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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

A Monthly Magazine

CONDUCTED BY CLERGYMEN AND LAYMEN

OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

VOL. XI.

NEW SERIES

LONDON
ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW
1897

PREFACE.

THAT the Church of England has a national character of its own is a truism which does not need stating. Its ideal is to be catholic in its organization, and in its adherence to the Creeds of the Undivided Church, Scriptural in its appeal to the supreme authority of the words of Christ, His Prophets and Apostles, and Primitive in its deference to the customs and interpretations of the Apostolic and Sub-apostolic Ages. The aim of THE CHURCHMAN is to realize something of this tone, and to express it without party bias or feeling on one side or the other.

This will be seen by glancing at the subjects treated during the past twelve months. On the pressing question of the *History of the Old Testament* we have had three more of Chancellor Lias's learned and valuable papers on "The Authorship of the Pentateuch"; Mr. Andrew Robinson has written on "The Cuneiform Records and the Fall of Babylon"; Canon Hayman on "The Most Formidable Pentateuchal Difficulty Obviated," and on Cheyne's treatment of Deuteronomy. In *Theology*, Mr. Fausset has written on "The Augustinian Doctrine of Grace and the Will," Mr. Morris on "English Church Teaching in Anglo-Saxon Times on the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper," Principal Sheraton, of Toronto, on "The Idea of the Church," Canon Macnamara on "The Influence and Effect of Modern Science on Christianity," and Mr. Llewellyn Davies on "Reunion." In matters of *Controversy*, from which, unhappily, no searcher for truth can ever be entirely free, Mr. Montague Fowler has written on "The Earlier Anglican Resistance to Roman Claims," Mr. Alfred Pearson on "Cardinal Manning's Admissions," Canon McCormick on "Church Teaching and the Church of Rome"; Mr. Dimock has written three papers on "The History of the Prayer-Book as bearing on Present Controversies," Canon Birch on "Replies to the Pope's Bull," and there has been a paper on "The Reformers' Views of the Sacrifice of the Mass." In *Ecclesiastical* matters we have had a paper on "The Benefices Bill of 1897," from Dr. Hiley; on "The Diaconate as a Permanent Order," by Mr. Downer; on "Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister," by Chancellor P. V. Smith; on "Some Latent Forces in the Church," by Mr. E. C. Carter; on "Characteristics of a Good Hymn-Tune," by Dr. Ramsbotham; and on "What Constitutes a Successful Ministry,"

by Mr. W. H. Purchas. As to questions of *Political* and *Contemporary* interest, we have had papers on "Armenia," "The Indian Famine of 1897," "Queen and People," and "The Teaching of Scripture in Schools" (Miss Birrell). Among *Devotional* subjects, we have had "Patience, Human and Divine," by the Hon. M. Cordelia Leigh; "The Power of Faith," "Sloth," and "Worldliness." *Biographical Studies* have been contributed on Archbishop Magee, Bishop Harold Browne (Dr. Hiley), Count Campello (Mr. H. J. R. Marston), J. W. Knott (the late Mr. E. P. Hathaway), Thomas Scott (Mr. J. A. Porter), and "William Morris" (Mr. M. Kