Christ. The name "Church" (ecclesia) came into use for each society and for the whole body. We read constantly of the "Church" and the "Churches," and of the

"brethren," the "saints," the "called," the "faithful," who are the members of the Church. Besides what they were told concerning Jesus Christ by their teachers, the believers were taught that the body to which they belonged came into existence on a certain Day of Pentecost, through the action of an overpowering Spirit, which brought thousands of strangers into joyous brotherhood and partnership.

It is obvious that a line might easily have been drawn round this Apostolic Church. Let this be conceded to those who insist that some circumscription must be found for the Church, to separate it from the rest of mankind. The Church consisted of all the Churches, and those of the members who had been admitted by the baptism, and had not separated themselves or been separated from the communion, which were the badges of the society. There were no Protestants, no Nonconformists, no sects of heretics, in the age of the New Testament. But there were many persons included amongst the members of the Church whom we are surprised to find the Apostles allowing to remain within the fellowship. St. Paul, it is evident, could not have thought of the body of Christ as having its sanctity created by the faith or graces of its members. He refers to misbelieving, to immoral, to insubordinate Christians, without showing any desire to drive them out of the Church. He nowhere gives the least hint of making a distinction in his own mind between the truly converted as constituting the body of Christ and the other merely professing Christians as not belonging to the body. Believing, as he did, in the holiness of the Church, he could not have regarded this holiness as identical with, or dependent upon, the purity and devoutness of its actual members.

St. Paul may be said to be the theological exponent of the doctrine of the Church amongst the New Testament writers; and his account of the Church is chiefly to be found in the Epistle to the Ephesians. In the first half of the epistle he sets forth the calling of Christians, and in the second half the duties which spring out of the calling. The idea of the Church is closely associated with the calling—the calling being the expression of the eternal Divine purpose. The Apostle saw in Christ God choosing men to be His children, holy and without blemish, before Him in love. That this purpose might be carried out, the Son of God was manifested, died, was raised to the Father's right hand, to be the Head of this family of God. Everyone who accepted the Gospel was taken into this family; was joined to Christ as a member of His body. But the reality and perfectness of the family, the society, the body, were in God's purpose and idea. That which St. Paul saw in the Church was what God had made and was making. And

he could, therefore, contemplate the Church without qualification as a perfect body with perfect members. The actual Christians and their societies had all sorts of deformities and weaknesses. But it was God's design that individual members and the several Churches should grow into the perfection of the ideal Church, of the family which God had prepared, of the body which was the proper fulness or completion of the Divine Head. The various institutions and provisions of Christian Church life were given in order that the actual imperfect members might be nourished, and trained, and adjusted into their proper forms and places.

I do not deny that there is a certain difficulty in forming a mental conception of this ideal Church—a Church which is more real than any actual society, because it is God's purpose and creation; but the difficulty seems to me to be of the same kind with that of all our truest theological thoughts. And I offer two or three considerations which may perhaps diminish the difficulty: (1) Christ, contemplated as we know Him, has the ideal Church, so to say, attached to Him. It makes a great difference whether we are looking about for a separate Divine Church on the earth, or are letting Christ in heaven suggest and bring home to us the Church, which is His body. Christ evidently sought to hinder His followers from thinking of Him by Himself. He desired to be associated by them, on the one hand with the Father, on the other hand with mankind. It was a main part of the purpose of His coming, that He should attach men to Himself, and Himself to men. We know Him most truly when we contemplate Him as the Son of the Father and the Head of His body. And the body, thus regarded as completing Christ, becomes easily to our minds ideal, spiritual, prophetic; a vision of what should be and is to be, not made by our imaginations, but discerned in the will of God by our faith. (2) Again, it may be helpful to place the Church by the side of the kingdom of Christ, or of God, or of heaven. During the last generation or two we have been learning how much Christians have lost by falling into a way of identifying the kingdom of heaven with happiness after death. It is generally recognised now that the establishment of the heavenly kingdom on the earth is the key to the Gospel narrative. It is sometimes said that the kingdom of Christ is the Church; and there is substantial truth, I think, in the identification. The kingdom by no means occupies in the Acts and the Epistles the place which it does in the Gospels; and where it does occur, we might sometimes, perhaps, without injury to the sense, substitute the Church for it. But this could not always be done. The name retains its own proper meaning, and suggests the ideas associated with a kingdom

and commonwealth. It should set us thinking of the King, Christ the representative of God, the Son of the Father; of the laws, which are the impulses of the Spirit of Christ; of the franchises and possessions, which are spiritual; of the subjects, who are admitted into it and bound to be loyal to its authority and brotherly with their fellow-citizens; of the territory, which is the world of human feeling and action. We are referring to the same condition of things, whether we speak of Christ as the head of His body, the Church, or as the Prince of the heavenly kingdom. And it seems to me that the idea of the heavenly kingdom, with Christ reigning in it upon the earth as King of kings and Lord of lords, does not demand or invite that circumscription and definition of its subjects which the idea of the Church has been thought to make necessary. (3) A third consideration is, that a parallel may be found for the ideal Church, and the actual Church or Churches in the ideal Christian and the actual man. Take such statements as those of St. John: "Whosoever abideth in Him sinneth not: whosoever sinneth hath not seen Him, neither knoweth Him." "Whosoever is begotten of God doeth no sin, because His seed abideth in him; and he cannot sin, because he is begotten of God." A reader who knows the actual only must be perplexed by such sayings; he will understand the Apostle as implying that there are certain persons, the truly regenerate, who never fall into sin; as dividing mankind between the class of sinless persons, the children of God, and the class of sinners, the children of the devil. But he finds the same Apostle protesting: "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." What St. John means is, that the true son of God does not sin, and cannot sin. He knows that in the actual human beings whom the Father has called His children, there is also another nature different from that of the child of God. What St. John wishes to impress upon his Christian reader is that, when he sins, he is denying his true self, is violating the nature which he has received of the Father. It is right and well that sinful human beings should be called children of God; it is most desirable that every Christian should account himself as a son of God. There is always the true man, of God's making, accompanying the imperfect sinning man; and to this ideal man the actual man must strive to conform himself. As Milton says in his grand style: "He that holds himself in reverence and due esteem, both for the dignity of God's image upon him and for the price of his redemption, which he thinks is visibly marked upon his forehead, accounts himself both a fit person to do the noblest and godliest deeds, and also much better worth than to deject and defile, with

such a debasement and such a pollution as sin is, himself so highly ransomed and ennobled to a new friendship and filial relation with God" ("The Reason of Church Government," chap. iii.). It seems not unlikely that when our Lord said of little children, "Their angels do always behold the face of My Father which is in heaven," He meant by the "angel" the spiritual double, the ideal heavenly form, of the earthly person.

If, then, we think of the One Catholic and Apostolic Church as the ideal Divinely-created organic structure into which actual Churches and their earthly members are to grow, how shall we be led to regard existing Christendom and its many Christian communions?

1. Our faith will be less shocked and disturbed by the split-up condition of Christendom. I say "less," than if we felt ourselves bound to identify the Bride of Christ with some one of the existing communions, or with the aggregate of so many of them, or with a body of select persons more or less hidden in them. There must be much to trouble us in the sight of Christian bodies disowning each other, as there is in the defects and faults of every Christian body, and in the immense non-Christian world still unconquered at the end of the nineteenth century. But we shall not refuse to see some advantages—as we often have to recognise with thankfulness good coming out of evil—that appear to result from separation and diversity. Functions and powers of the kingdom of God, which might have been otherwise dormant, have been developed through the special energies and special adjustments to environment set going by the separateness of communions. The Christianity of the world may be perceived to be larger and richer than it might be if it were the religion of a single well-disciplined body. We are freed from the painful supposed duty of judging and disowning great Christian societies, and are encouraged, on the contrary, to discern all the good we can in them.

2. It is natural to members of the Church of England to value highly succession and order and authoritative institutions. Whilst there is nothing to forbid our admitting that the Church of Rome has advantages not possessed by ourselves or by the non-Episcopalian communions, we may reasonably congratulate ourselves on having Episcopacy with an unbroken succession, the Sacraments, the inheritance of the Christian literature of all ages. It may rightly seem to us a great gain that Christian Churches should be as national as possible. We may hold and contend that the kingdom of Christ is best established in any part of the earth where the ancient order has been preserved and the organized nation of the land worships God and cleaves to Christ in a Church of its own.

But all that we may be obliged to protest against and to condemn in the Churches of Rome or of Eastern Europe will not bind us to "unchurch" them, or to pronounce them separated from Christ.

3. But we shall follow the whole stress of the New Testament in looking reverently for the fruits of the Spirit, in person and society, and holding them to be trustworthy credentials of fellowship with Christ. Christ bade His followers "beware of false prophets": how were they to discern them? Did Christ say, "Take care that anyone who undertakes to teach and guide you shall show himself to be authorized by Me, or by the Apostles whom I commission as My representatives"? The criterion He gave was, "By their fruits ye shall know them." Nothing could be more marked or definite than the commission which Christ gave to the Twelve. They knew themselves to have His commission, and they felt even their number to be important, and as the Twelve they ruled the Pentecostal Church. But if Christ had charged His followers, "Listen to no one but the Twelve, or those whom the Twelve may ordain," they would have been bound to treat St. Paul as a false prophet. Saul of Tarsus did, indeed, excite suspicion and misgivings in the Twelve and their adherents. He appeared outside of Christ's order, rendered no allegiance to the Twelve, took his stand on the commission he had received in a vision, and claimed to be known and judged by his fruits. His credentials, he boldly declared, were the Churches he founded—these and his own manifest integrity and devotion. The irregular Apostle did a greater work in spreading the kingdom of Christ than all the regular Apostles together. It is important, however, to notice that St. Paul was not indifferent to the unity of the Church. He laboured zealously and successfully to keep his Churches in fellowship with those of the Twelve. What more impressive testimony could we have than St. Paul and his work, that by the will of Christ there should be room amongst Christians for unauthorized service and leadership? Christ made solemn choice and appointment of the Twelve, and then, without giving any explanation or notice to the Twelve, sent a thirteenth, whom they were to accept as a colleague against their first surprise and misgivings, because they could not help seeing that he was doing Christ's work and had the Spirit with him. Such warrant have we for acknowledging the presence of Christ and the Spirit with the Christian societies which reject one part or another of the traditional order of the Church. We know these societies by their fruits.

4. Our own Church we may thankfully and reverently perceive to have a peculiarly important place amongst the aggre-

gate of the Christian bodies. It is a great Church, with special privileges, and we may humbly hope that its work in the world is not altogether unworthy of it. But it is further important through the middle place in which it stands. If an unfriendly critic might taunt the Church of England with being neither one thing nor the other, neither loyally Catholic nor frankly Protestant, we shall prefer to believe that it is both. And it may be for the advantage of Christendom that we should not throw in our lot either with those to whom succession and order are everything, or with those to whom a Church is a collection of persons who happen to agree in the deductions they draw from the New Testament.

5. Lastly, if the perfect Church of Christ is represented on the earth by these many inadequate and fragmentary and transitory bodies which profess loyalty to the one Lord and Saviour, and if each of the bodies has life and truth in proportion to its real loyalty to Christ the Head, then the royal road to unity must be through each drawing closer to Christ as a member to the Head. To be open to the light of Christ and so to drop errors, to study what the Son of man will approve in policy and conduct, to weigh interests and values in the scales of God, to understand that the aim of all Christians and of all Christian societies must be to grow into perfect fellowship with Christ—these are the ways of progress for the bettering of each Church in itself and for the unity of Church to Church.

J. Llewelyn Davies.

Art. IV.—HOW TO SAVE VOLUNTARY SCHOOLS.

"It behoves every ratepayer, who wishes to keep down his rate-bill . . . to bestir himself in time to prevent his fleece from being cut utterly short."—Lord Salisbury, Nov. 19.

THAT the average cost of elementary education "has increased, is increasing, and ought to be diminished," is the cry of the groaning ratepayer over probably the whole area of England and Wales. It may be worth while to sketch the modest beginnings, and contrast them with the enormous progress of that career of costliness of which the end is not yet in sight. In 1870 Voluntary Schools alone existed, and were educating at 25s. 6d. per head. In 1872 that charge had risen to 27s. odd. Why? Because School Boards had in the meanwhile got to their work with a will, and were already spending 28s. per head, thus forcing up the scale of expense for the others. In 1894 Board School charges reached over 48s. 9d. per head, and had forced up the voluntarists to spend nearly

33s. 2d. But of this cost a fraction *over* 18s. 4½d. represented the ratepayers' share, while a trifle *less than* 6s. 6½d. was that of the subscriber. We need not for present purposes pursue the analysis of income into further detail. The important point to notice is that rate-supported schools cost the ratepayer over 18s. 4d., whereas subscription-supported schools cost the subscriber 6s. 6½d. or less; that is to say, the proportion is little short of 3 to 1, or £1 subscribed goes nearly as far as £3 of rates in maintaining a school.

The cost for erection of buildings, including sites, and also —as a note (p. 19) of the last Report of the Education Department (from which the above figures are taken) informs us— including "the cost of laboratories, workshops, laundries, cookery-kitchens, School Board offices, etc.," is for Board Schools £13 6s. 9d. per head; while for Voluntary Schools (which often get their sites free) it is £7 per head. What the "etc." covers in the above enumeration must be conjectured. Probably swimming-baths, gymnastic exercise apparatus, and the like, may go in under it. Of the relevancy of these to elementary education, the reader may form his own estimate. To meet the rapidly expanding outlay, a total of loans, amounting to little short of £29,500,000, had up to April last been contracted, with the express sanction of the Education Department, on the security of the rates, of which only a little over £4,500,000 is spoken of as "repaid." This mass of indebtedness has lately been increasing with overwhelming strides. In 1889-90 the year's loans were *under* £820,000; in 1894-95 the Boards plunged in a single twelvemonth into *over* £2,500,000. We should be only too glad to think that rateable values had risen by even one-third of the amount of this enormous pile of debts incurred on their security. There needs no other proof that the Boards, as a whole, are not only "outrunning the constable," but distancing him out of sight.

Thus the net result is, that Voluntary Schools, after all the inflation of educational expenses by the spendthrift rivalry of the Boards, remain about 28 per cent. cheaper to maintain than Board Schools; that they build and accommodate for nearly 50 per cent. cheaper; and that the subscribers' share, as compared with the ratepayers', is nearly 200 per cent. less, all the while avoiding the local *incubus* of indebtedness.

But from the tantalizing advantage of this superior economy the ratepayer is debarred, because (1) in every Board area, after subscribing to a Voluntary School, he is compelled to pay his rate in full; (2) whenever there is a call for further school accommodation, the Department claims a statutory power of forcing a School Board on a reluctant locality, and mostly exercises that power to thwart or exclude voluntary provision.

It is well known that Mr. W. E. Forster in 1870 fixed a rate of 3d. in the £ as the probable maximum. We learn from the Report (p. 38) that interest and repayment (although, as we have seen, tardy) of loans are now together absorbing precisely that figure. The cost of elementary education, it should be observed, need no more rise than the cost of other education. The human mind is much as it was, in respect of capacity, twenty-five years ago; the rudiments necessary to it are no other than then. What can be the reason why the school bill should rise nearly 90 per cent. in the course of a quarter of a century? It is not so at Eton or Winchester. Why must it be so on the Victoria Embankment of the Thames? We can only sketch an answer in brief outline: (1) The policy of the Education Department has been to secure to the School Board a practical monopoly of fresh supply. (2) Under the influence of the Department, and that of a free hand in the public purse, every School Board, however popular its electoral basis, tends to become an oligarchy; and (3) experience shows that oligarchies and monopolies, especially when coupled, result in extravagance; while, (4) given once an initial movement in favour of costliness, it follows a law of evolution, and every fresh expense entails a further one. Just as the weird sisters laid on Macbeth the ban,

> He shall, he will, he must spill much more blood,
> And become worse to make his title good,

so the average School Board "shall, will, must" spend much more cash, "and become worse"—*i.e.*, for the ratepayer—but *without* bettering its own "title." It remains oligarchic still.

To the above-stated elements of greater cost incurred must be added the enormously increased burden for the ratepayer in each of the items if Voluntary Schools become extinct. The estimate of cost for replacing fabrics and sites in that case was put some six years ago by Mr. Chamberlain at between £28,000,000 and £40,000,000. This is the avalanche likely to descend on the ratepayer's back. This is why the appeal now lies to *him*. Let him demand on the ground of bare justice, as I will presently show, his absolute right in the matter, and answer the appeal which the Prime Minister has lately made to him by so doing.

It seems reasonable to presume that rateable values rise slowly, while population rises more quickly. If so, *that* should, with every sound economist, be a cogent reason for studious thrift. The opposite has been the course of School Board precepts, as translated into pence or shillings in the

pound. They should have taken nature's warning in finance. They have, in fact, ignored it.

On the special merit of the Voluntary system—its personal share in the child—I do not now enlarge. The humblest school in obscure hamlet or squalid suburb which speaks thus to the child's whole nature warmly, becomes in its degree an *alma mater*, claiming, and often finding, love and veneration. Towards a Board School such feelings would seem almost grotesquely misplaced; as in the child whom Sydney Smith found stroking a tortoise on the back of its shell. A cold and neutral respect for the ladder of learning, serviceable to mount by, is all one can expect there. But I am dwelling now on the purely economic aspect, important to civil liberty and local self-government, the rightful heritage of the sorely-taxed Englishman.

My point of view is that of the citizen ratepayer, from which standpoint the following considerations were not long since respectfully submitted by a life-member of the National Society to the committee understood to be advising his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury as regards Voluntary Schools. They were politely returned by the secretary of that committee to the writer without note or comment:

"Let the two rival systems of Voluntary and Board Schools once be set before the ratepayer with perfect freedom of choice, and the superior economy of the Voluntary will command his preference. At present he has no effective choice, because as soon as he has subscribed to A, he is mulcted, by compulsion of law requiring payment of rate, in full to B.

"When in 1870 an amendment was proposed in Parliament that subscriptions should be counted against rates, it was negatived, and its supporters solaced with a special extra grant, up to 50 per cent., conceded to Voluntary Schools—a relief which very soon became nugatory, through onerous conditions annexed to it by the Education Department, and by a rising scale of expensiveness all along the educational line of advance. This is the standing risk to which all such relief is liable. It is always in the power of the Government, either indirectly, through the Educational Department, or directly, if the relief comes direct from the Exchequer, to make it nugatory. The same is true of relief direct from the rates. Conditions, giving the ratepayers powers of management, can always be subsequently obtruded. There is no finality and no security in any of them; but *once give the ratepayer a strong and direct interest in the maintenance of Voluntary Schools by counting subscriptions against rates*, and his vivid sense of their value in relieving his burdens will make him their lasting friend.

The absence of this condition is why the general public take so languid an interest in the controversy about saving Voluntary Schools. But given this condition, they cannot then be extinguished, because the interest in maintaining will always be greater than that in surrendering.

"The present system is indeed one of gross injustice. Every shilling subscribed is a public subsidy from the individual, maintaining a public elementary school in efficiency. Every such shilling is entered in a public balance-sheet, duly audited, as law requires, and submitted to the inspector, and is treated as an asset for the purposes of public education, to every intent except that of *pro tanto* relieving the subscriber. The subscriber is told, in effect, that the public is to take full benefit from his subscription, but is to give him no credit for it. He is treated as a dangerous person, and promptly mulcted, rather than as a useful citizen, zealous for the public good. By conniving at, and submitting without indignant protest to that injustice, Voluntarists make themselves accessories to the wrong, and share in a measure its moral culpability. The position is analogous, only with *à fortiori* cogency, to that urged by Dissenters against Church rates in 1868-69. They said: 'We subscribe voluntarily for the support of our own sectarian places of worship and their services, and it is not fair that we should be taxed over again for the public needs of the parish church.' But in this case it is a *public* elementary school, open to all, and existing for the benefit of all, to which the subscriber pays, and his subscription vastly relieves the common public burden of all; and yet he is taxed over again, as though he had done nothing. This is, therefore, *à fortiori* a case demanding redress. It is so clearly a just demand, that, if once made and sustained, no Government can refuse it; and for the same reason no Government will venture to rescind it. It becomes an absolutely impregnable position.

"It will, moreover, not impede, but prepare the way for any further educational reforms, in the matter of finance, which may be equitable and safe. Thus, if a ratepayer liable to 30s. rating subscribes 20s., and pays to the rate the balance of 10s., his school's right to any share in the distribution of that balance is no whit the worse. But probably, if coupled with a large measure of federation, with the abolition of rates on school-buildings, and with that of the income limit above 17s. 6d., it would supply all that was necessary.

"It is obvious that the above proposal will give the Voluntary System a new root in wide, popular sympathies, instead of its depending on the precarious favours of Government, which of themselves tend to provoke the attack of any

hostile Government which may succeed. It is also the only plan which will impose a salutary check on the ever-growing costliness of the School Boards, the effect of which is to starve subscriptions at present. Once obtain the right, which justice demands, of *counting subscriptions against rates*, and that costliness will have the opposite effect, of increasing subscriptions; since the greater that costliness, the greater will be the attraction of the more economical, *i.e.*, the Voluntary System. At present the School Boards hold the longer arm of the lever, the Voluntarists the shorter. This concession will equate those arms, and there is nothing else that will. The double-action of the screw, which now forces subscriptions down exactly in proportion as it forces rates up, will be by this exactly reversed.

"It should never be forgotten that in 1870 the probable maximum of rate was put at 3d. in the £, and that by this understanding much opposition was conciliated and economic fears allayed.

"The history of School Boards since 1870 shows a somewhat ostentatiously scandalous contempt for that understanding. They have directly made the power of the purse, confided to them 'to supplement' only, the means of 'supplanting' the Voluntary system. The same power has been worked without scruple by the Education Department to give Boards a pre-emption, which often amounts to a practical monopoly.

"The Voluntary system represents that spring of individual energy from which all the greatness of our country, imperial and commercial, has been evolved. School Boards represent that opposite system of State interference which, where needless, should ever be avoided, and which, wherever admitted, should be jealously watched. Their working has been to maximize that influence which should be minimized; and their result monopoly, coupled with extravagance, as monopoly mostly is.

"The present proposal takes as its basis the ratepayer's rights pure and simple, and among them his right to free choice between two existing systems, from which choice he is now barred. It makes that right a point of civil liberty. It would in effect arm him with a 'local veto' against the excesses of Boards and Department alike, and thus crown the edifice of local self-government in respect to his public burden of education.

"It thus wholly avoids all religious difficulty, being open to Church and sects alike. Baptists, or Wesleyans, or Secularists, could, if they pleased, avail themselves of its broad charter of perfect freedom equally. It also disturbs neither management nor teaching, and requires—what seems to escape the

notice of the propounders of several schemes—no interference with the trust-deeds of schools. It is difficult to see how these last can be reconciled with some conditions contemplated in such schemes. But, in fact, any scheme which depends on relief from without opens the door to future, if not present, tampering with trusts, because it gives the power of the purse, imperial or local, indefinite opportunity of asserting itself.

"The defenders of Voluntary Schools, so far, seem busying themselves with the problem—how to preserve conditions of independence under a status of dependence. The two are irreconcilable and the problem insoluble.

"School Boards would, of course, be limited and circumscribed by the present proposal. They would have, in homely phrase, to 'cut their coat by their cloth,' which is just what Voluntarists have now to do. It is only by their abuse of the power of the purse that they have been able to dispense with that obligation, and that is the just and sufficient answer to any inconvenience which they may sustain.

"The present memorialist thinks that the outcome of his proposal, if adopted, would probably settle down, after a few years, into Boards building school premises, and Voluntarists maintaining and working the schools built. But that these would be built on a less sumptuous scale, to the great relief of the ratepayer, and the checking of the vast local debts which are now being piled up. In short, the ratepayers' rights and interest are the key to the system proposed."

It is not easy to exhaust the far-reaching consequences which would at once or soon follow from this absolutely just concession. "Magnam vectigal parsimonia" is a venerable proverb. I would read at present "justitia" for "parsimonia." "Voluntarists will find in simple justice their amplest endowment." "Parsimonia" they have always shown. Let the two be now united, and their schools are saved; and the ratepayer, in saving them, saves himself. But the principal among those many-sided benefits, some positive, some negative, may be tabulated as follows:

This proposal, then—

1. Promises *not* an increase, but a reduction, in the ever-growing and largely-superfluous cost of elementary education;
2. Makes no demand on the Exchequer; and thus
3. Encounters no "lion in the path";
4. Absolutely avoids all religious difficulty, and does not, by seeking public money for denominational schools, challenge the opposition of political Dissenters.
5. Gives the ratepayer an effective "local veto" on (i.) the heavy hand of the School Boards, (ii.) the high hand of the Department.

6. Opens the widest field of choice to the parent, by the "multiplication of denominational schools" (as urged by Lord Salisbury to the Dissenters' deputation).

7. Saves Voluntary Schools existing, and, if coupled with adequate federation, saves them *all*.

8. Replants the Voluntary System wide and deep in an enlarged area of popular sympathies.

9. Thus ensures the ratepayer against the vast increase of his burdens threatened by that system's extinction.

10. Runs no risk as regards management, teaching, or teachers;

11. Therefore needs no securities;

12. Is automatic in its action;

13. Does not clog the further course of remedies, if necessary, and if any can be found equitable, safe, and expedient;

14. Effects that control directly by the ratepayer over the rates, which some desire to attach to County Councils, etc.;

15. Is founded on ABSOLUTE JUSTICE and CIVIL RIGHT. The original sin of the Act of 1870 was that it shut out this obviously just condition. By the neglect of this over 1,300 Voluntary Schools have been lost in twenty-five years, or fifty-two on the average yearly.

Had this condition been observed, they might all have been saved. Their transfer to Boards has probably cost the ratepayers some £100,000 annually for maintenance merely; and this wasteful havoc is still going on. The Board Schools, created "to fill up gaps," as Mr. Forster expressly said, have been busy in making them; and in this mischievous policy the Education Department has mostly given them a free hand —most certainly has done nothing effective to stop them.

The recent case of King's College, London, may be cited to those who call for Treasury grants. Because it received aid from Lord Salisbury's late Government, *therefore* it became the *bête-noire* of the next. So it will be with the policy of subsidies from the Exchequer, even under a special Act, to denominational schools as such. It might be judged even by a hostile Government impolitic and invidious summarily to rescind a vote affecting the salaries of many thousand teachers, although, with due notice according to the custom of the profession, even this would be within a Government's, like any other employer's, rights. But to couple the continuance with conditions destructive to the *raison d'être* of Voluntary Schools would be easy and safe. Nay, from the Harcourt-Asquith standpoint, it would be the one method of policy encountering least resistance. Deterred by recent lessons from direct attacks upon Church interests, they would let that "sleeping dog lie," for they have felt his teeth. All the more eager would they be to undermine the Church through her schools. Lulled by

Treasury grants (assuming the policy lately urged by high ecclesiastical authority adopted), Churchmen would meanwhile have let their subscriptions drop down to the bare rate of current demand. To improvise these suddenly to meet such a hostile policy as the above would be impossible. The Voluntarists would then be exactly as Æsop's frogs if they had taken the leap down the well and then found it drying up. The bargain, indeed, which the Church leaders are urging is a Mephistophelic compact—not, of course, with the enemy in person, but with that friend into whose shoes the enemy is sure sooner or later to step. For the only constant factor in British politics is now their inconstancy. Every General Election since 1868 has reversed the majority of its predecessor, with, I believe, the one exception of 1885, due to the overwhelming popularity, then at its zenith, of one political personage. What men call "the jump of the cat," and gods "the swing of the pendulum," is sure to take place. Then back comes Mephistopheles. He is, in effect, away on furlough only. And as sure as he returns and finds Voluntary Schools virtually in pawn to the secular power, he will *exact the bond*, by enforcing secularist conditions. Will any one of the hundred or so of men who, most of them eminent and many of them brilliant, formed the Archbishop's deputation on November 20 show any weak link in the above chain of probable reasoning?

I say the counter-proposal made above combines simple justice with freedom, economy, efficiency, elasticity, neutrality for a Church and sect, and automatic action. Of course, it will probably ruffle the rose-leaves on which School Boards repose, and introduce the thorn of thrift into their well-stuffed pillows. It may even dislocate the wheels of the triumphal car of the Department, and cause it to "drive heavily." But Boards and Department need the lesson that they exist to square their machinery with justice and freedom, not to warp these last to suit it. I say, then, to voluntarists, "Make to yourselves friends of that mammon of unrighteousness," the ratepayer's interest in what tends to keep down his rates. Voluntarism will then strike its tap-root deep in the native soil of civil right and civil freedom. It will entwine itself with those traditions which lie deepest in the heart of our race, and which will only perish with the race itself. Is not this better than sitting on the door-steps of Downing Street, and crying for a slice of the moon—"because the man in the moon is our friend now, don't you know"? And *après*—how about the *new* moon, and the man in *that?*

CANON HAYMAN, D.D.

P.S.—Since the above was written the writer has received, direct from Canada, through an unimpeachable channel, infor-

mation showing that the principle advocated above is the basis of school administration in the important province of Quebec. The statement is that "any persons sending their children to such separate schools, or supporting the same by subscribing thereto annually an amount equal to the sum at which, if such separate school did not exist, they must have been rated, in order to obtain the annual school grant, are exempt from the payment of all rates imposed for the support of the public schools." Thus in Quebec the "separate" schools correspond to our "voluntary," the "public schools" to our Board Schools; and whoso subscribes to the former is exempt from being rated to the latter. The proposal made above is to exempt him either *in toto* or *pro tanto*. But that is a question of detail, the principle being clearly identical with that practised in Quebec. This forms a sufficient answer to all objections of impossibility or practical difficulty, such as the official mind is prone to urge against any change of system, however founded in justice.

ART. V.—THE INTERMEDIATE STATE OF THE BLESSED DEAD.

THE subject I am about to deal with is, without gainsaying, interesting, but also somewhat speculative. The materials out of which we have to construct a theory are scanty. The purpose of Divine revelation is, not so much to satisfy our intellectual curiosity with regard to the next stage of our life, as to attract our attention and concentrate our love upon the Lord Jesus, so that for all the future that lies before us, visible and invisible, we are in a way impelled to go on trusting in Him exclusively for guidance, direction, and spiritual satisfaction at our journey's end. The veil which hides the invisible world is drawn aside only partially, and for this practical purpose; and it is only indirectly and, as it were, casually, while in the pursuit of this purpose, that a stray gleam of light falls upon the enveloping darkness and dimly illuminates it.

Gathering up, then, such hints as Scripture thus affords us, and adopting the only possible method of argument open to us—the analogy of our present spiritual life and experiences—I propose to consider, as briefly as is consistent with lucidity, what opinions in harmony with the tenor of Christian revelation we may reasonably entertain (1) with regard to the mode of existence of, and (2) the modifying causes which will probably be operative upon, the blessed dead in the intermediate stage of their existence.

Now this phrase, "intermediate state," implies two *termini*. There is the state at the point of departure, and there is the state at the point of arrival. A brief consideration of the diverse conditions of the blessed dead at these two points of their existence will to some extent make clear what the problem is which lies before us, and may also perhaps suggest some clue towards its probable solution.

Our sources of knowledge of the first—the point of departure—are two: (1) The intuitive knowledge, as far as it goes, which every Christian has (who knows anything of the spiritual life and its ideal) of the workings of his own heart; and (2) the intimations which are given in the Bible of the actual condition in the sight of God, the Searcher of all hearts, of every believer, however immature, and however developed. As regards the point of arrival, we are exclusively dependent upon the announcements of God's Word.

As regards the point of departure, it will scarcely be denied by anyone that even the most holy and heavenly-minded Christian leaves this stage of his existence an imperfect, unfinished, sin-tainted creature.

> And they who fain would serve Thee best
> Are conscious most of sin within.

To the external observer, the lives of such saints may appear to be faultless; to themselves, who are conscious of evil imaginations and sinful propensities, which, however repressed, still start up to trouble them, it is far otherwise. This is one extreme of the possible condition of Christian life at the point of departure. Let us consider the other extreme.

Conversion to God, so far as we know, is possible as long as breath lasts. The conversion may be sudden, practically instantaneous, and yet real. It may come about at any period of this earthly life. It may conceivably occur on the death-bed, at the last gasp, as it were. Now, the subject of such a conversion all his life long may have been acting on principles opposed to God's truth, and in consequence may have acquired evil habits, rooted in his nature and personality, deep-seated and firmly-established through life-long practice, and in this spiritual condition may pass away to the invisible world.

Between these two extremes of the Christian life, believers in every possible varying degree of holy character die; but one and all are marred by sin.

Then, again, there is this material organism in which the spiritual life is enshrouded. It is an organism admirably adapted to the requirements of the animal nature, of which we all partake, but strangely unfitted to, out of harmony with, rebellious against, the ends of the true higher life. These

organic propensities, poisoned as they are by the virus of sin, ever craving or imperiously demanding gratification, own no allegiance to the motions of the Holy Spirit, and as long as life lasts thwart and clog its influence, never reduced to unresisting obedience, much less to helpful ministration. It is unnecessary to enlarge upon this subject. We are all, alas! unhappily too familiar with the unspiritual tendencies of this body of our humiliation not to be able to fill in the detail for ourselves.

And such as the organism is, such is its environment. The world around us is ever demanding our sole attention and concern, sometimes indeed legitimately. But, without doubt, the unbroken influence of the environment is to reduce us to a state of voluntary slavery, to the exclusive pursuit of the things of sight and sense. The set of the stream of the world is unquestionably against God and a godly life. This is the conditions of things on departure.

On reaching the destination—the resurrection state—we believe, on the testimony of God's Word, that harmony has been established between the material and immaterial constituents of our complex nature. This harmony is based on the higher principle of devotion to God, with the reduction to subservience and helpfulness of the organism, to that devotion. The body is now, whatever it was before, the ideal of an organ of the spirit, an indestructible, potent, spirit-governed body. And, again, such as the body is, such is its environment. The risen saint lives in an atmosphere of holiness, and all the higher dominant principles of the spiritual nature are now governing *de facto* as well as *de jure*, and in proportionate harmony with that environment.

The problem before us is now, I think, more clearly defined. What explanation can we afford as to this marvellous transformation? How are we to bridge over this interval with some explanation consistent with Scripture and analogous to our present experience? What probable theory can we advance as to the causes of this process going on in the intermediate state, by which believers attain to the τέλος of their creation, so that, on their arrival at the end of it, they are like Christ, τετελειωμένοι, satisfying the ideal which God had in the original creation?

One view of the condition of the blessed dead in the intermediate stage of their existence has been advanced, which, I submit, must at the outset be put aside. It has been supposed that at death the human being passes into a condition of utter absolute unconsciousness. There is thus an annihilation of all consciousness of duration. The consciousness at the moment of death, and the consciousness at the moment of resurrection,

though millions of years may conceivably intervene, will be as immediately successive as any two successive mental states now. Doubtless, on this hypothesis, the fact that there will be no consciousness of any interval will be as now stated. But it is no answer to the question before us. It affords no explanation whatever of the process of complete sanctification and complete development. Arguing, as we only can argue, from the analogy of our present experience, as to the *modus operandi* of Christian sanctification, we must conclude that it is a process of influencing the affections by the presentation of rational motives through the conscious acceptance of Divine truth. The inspiration of the Holy Ghost, supernatural though it be, works on these lines, in harmony with the laws of our mental structure. We can conceive of the formation of a moral character in no other way. The saint dies with infirmities, to say the least, of temper and affections. If he were to wake up with all these eliminated, and a character of perfect holiness substituted, the process could be compared only, but very imperfectly, to those remarkable surgical operations of recent times, which have become possible through the discovery of anæsthetics. The notion that in this condition of utter unconsciousness a rooted sinful mental habit could be excised, and an established holy mental habit inserted, seems to be very like an inconceivable absurdity. The Divine universal process, and by us the only conceivable rational process, of the formation of the Christian character is by the exercise of those moral principles which make up that character. On this theory, the command, "mortify your members which are upon the earth," becomes altogether superfluous. The battle with corrupt and worldly desires, so trying, so humiliating, may be abandoned at once. While in a state of unconsciousness we shall undergo an operation, and when we wake up we shall be morally transformed!

But, again, Sir William Hamilton, in his "Metaphysics"[1]—and he is supported by very nearly all modern psychologists—advances good reasons for concluding that the mind during the whole period of its existence, even in the profoundest sleep, never altogether ceases its activity, and is never wholly unconscious, though may be with feebler energy.

The supposition, then, I am now considering is to be dismissed. It is marked by two defects, each of which is fatal to any scientific hypothesis: (1) It is extremely probable that, as a fact, it is false in itself: and (2) even if it were true, it would not account for the phenomena which it professes to explain. Surely it goes without saying that the spiritual

[1] Vol. i., lect. xvii.

life of the Christian is a history, a process of growth, consisting of successive stages, each of which normally prepares for and leads on to the next, and so on to the ultimate development.

Still guided by the lamp of Holy Scripture, and the analogy of our present experience, we may now proceed to inquire whether we may not discern in this intermediate state traces of conditions and efficient causes which may account for this perfecting process leading to the perfection of human nature. It may conduce to clearness of exposition if I arrange these *conditions* and *causes* in two classes: (1) negative, and then (2) positive.

(1) Negative in the removal of hindrances, in the substitution of favourable for unfavourable conditions.

The present scene is one of incessant distraction and seductive forcible temptation. The world has its legitimate interests and just claims upon our attention, who doubts? But does it stop at the boundary of its righteous prerogatives? It appeals to us with fascinating charms through every inlet of our organism, and throughout the whole period of our waking existence it obtrusively and clamorously demands our sole devotion. With a force like gravitation it drags us down from the thinking and pursuit of higher things. The holiest of men are most conscious of this clogging, thwarting force, ever pulling them away from the eternal realities of their faith.

Now all this set and rush of the tide of worldly influence will be done away with. The thief on the cross would be that day with Christ in Paradise; and where Christ is, there is true full-flowing life and unchecked liberty. The believer is introduced to a scene where all the circumstances, surroundings, and society will be favourable to the onward course of the redeemed soul. Pleasures and pains, and probation arising out of them, as a means to development of character, will, I think, still exist:—probation—because growth in holiness is conceivably only achievable by trial, discipline, and exercise; pains—because the departed believer is still imperfectly holy, still sin-tainted, and the consciousness of that taint (as consciousness there must be) can never be pleasant. But they both—pains and probation—will be robbed of that over-mastering disproportionate force which they now wield.

Again, in this world, it is to a great extent true that the body serves the soul, only that the soul may more effectually serve the body—as if the brute within us were the lord, and the rational soul its slave. The propensities of our animal organism, however innocent in themselves, are every moment in danger of being inflamed into excess, and therefore to sinful gratification. These propensities are blind to all considera-

tions of prudence, of virtue, of religion. They know nothing of proportion or fitness. Such provocation to forbidden excess Adam was liable to in the Garden of Eden, and, through voluntarily yielding, fell. How much more when this animal body is the bandmaid, source, and seat of sensual cravings, wicked passions, and turbulent lust? Well might St. Paul speak of it as "the body of this death." The body tainted with the virus of sin in every fibre so thwarted him that he could not do the things that he would.

This tremendous obstacle will be cleared away—at least, enormously diminished. For example, the appetites and passions essential to preservation and reproduction, so distracting, so efficient for evil (I need not stop to explain how), will totally disappear.

What the organism will be in this intermediate state cannot be positively stated; but in order to insure the identity of the risen with the present body, a bodily organism of some sort must, as I think, continue to exist. How are we to conceive of the ultimate development to the complete control of the spirit over the organism if there is no organism for it to influence? How is this transformation of this earthly organism into the πνευματικὸν σῶμα to be effected except by a process of development—a process accomplished by exercise and trial? Probation, in this sense of exercise and trial, as the agency for the establishment and manifestation of character, is the divinely-appointed means of all development, of all activities of human nature, corporeal, intellectual, and spiritual. We can argue only from the analogy of our present experience. And why should not the process of sanctification and development be effected by essentially the same kind of agency, though under indefinitely more favourable conditions, as it is now?

In the intermediate state, then, the body, identically the same with the present, will no longer be the seat and source, lever and fulcrum, of ungodly passions and inducements; and the environment will be correspondingly and proportionately favourable to spiritual progress and development.

(2) Turning now to the positive side, the existence of efficient causes, I admit at once that so far no real advance has been made in the endeavour to causally account for the result described in 1 Cor. xv. The hindrances have been removed; the situation is auspicious. But neither favourable situations nor removals of hindrances will ever be the cause of anything. The burglary, or, to speak with technical correctness, the robbery, would not have been committed if the door had not been left unlocked. True; but no amount of unlocked doors will ever cause a robbery. The condition of unlocked

doors permitted the introduction of the cause, and gave it scope to operate. A reasonable explanation consistent with Scripture of the marvellous change from the condition at the point of departure to that at the point of arrival is still to seek. That resurrection-state is an effect for which we constitutionally ask for a cause.

Now universally, in the kingdoms both of nature and grace, the Divine method of reaching results of any sort is by the adoption of means and ends. Is it not reasonable to conclude that this law obtains also in the unseen world in the intermediate state? Holding still the clue of the analogy of our earthly spiritual life, I think I can discern two efficient causes actually in operation, and adequate, in the conditions already mentioned, to produce the effect. These are: (1) A rectified will; (2) the inspiration of the Holy Ghost.

I admit that it is beyond our power to analyse and disintegrate the action of our own personality, whatever it may be, into these two constituents. Our own volition and Divine influence mysteriously co-operate. But, all the same, our actions are our very own, the outcome of our own personality, although some of them would not take place apart from Divine help. It is, therefore, only for clearness of thought and logical presentation that I speak separately of these two efficient causes. As a matter of fact, they indissolubly combine in the production of the homogeneous effect.

(1) A rectified will.

Kant begins his immortal work on the "Metaphysic of Ethics" with this sentence: "There is nothing in the world which can be termed absolutely and altogether good—*a good will alone excepted.*" Now, spiritual conversion is conversion of the will. In the extensive realm of human nature the will is the executive. That executive, that will, in the case of the converted man, no longer works as before in the direction of self, but, with more or less steadiness, in the direction of God. The central leading tendency of the regenerated man is to live to God.

A magnet may have its waverings and vibrations through collateral attractions and repulsions, but there is no room for doubt as to the direction of its tendency. The hinge on which it turns may be choked, or it may be kept back by foreign physical force, but the tendency of the magnet is there all the same. The hindrances are accidental, the tendency is essential. Remove the former, and the magnet with accelerative force springs forward, according to its inherent, though concealed, tendency.

Or another illustration. You have a spiral spring coiled up. If it is choked with dirt and clay it will remain stationary,

but the essential tendency of that spiral, though masked, is still there. Let the choking clay be dissolved, and the spring flies to its normal condition.

The point and application of these illustrations are obvious to us all. The essential dominant tendency of the dying believer, when the accidental hindrances have been cleared away, will have full swing and free play.

I now pass to another point. The springs of human activity are the desires, emotions, passions, affections, sentiments. A creature endowed with intellect and will, if he had no desires would never move—would never do anything. These desires are the constitutional motors of our volitions.

But in this present earthly phase of our existence, these springs of activity, these emotions, have not, and cannot be granted, full play. And yet the characteristic of all emotions is their tendency to accelerated intensity. This is matter of almost every-day experience. But now the possible potency of our emotions with this tendency to rapid enhancement is far larger than the strength of this organism to sustain. The force of the passions is much greater proportionately than the strength of the organism. Full permission and unchecked play cannot be allowed, simply because the physical power to sustain this uncontrolled gratification does not exist, and the organic machinery soon breaks down. If a condition of torpor does not intervene, there arises great peril of insanity; and indeed, in almost all cases, the imperious demands of earthly existence impose a bar. Thus, the present physical organism is a hindrance to and a limitation of the capacity of these emotions and of their causal efficacy.

But let this limiting obstructive body with its animal appetites be swept away, and a congenial, untiring organism replace it—is it not obvious that, with more extensive and intensive powers of perception, with clearer and broader views of Divine truth, with more intimate and deeper knowledge of the Saviour, the ruling passion of love for Him will be immeasurably intensified? Is it not obvious that this emotion of love, this essential tendency of the regenerated soul, will reign supreme, unthwarted, unlimited, and will exert an increasingly transforming force, of which any conception we may entertain can scarcely be exaggerated? The love of the redeemed soul for its Saviour will then be indefinitely more enhanced, more uniform, more efficient, inciting to the highest activity every faculty, corporeal, intellectual, volitional, with which we are endowed. The process of sanctification will no longer be limping and halting, as it is now with the best of us, but will proceed at a rate past calculation, flying, as it were on eagle's wings, right and straight to its central goal, complete and perfect conformity to the will of God.

(2) The influence of the Holy Ghost.

The account of this second concurrent efficient cause needs no elaboration. The mode of action of the Divine Spirit upon our nature cannot be stated in intelligible terms, because it is incomprehensible and inconceivable. Nor, indeed, for the matter of that, can we understand the mode of action of our own will upon our own physical organism. Physiologists can tell us accurately what the nexus and mutual actions of the components of the corporeal machine are, but they can give no answer to the question, How does the immaterial mind act in the first place on the machinery at all? We simply know the fact that it does act. On the testimony of Holy Scripture and of our own experience of the effect, we are assured of the fact of this Divine influence; and that is enough. The Holy Ghost enlightens the understanding, excites the emotions, fortifies the will, and all in order to the production of one result—the sanctification of the whole man.

We may reasonably conclude that this Divine causal influence will go on, at the other side, beyond the vail. The influence will be the same in kind, immeasurably higher in degree; and that just so far as (1) the ungodly provocations of this earthly scene are no longer present, and (2) the receptivity of the human soul is indefinitely enlarged. Who shall measure the transforming force which the Divine Spirit may not exert then?

Now, the course and direction of this transmuting conquering force invariably follows one rule, obeys one law. The sanctifying operation of the Holy Ghost is always from the centre to the periphery. The action of the Spirit is first at the centre, the governing principle in man, the will. He then extends His rule over the adjacent spheres, and so onwards until at last He reaches and transforms the organism, so that it finally becomes the perfect organ of the perfect will.

Still keeping within the terms of Scripture revelation and the conditions of analogical argument, I will now, if I may be allowed, hazard a speculation as to a possible mode of reconstructing this sinful body into the resurrection body, the conditions and causes of which, I think, are supplied by the phenomena of the intermediate state. I do not profess to explain how actually the transformation *will* be effected, but to state a theory how it *may* possibly be effected—a theory to which, as far as I know, physical science offers no ground of objection.

First of all, it is of primary importance to hold as an indisputable truth the identity of the resurrection body with the present organism. This fact is incontrovertible. It is established by the terms used by St. Paul in contrasting the diverse

qualifications and capacities of both. In his antithetically-compacted sentences what I wish to draw attention to is, (1) the unity of the subject throughout, and (2) the diversity of the predicates. "*It* is sown in corruption, *it* is raised in incorruption; *it* is sown in dishonour, *it* is raised in glory; *it* is sown in weakness, *it* is raised in power; *it* is sown a natural body, *it* is raised a spiritual body."[1] That very body, which we speak of as dead and buried, is that identical body which is raised. To ensure the identity of the body in the interim between death and the resurrection, I infer that an organism of some kind must continue in existence. If our present body is utterly dissolved and dissipated, so that no atom of matter, however infinitesimally small, is retained in living union with the immortal spirit, there may be a creation of a new body, but there cannot be, as far as I can see, (1) a *resurrection* of the body, nor (2) an *identity* of that resurrection body with our present body.

The next emergent question (wherein there consists the identity of the human body) admits of an easy negative answer, and that may guide us in some sort to the positive. Let us turn to the analogical lessons which our present experience of corporeal existence teaches us. A man during the whole period of his existence in this world has the same body. But this same body in the two stages of infancy and maturity does not consist (1) of the same *number* of material particles, nor (2) of the *same* particles. The constituent particles of our present organism are changing from moment to moment in both respects. The identity of the living human organism is quite independent of these considerations, and might continue entirely unaffected by the quantity or quality of the material atoms of which it is composed. So long as the living principle retains the power of rejecting, of appropriating, of assimilating and vitalizing, foreign matter, the organism continues the same, quite irrespective of the amount or sameness of the foreign matter provisionally appropriated. The body would retain its identity if the living principle within it were vitally united with millions of particles of the coarsest texture, or if connected with only one of the most refined quality, or if connected at different periods with both. If, as is conceivably possible, the living principle were united with one material particle only (not necessarily the same particle throughout), that atom might be absolutely invisible to our perceptions, also absolutely indestructible by any or all of the forces of Nature. In this way the identity of the body would be secured, the process of sanctification would go on until the conditions of

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 45.

the realization of the resurrection-body were satisfied. That resurrection-body and the present sin-tainted body would be the same throughout.

I am not aware that scientists have any ground from their knowledge of nature to assert that this is impossible. For, consider what they tell us about *ether*. Now, ether is matter. It possesses the essential properties; it occupies space; it has *vis inertiæ;* it is ultimately incompressible. This ether, by its undulatory motion, gives us the sensations of light. And they quietly inform us of this astounding fact. In order that we may have the sensation and perception of violet light, this ether must impinge on the retina, *in one second*, 831,479,000,000,000—*i.e.*, 831 billions 479 thousand millions of times. And yet, ether is matter.

Let us study, as the Apostle bids us, the process of growth in a planted seed. Of this organism we can inspect the history from beginning to end. We can examine it during life, and at death, in the grave, beyond and through the intermediate state, and on to its glorious resurrection. The present organism is the seed, the resurrection-organism is the developed plant. The identity of the plant remains, and yet how diverse!

This analogical illustration is imperfect necessarily, and, of course, because the plant is devoid of that dignifying property with which we are endowed, the spontaneity of choice, the inherent force of our own free volition upon our own organism. It is a power which, in a limited degree, we possess now, and, as is most likely, shall retain in the next life in an intensified degree. Surely this inherent force, the rectified will, illuminated and fortified by the Divine influence of the Holy Ghost, is adequate in the conditions I have described to transmute the body of this humiliation into the πνευματικὸν σῶμα. It is, let us remember, the kernel which makes the shell, not the shell the kernel.

In addition to this analogical reasoning in support of this theory of the historical development of the blessed dead in the intermediate state, I think we may appeal to the express statements of God's Word. The resurrection of Jesus Christ, and the resurrection of His true followers, redeemed saints, are, on the testimony of Holy Writ, exactly similar and parallel events, results of one and the same law of development, products of the same efficient cause. Jesus during His earthly life had not a vitiated recalcitrant body. His organism never thwarted, was ever open to, the influences of the Spirit. His whole human nature, body and soul, was interpenetrated and animated by the breath of the Holy Ghost. Therefore, in His case the process of normal development extended to and

covered, in His earthly life, the corporeal element. Prior to death He was τετελειωμένος. Though His body, being an organism, was, from the very nature of its machinery, liable to demolition by external violence, yet it could not be "holden of death." Perfectly sanctified in every department of His human nature, what could the consequence be but a resurrection with a resurrection-body to be perfected into a πνευματικὸν σῶμα? This, I take it, is the meaning of these words of the Apostle:[1] "Who was born of the seed of David according to the flesh, who was declared [established, constituted] powerfully as the Son of God, by the resurrection of the dead, *in accordance with the Spirit of Holiness.*"[2] Now, the resurrection of the believer is essentially the same process, effected by the same agency, but, of course, hindered in this earthly state of existence by the rebelliousness of this sinful ψυχικὸν σῶμα, and therefore standing over to be accomplished in the intermediate state, when the efficient causes, now in operation, will have full and free scope to work out their complete and ultimate effect, in the sanctification of the soul and reconstruction of the body. I appeal to the express words of Scripture: "But if the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ Jesus from the dead shall quicken also your mortal bodies *through His Spirit that dwells in you.*"[3] The Holy Ghost, commencing the exercise of His transforming causal energy in this life, will continue to put forth that energy beyond the grave, and thereby shall ultimately effect the resurrection of those mortal bodies—*i.e.*, the animal-governed body shall become the spirit-governed body.[4]

I have been endeavouring to trace a history (and the life of the redeemed saint, surely, *is* a history), pointing out the successive stages in the development of that history and their causes. But at this point a query may be started. The saints who are alive on the resurrection morn will not pass through the portals of death, but, in a moment, will be changed. What that change will be, whether a hastening of the process I have sketched, which may be possible, or something altogether inconceivable to us now, I cannot say; nor am I required to make any statement on the point, for the question does not come within the scope of my paper, viz., the intermediate state

---

[1] Rom. i. 3. [2] *Vide* Godet *in loco.* [3] Rom. viii. 11.

[4] The difference of reading here—διά with the genitive being the Revised Text, and διά with the accusative being the Revised Text Margin—will make no difference as regards the fact I am stating. Διά with the genitive points to the efficient cause, *by which*; διά with the accusative points to the normal state, *in consequence of which.* Both are effects of the Holy Ghost's influence, and they imply each other.

of the blessed *dead*, not the state of the blessed alive at the coming of the Lord.[1]

Taking a firm stand on the fact of the universal adoption of means and ends in God's government, shall we not infer with great probability that this realized perfection of human nature shall be in order to the employment and exercise on a loftier and grander scale of these perfected capabilities? "God's people shall do Him service,"[2] and that without the wearying conditions and sin-poisoned imperfections of this earthly service. Will not the character of that service which His redeemed saints shall render Him be commensurate—not merely correspondent to the blissful surroundings—but commensurate with the enhanced faculties of all kinds with which they then shall be equipped? It is a feeble and frivolous conception, to be sure, that the state of the perfected saints will be one of inert unbroken repose.[3] Or, is it any advance to imagine that they will be reclining on bright clouds and playing on golden harps; or to suppose, quoting the words of a favourite hymn, that this will satisfy the ideal of perfected human nature:

> What rapture will it be
> Prostrate before Thy throne to lie,
> And *gaze* and *gaze* on Thee!

In the boundless universe of God's creation may there not be vast intricate fields of inquiry, undertakings of great pith and moment, responsibilities to be discharged, which shall evoke unto the highest activity every holy God-centred affection, every capacity of intellectual insight, all the intensified energy of the sanctified will, and that assisted and furthered by a congenial ideally perfected organism? Do not the words of our Saviour, when contemplated in the light of the resurrection-state, suggest such ideas? "Well done, thou good servant: because thou wast found faithful in a very little, have thou authority over ten cities."[4] "I will set thee over many things."[5]

S. DYSON, D.D.

---

[1] There are several other questions which might, with more or less relevance, be started, for the subject is bristling with questions, but I have deliberately put them all aside, and confined myself strictly within the scope of the inquiry indicated by the title.

[2] Rev. xxii. 3.

[3] Rev. xiv. 13, "That they may rest from their (*wearying toilsome*) labour."

[4] Luke xix. 17.

[5] Matt. xxv. 23.

ART. VI.—THE CLERGY AS TEACHERS OF SANITATION.

IT has been my earnest endeavour for many years to make the knowledge of sanitation and personal hygiene the birthright of every English man and woman, and having at last succeeded in the first step, I now proceed to the second.

The first step to which I allude consists in stimulating and increasing the teaching of the facts of elementary physiology and the principles of elementary hygiene all over the kingdom, and this has been mainly accomplished by getting this subject introduced into the syllabus of the local examinations of the Universities. I now turn with confidence to the clergy, who, with the warm support of the National Health Society, I would seek to interest in what concerns the body as well as what concerns the soul. This I call the second step.

The need of such knowledge is everywhere painfully apparent. It is calculated that some 200,000 in this country still die needless and premature deaths, to say nothing of some 6,000,000 sick-beds that the knowledge and practice of hygiene would have rendered unnecessary.

We each set out on the journey of life with a certain amount of life force, or, in other words, every man is constructed to live so many years, and months, and days; and it is surely our bounden duty, in the enlightened age in which we live, to see that these years are not cut short by culpable ignorance or carelessness. Only about one in eight die really natural deaths, or, in other words, live out their days. And the premature deaths of at least half the rest are preventable. The spread of hygiene has, however, already greatly lengthened our days. In the eighteenth century it is calculated that every person in this kingdom, on an average, lived for twenty years. By 1860 this period was lengthened to thirty-six years; and now at the present day every man lives on an average for forty-two, and every woman for forty-four years.

This is, however, still very far short of the sanitary ideal. Children are slain by thousands by dirt and ignorance, and our country districts are still a disgrace to sanitation; and the worst feature is that we feel so little ashamed. We can lose 33,000 lives in one year from typhoid fever—an entirely preventable disease—and feel no shame. Before the Christian era, in a country called Greece, it was not so. If a

babe died there the parents were ashamed to bury it in the light of the sun, and stole forth at night to put the body in the grave, whose life had so carelessly slipped through their fingers.

I do not for a moment press this consideration of hygiene upon the clergy for their own sakes, for statistics prove that already this favoured class lives nearly twice as long as an average Englishman. I do not for a moment wish them to take up this subject from a selfish point of view, but solely for others. Their work lies amongst *men*, and *women*, and *children*, and it is well to remember this, for some, indeed, act as if their parishioners were already disembodied spirits and had no bodies at all. Man consists of spirit, soul, and body; and while the welfare of the soul is undoubtedly the first consideration, the improvement of the whole man is surely the province of the clergyman. I am glad to have been able so to press this truth on one of our largest societies for disseminating Christian literature, that they have now begun to circulate plain health tracts for the people, which, while not neglecting the soul, deal in simple terms with the sanitation and hygiene of everyday life. Surely it has been well shown in the earnest address of Rabbi Adler to the Church Sanitary Association, that the Bible itself is a great teacher of sanitation. It speaks of public hygiene; of infectious diseases; of unsanitary dwellings; of dietary laws; of the examination and selection of food; and above all, of cleanliness. I might appeal, too, to that well-known proverb, "Cleanliness is next to godliness," or, in other words, hygiene is next to Christianity. The origin of this proverb is confessedly obscure; it is now believed to be condensed from a sentence in the Mishna: "Outward cleanliness leads to inward purity."

Besides all this, in medical missionaries we have an instance of the marked success of the sound principle of seeking to benefit the whole man, not merely a part of him. In mediæval times this was generally understood. Most monks and nuns had some knowledge of the healing art; but for a long time body and soul have been completely divorced, and are now only by degrees being brought together again.

It must not be supposed from these remarks that I wish in any way to ignore the earnest way in which many of the clergy have already grappled with this question; on the contrary, I would here pay the heartiest tribute to their great earnestness in the cause of temperance, in the cause of education, and in many social questions affecting the general welfare. But is it not obvious how much the temperance enthusiasm must gain from an accurate knowledge of the effects of alcohol on a man's body? What a great advance is possible

from merely going round the school with a kindly smile and patting the pretty children on the head, to grasping some of the more important facts connected with the hygiene of school life! Great suffering and injustice are still inflicted on our school children for want of this knowledge, and there can be no doubt that the influence of an educated eye would do much to relieve this.

Then, again, look with what important events in life a clergyman is necessarily associated! He is connected with the infant and the young mother in the rites of the Church, and has great opportunities of giving helpful counsel at a time when this is greatly needed. He has to do with all marriages; and how much can be done by an enlightened man with regard to this is but little known. Public opinion has yet to be formed in a right direction on this important matter. It must be done gradually and wisely, and there is much in which a clergyman can help in this direction. At death, too, he is always present, and whilst spiritual instructions ever claim the foremost place, he is necessarily cognizant of epidemics and any special diseases that may affect his flock. To ask a clergyman to assist in these matters without having made even a brief study of the subject is simply to ask him to do more harm than good.

But the experience of many years tells us that the leading facts of hygiene are few and simple and well defined, and may readily be mastered by educated minds in a very short period. The clergyman should work with the doctor and with the sanitary officer, to whom, indeed, if we may use such a contradiction in terms, he should be a sort of lay-helper. We thus get unity in variety, all three working for the common good.

Again, consider how much the clergy have to do with buildings of various sorts. Churches are not always sanitary, and a clergyman who understands the elements of hygiene will not poison half his congregation with carbonic oxide, as was done some little time ago in England.

It may be thought in all this that I am seeking to add to the already multifarious labours of the clergy; on the contrary, I am seeking to reduce them. For I have no doubt that they already constantly take an interest and make remarks, more or less wise, upon all the subjects upon which I have spoken, and I am perfectly sure that where more accurate knowledge is possessed such remarks would come much more readily and much more to the purpose, and the labour be really lightened instead of made heavier.

Besides which, they would be able to secure much more efficient help in their Sunday-school teachers and district

visitors, who are ever in connection with their flock. An educated clergyman could give to these many useful hints as to what to say and how to help in their constant intercourse with the people.

And last, but not least, is it nothing to have some knowledge about the laws that regulate our own health? It is true that clergymen live long, but they often work unwisely for the want of such knowledge. Many a sermon would not only be better written, but better preached, if the laws of health were better obeyed. There is a subtle union between mind and body, which we neglect at our peril. The laws of health are imperative, and for first-rate thought there must be first-rate blood. The value of exercise, both for relieving the brain and for cultivating it, requires to be intelligently understood. The clergy know a good deal about the laws of soul health, and they will be astonished, when they come to consider sanitation, to see how many valuable similes arise, and how alike the laws of body and soul are seen to be; for there is not only "natural law in the spiritual world," but a spiritual law in the natural world.

I would appeal, then, finally, to your great body on behalf of the English nation. They are slow to move in any direction, but when they find the clergy in earnest upon the great elementary truths of healthy life, they will confidently follow such leaders; and, curiously enough, on many occasions the clergyman's remarks may be more heeded than the doctor's. The doctor, after all, is not yet a sanitary officer, and the sanitary officer is not yet the trusted adviser of the people (he is often rather regarded as an enemy). The clergyman alone occupies this place, which is rightly his owing to his care for the soul, but which we are convinced he will do nothing but strengthen if he adds to it a little intelligent care for the body.

Finally, let me earnestly point out that, so far from a brief course of hygienic instruction leading to the clergy interfering in matters with which they have no direct concern, the matter *does* concern them, and such instruction would enable them to be intelligently interested in, and to effectually help on, the welfare of their parishioners in a way that would otherwise be impossible.

ALFRED SCHOFIELD.

Review.

La Science et la Religion. By FERDINAND BRUNETIÈRE. Paris: Firmin-Didot et Cie. 1895.

IN January, 1895, M. Brunetière, a member of the French Academy, and a well-known writer on philosophical and social questions from a religious standpoint, published a magazine article with the above title. It was inspired by a visit which he paid to the Pope, and contains reflections on the "social problem," as we term it—a vague expression, but one sufficiently well understood perhaps—that were more particularly suggested by the Pope's famous encyclical on the condition of workmen, a study of which appeared in these columns shortly after it was published. This magazine article provoked a great deal of discussion in France and Geneva. Radicals attacked it because of its reactionary bias, freethinkers because of the prominent part assigned to religion as a factor in present-day affairs, and Protestants because of many expressions derogatory to Protestantism. Accordingly M. Brunetière reprinted his article in a book form in April, 1895, with many additions by way of explanation and defence. This is the brochure before us.

It contains a good deal of interesting and stimulating matter. Several of the ideas and reflections are curiously similar to some in Mr. Kidd's great book on "Social Evolution." There is rather too much, however, of rash dogmatic statement on matters of opinion; and the author is not happy in the tone of his answers to several objections that were made to his original article. It is often querulous and feeble. If a writer will make arbitrary pronouncements on things that are very greatly open to argument, he cannot be surprised if those who hold diametrically opposite views take exception to his statements, and it does not become him to complain of them. Nevertheless, as we have said, the reader will find here and there several true ideas well expressed in forcible phrases. The weakest part of the book is, in our opinion, that which discusses the influence of recent Papal encyclicals on the modern questions to which they relate.

Briefly, there are three main theses: That science has failed in her promises of instruction and regeneration of humanity; that these blessings must be worked out by religion; that the best form of religion for this purpose is (Roman) Catholicism.

The first part is really valuable. Modern science, in all her manifold departments, has made imposing and brilliant promises. In these, says the author, she has failed. She is bankrupt. Scientific men undertook to renew the face of the world—they have left it as it was. When it is urged that these great claims have been made by literary men of science merely, so to speak, as a department of literature, and thus that they are without real weight—this is a delicate point, remarks M. Brunetière slyly; and indeed it is. To many of us the thought has often occurred—Are literary men of science proper persons to speak on behalf of science? If Matthew Arnold could write about "Literature and Dogma" with the endeavour to prove that often sacred writings must be regarded simply in their literary aspect, and their words not strained to bear meanings which they were never meant to bear, could not the same idea be expressed with regard to "Literature and Science"? For instance, are Renan, Huxley, Comte, and Taine men of letters or of science? The right answer to the question is that such men as these have made Science popular, and she ought not to repudiate them. But in any case, taking these promises as they are, it can be easily demonstrated that they have

failed in their fulfilment. We cannot here follow the author minutely in his arguments, but they are very interesting. Beginning with physical science, he points out that anatomy, physiology, and ethnology have done nothing to elucidate clearly either our origin or our destiny. Has philology, he goes on, kept her promises better? No; neither the Hellenists, who demonstrate that Christianity was inspired by Aurelius and Epictetus; nor the Hebraizers, who show us in the Bible a book like any other, the Mahabahrata of Semitism, the Iliad of Israel; nor the Orientalists, who compare Christ to Buddha—none of these have redeemed the bills to which they put their names. Rightly is all this termed a "debauch of criticism"; since, for example, if we desired to put the date of the composition of the Pentateuch in almost every conceivable period, the masters of modern philology would supply us with valid reasons for so doing! The historians have done no better—in fact, modern Science has lost her prestige, and Religion has won back what she had lost.

This is M. Brunetière's first thesis, and it is the most valuable part of the book. The second, in which he claims that the remedy for social evils is in a return to Christian principles, is of no use to English readers, because the chief support of his contention is vested on the arguments of different Papal encyclicals.

The third division is interesting, as showing the ideas of a devout Roman Catholic man of science as to the relations of his religion to the world, and as displaying also his nearly complete ignorance of the true spirit of Protestantism. The author begins by confessing that he cannot prove either that morality is independent of religion, or religion of morality, but that both must work hand in hand; and by pointing out that all our modern morality is, even unconsciously, coloured by Christian dogma. He then goes on to say:

"So for all those who do not think that a democracy can afford to pay no attention to morality, and who also are aware that men are not governed by any other power so considerable as religion still is, the only question is to choose from the forms of Christianity that which is best adapted for the regeneration of morality, and that is—I say it without hesitation—Catholicism."[1]

After this bold declaration the author immediately begins to "hedge," but in such ungracious and really ignorant terms, that his expressions called forth a storm of Protestant protest in Paris and Geneva. The misconception of even educated foreigners as to the teaching and government of reformed churches, especially of the Anglican and the Presbyterian, is astonishing. We suppose that they do not take the trouble to find out. But, for example, we give a synopsis of M. Brunetière's argument: Protestantism, he says, is an absence of government; Roman Catholicism is a government, and also a "doctrine," and a "tradition"; and not only has it a theology, but a "sociology." The essence of Protestantism is that it is individualistic, selfishly occupied with individual salvation. Catholicism is occupied in a common salvation for all by means of works of supererogation. "The barefooted Carmelite, who weeps over the sins of the worldly in his cell, blots them out." Thus there is a great "circulation of charity," in which the living pray for the dead, and the dead intercede for the living. By means of this the social regeneration will be wrought.

We have not, of course, given the arguments which M. Brunetière brings forward in support of his statements; but they are interesting, chiefly because obvious and conclusive retorts will leap to the mind of

[1] Page 69.

every English reader. But it is saddening to think that, in France, pious Papists are so misinformed as to our religion; and, further, we must regretfully add that pious Protestants have to defend the faith of the Gospel from rationalistic attacks within their own fold. M. Brunetière does not allude to this, but it is well known to every follower of the fortunes of the *Église Reformée*, and perhaps it induced some of his remarks. But we turn from this, and call attention to three contentions with which the author closes his book, and which he supports with arguments that are common to Christianity, and are really well and forcibly put. Can we expect from religion, he asks, what for three or four hundred years we have vainly expected from "science"? It is difficult to say, and we must only expect it in proportion to our faith; but in the meantime there are three things can be safely laid down. First, "moral" must be separated from "natural" science; it has nothing to do with it. Second, original sin is a fact; virtue is the victory of will over nature. Third, the social question is a moral question—*i.e.*, there will never be a scientific means of destroying the inequalities amongst men. Few will dissent from these doctrines, nor from the aspiration of the author that all "men of good will" may close up their ranks to fight for the welfare of humanity on a religious basis.

W. A. PURTON.

Short Notices.

The Law of the Church of Ireland. By the Right Hon. R. R. WARREN. Pp. 141. Stevens and Haynes.

THIS little book is a valuable addition to the literature of ecclesiastical law. It also supplies much interesting information concerning an important event in Church history. When on January 1, 1871, the Church of Ireland ceased to be established, it was not only deprived of the greater part of its property, but it was also left without tribunals to declare and enforce its law, and without a representative or other assembly having authority to make such changes therein as were required by its altered circumstances.

Irish Churchmen were therefore called on to frame a constitution which, while interfering as little as possible with its continuity of the history of their Church, would be suited to an association resting solely, as far as legal right and obligation are concerned, upon the contract of its members. To this difficult task they applied themselves successfully; and the result is the present ecclesiastical law, consisting of the laws, constitutions, and ordinances in force at the time of disestablishment, as altered, modified, or supplemented by the new legislative authority that was then created. A treatise on this subject has been long required, and the want has been at length supplied by this book. Mr. Warren, in addition to being a distinguished lawyer, has always been one of the most active and prominent workers in the synods of the Church and in the Church representative body. He has thus been able to produce, under the modest description of an essay, a work that is at once scientific and practical. He deals with the principles underlying the law of the Church of Ireland and most of its important details. He has given special attention to such matters as Church tribunals, faculties, ecclesiastical edifices, burial-grounds, and marriage, the law of which has been necessarily modified by disestablishment, and in its present shape is not well understood even by the Irish clergy. Amongst the statutes and other docu-

ments to be found in the appendix, there is reprinted from Dr. Ball's "History of the Reformed Church of Ireland," a statement of the particulars of the revision of the Book of Common Prayer — a subject regarding which there is considerable misapprehension, especially in this country. Indeed, Mr. Warren's book, as a whole, will be found instructive by the English reader, and will go far to satisfy him, in the words of the preface, that "the Irish Church has come out from the ordeal of disestablishment and disendowment with credit."

College Sermons. By the late BENJAMIN JOWETT, Master of Balliol. Pp. 348. Price 7s. 6d. John Murray.

There would naturally be a very wide desire to possess in a permanent form the striking religious essays which the late Master of Balliol used to deliver from the college pulpit. They will be read with interest and pleasure even by those who have a more definite grasp on dogmatic Christianity than the celebrated Oxford tutor and professor. Dean Fremantle has made an admirable selection, illustrating from every side the Master's standpoint. Jowett's was a position of intellectual doubt united with the strongest possible moral and religious appreciation; and it is extremely interesting to see how a mind of the highest calibre endeavours to accommodate itself to Christian teaching. Besides this point of consideration, the Sermons are characterized by practical wisdom, strong common-sense, knowledge of the world and character, a perfect style of crisp, simple English; great lucidity and directness, a playful humour, and strong sympathy with the audience. His own position seems to be defined in the description of the modern prophet in the University Sermon on page 64:

"Can we imagine the feelings of some prophet or great religious teacher when he finds the world turning against him, and he begins to understand the difficulty of telling men what is at variance with their old prejudices or traditions? He does not lose faith in the truth, but he is inclined to despair of his fellow-men. There are such enmities to be overcome, such misrepresentations to be cleared up, such a mass of obloquy to be undergone; and he, without any power to stem the rising tide of ignorance and fanaticism, is but a feeble mortal who can trust only in himself and God. That is the feeling under which the prophet Elijah says, 'It is enough; now, O Lord, take away my life; for I am no better than any of my fathers.' He has no personal ambition, but he feels the want of other men's sympathy, to whom he desires to do good, and they will not; and to whom he would preach the truth of which his own mind is full, but they will not hear him. 'How often would I have gathered thy children together'; and 'Ye will not come unto Me that ye might have life.' And perhaps he wonders whether, if he were to leave his own people or country, and come again to them, like the Athenian legislator, they would receive him; if the prejudices against him would have worn away, or if he would still be the object of hatred and persecution. And still loving his brethren, like St. Paul, and eager that they should be saved, he also knows that the difficulties and disappointments which have hitherto attended him may be his portion to the end. He is not certain that his Gospel will ever triumph, but he is certain that it is the truth; and he is willing that his own name should pass away, that there should be no reaction or compensation, if he can only be confident that he is doing the will of God and keeping that which is entrusted to him. As his mission to his fellow-men appears to fail, he clings more and more to the thought of God. Somewhere, he cannot tell where, by some means, he cannot tell what, he believes that the ways of God will be justified to man; of himself or of his own reward he never thinks; all that is absorbed in his love of God."

The Faithful Dead. By a LAY CHURCHMAN. Pp. 130. Price 2s. 6d. Nisbet and Co.

This is a very temperate and accurate review of the whole question of prayers for the dead, and clears up many vague and doubtful points. It shows that the dead do not need our prayers; that the Church of England has carefully excluded all such prayers; and gives a useful criticism of the works of Dean Luckock and Canon MacColl on this subject. The author shows the strong probability that Onesiphorus was not dead when St. Paul spoke of his household, but only away on a journey.

This useful book will set many anxious thoughts at rest.

The Knights and Kings of Chess. By the Rev. G. A. MACDONNELL. Pp. 206. Price 2s. 6d. Cox.

All devotees of chess will delight in this work, which is a series of biographical sketches of eminent masters of the game, with other reminiscences connected with the royal pastime.

The Clergy List for 1896. Pp. 674. Kelly and Co.

This wonderfully accurate volume contains complete lists of the clergy in England, Wales, Scotland, Ireland, and the Colonies, including army, navy, prison, union, and foreign chaplains, with degrees, orders, and appointments; an alphabetical list of benefices, with the dedication of the churches, post-town, railway-station, county, incumbent, curates, annual value, patron, and population; the cathedral establishments, rural deaneries, and constituent parishes; and lists of public and private patrons of benefices, with their value. It is proposed to make a very extensive change in the form of the first portion of this list next year, when not only the present benefice held by every clergyman will be given, but also a record of all previous benefices or curacies which may have been held by him.

Three Hours at the Cross. By the Rev. W. J. HOCKING. Pp. 87. Wells, Gardner and Co.

This devout, thoughtful, and suggestive manual for Good Friday is intended chiefly for those who are unable to attend the afternoon meditations at church, which are now so usual. They will be found helpful, not only to these, but to the clergy who now conduct such meetings for thought and prayer. The language is simple and reverent, and there is a fitting absence of rhetoric or realistic description.

The Red Hot Library.

No. 1: *Francis the Saint.* By Staff-Captain DOUGLAS. Pp. 125. Price 6d. Salvation Army.

The best features of the life of that wonderfully earnest and devout Christian, Francis of Assisi, are given in this little volume in touching and simple language. It should be widely read beyond the limits of the Salvation Army.

No. 2: *George Fox.* By Staff-Captain DOUGLAS. Pp. 110. Price 6d. Salvation Army.

The biography of the famous founder of the Society of Friends has been put into a pleasant, modern English narrative by the writer. These memoirs are likely to do much good. The example and characteristics of great saints are always a powerful influence for good.

The Ten Commandments and the Lord's Prayer. By the Rev. E. P. HATHAWAY. Pp. 126. Elliot Stock.

During forty years Mr. Hathaway met his own class twice every Sunday, or addressed an entire school as superintendent. As a well-known and earnest teacher of great spiritual experience, the notes of the lessons which have been so valued by his scholars are an important

addition to Sunday-school literature. The characteristic of the book is its faithful spiritual teaching, which should always be the leading characteristic of Sunday-school work. We heartily recommend it, not only to Sunday-school teachers, but also for use in private and secondary schools.

A Visit to Bashan and Argob. By Major ALGERNON HEBER PERCY. Pp. 175. R.T.S.

Readers of "the giant cities of Bashan," and all interested in the antiquities of that remarkable tract of country, will be much pleased to pay it another visit in the company of the present traveller. The book is beautifully printed, and contains fifty-two very charming photographic illustrations.

Carl Winter's Dream. A Fairy Romance. By PAUL BÜTTMANN. Pp. 240. Elliot Stock.

This charming story relates the strange and fascinating adventures in fairyland of the little boy Carl and the little maid Marigold, whom he gallantly rescues from the hands of the cruel Giant Gaptooth. The book is a constant succession of surprising and exciting incidents, and will be a source of never-ending delight to the juvenile mind.

THE MONTH.

APPOINTMENTS.

THE Rev. John Cooke, D.D., Incumbent of Glenealy, has been appointed to a canonry in Christ Church Cathedral, Dublin—patron, the Archbishop of Dublin.

The Ven. A. Tait, D.D, Archdeacon of Tuam, has been appointed Canon of St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin—patron, the Bishop of Tuam (by lapse).

The Bishop of Worcester has appointed the Rev. A. R. Vardy, Head Master of King Edward's School, Birmingham, to be one of his examining chaplains, in the place of Dean Farrar, resigned.

The Rev. T. Selby Henrey, formerly Curate of St. Botolph's, Aldersgate, has been appointed Vicar of St. George's, Old Brentford, the patron being the Vicar of Ealing. Mr. Henrey, since he left St. Botolph's, has been doing temporary duty first at St. George's-in-the-East, and recently at St. George's, Hanover Square. It will be remembered that during the six years Mr. Henrey was at St. Botolph's he organized, and carried on, a series of mid-day services in the churchyard, which is frequented by a large number of City toilers during the dinner-hour, and that he succeeded in obtaining, as speakers, several bishops and other dignitaries of the Church, as well as leading laymen. He was practically curate-in-charge, and the high esteem in which he was held by the parishioners was brought forward very prominently in the controversy which arose respecting the appointment of the present Vicar.

NEW CHURCH.

The new St. Peter's Church at Eastbourne was dedicated on St. Paul's Day by Archdeacon Sutton. The new church takes the place of a temporary one behind the Town Hall, which has been in use for some years as a chapel-of-ease to St. Saviour's. It is a fine stone and brick building, in the Early English style, built with three main roofs, and lighted by a high window arcade in the side aisles. Great dignity is given to the interior by the large chancel, equal in width to the nave

30 feet), and with the same lofty roof, the only division being a massive rood-beam, surmounted by a cross. There will, however, be a wrought-iron screen shortly. The building, as at present erected, has cost about £16,000, of which nearly £4,000 has still to be raised. The plans also include a morning chapel and a tower, which will cost another £5,000 or £6,000.

Nonconformists and the Church.

Some representative Nonconformist ministers met on January 27 at the Bishop of Rochester's Episcopal residence to welcome the new Bishop to his diocese. The following address, which had thirty-one signatures, was read by the Rev. J. Tolefree Parr (Surrey Chapel):

"We, the undersigned ministers of Evangelical Free Churches of South London, including Congregationalists, Baptists, Presbyterians, and Methodists, desire to congratulate your lordship on your appointment as Bishop of the large and important diocese of Rochester, and to assure you of our hearty welcome. We have heard with sincere pleasure of the noble work accomplished by you in the city of Leeds as a Christian philanthropist, and in ministering to the well-being of the community irrespective of denominational distinctions. We shall hail with great satisfaction the manifestation of the same spirit in your present sphere as the chief representative of the Church of England. We assure you that, whilst we frankly recognise the diversity of judgment which necessarily exists in questions which sever us, we are prepared to stand shoulder to shoulder with you in the maintenance of the great principles of purity, righteousness, and temperance, which are held in common by all Christians."

The sentiments of the address were expanded in brief speeches by the Rev. F. B. Meyer (Christ Church, Westminster Bridge Road) and the Rev. J. Scott Lidgett (Warden of the Bermondsey Settlement). The Bishop cordially replied.

Gifts.

The Church Pastoral Aid Society has received two gifts of £500 each, one from Mr. John Henry Buxton, president of the society, and the other from Mr. B. Stretton, Wisbora Tower, Billingshurst. The receipts since April last towards the society's "Forward" Fund amount to £2,700.

Emigration.

The Rev. W. Osborn B. Allen, general secretary of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, writing to point out what is being done by that society for the spiritual welfare of emigrants, says: "The number which went to the United States in the last year was 126,646; to Canada, 16,658; to South Africa, 20,254; to Australasia, 10,532; making a total of 174,090. These figures refer only to emigrants of British origin. The most noticeable feature is the very large increase in the numbers going to South Africa, 7,000 more having gone in 1895 than in 1894. To minister to such numbers is a large task. We have appointed chaplains at the chief ports. We have published a list of clergy in the Colonies and in the United States who are ready to care for emigrants on their arrival. And further, we try to place chaplains on board all the great ships going to Canada, Australia, and the Cape, who will travel all the way with their floating flocks. During the past year eighty-five such appointments were made, and the value of these services cannot be over-estimated. Young men and young women, starting abroad for the first time, need counsel, and even warning, and those who best know the possible dangers will feel how necessary this branch of Church work is. I would only add that we hope to continue our work during the present year. If anyone desires to

obtain information about Canada or the United States, our chaplain, the Rev. J. Bridger (St. Nicholas Vestry, Liverpool), will be glad to answer any questions, while I shall be pleased to do the same with regard to the Cape or Australasia."

A lecture has been delivered at Sion College by Dr. A. Schofield on "The Clergy as Teachers of Sanitation." The chair was taken by the president of Sion College (the Rev. J. W. Pratt), and there was a large attendance of clergy. Dr. Schofield referred at the outset to the fact that 200,000 needless and premature deaths take place every year, to say nothing of some millions of unnecessary sicknesses. Only about one in eight died really natural deaths, and the premature deaths of at least half the rest were preventable. The spread of hygiene had, however, already greatly lengthened our days. Twenty was the average age in the last century; now it was forty-two for a man and forty-four for a woman. Having cited a number of similar facts to show at once the need and the value of hygienic knowledge, and the remarkable advantages which by their position the clergy enjoyed as teachers of hygiene, the lecturer urged that a committee should be formed to organize special lectures in hygiene for the clergy. A brisk discussion followed, in which the Revs. N. J. Devereux, E. P. Green, H. Williams, J. D. Mullins, J. H. Scott, C. T. Payne, and others, took part.

Obituary.

GENERAL RICHARD CHARLES LAWRENCE, who has lately died at Biarritz, aged seventy-seven, was the youngest and last survivor of the five Lawrence brothers, of Indian fame. Entering the Indian army in 1834, he went through the Sutlej campaign, and was present at the battle of Sobraon (1846). During the war of the Mutiny he greatly distinguished himself, winning the C.B. for his services before Delhi. His principal work, however, was performed under his brothers, Sir Henry and Sir John (afterwards Lord) Lawrence, during the pacification and organization of the Punjab, where the memory of "Deek," as the natives called him, is still held in affectionate reverence. By his marriage (in 1839) with Ellen, daughter of the late Colonel William Youngson, of Bowscar, Cumberland, General Lawrence leaves four sons and two daughters. Two of his sons have retired from the Indian army as colonels; a third is commanding officer of the 1st Dragoon Guards.

Sir Joseph Barnby died lately at his house in St. George's Square. Born in 1838, he became a chorister at York Minster in 1846, and afterwards entered the Royal Academy of Music. From 1863 to 1871 he was organist of St. Andrew's, Wells Street; from 1871 to 1886 he held the same post at St. Anne's, Soho. In 1875 he became precentor and director of musical instruction at Eton, his official connection with the school lasting till, in 1892, he was elected principal of the Guildhall School of Music. That year he also received the honour of knighthood. He had been conductor of the Royal Albert Hall Choral Society since 1872, when he succeeded Gounod. Sir Joseph Barnby has taken a place amongst composers of Church music, and of his other compositions, his "Eton Boating Song" is a universal favourite.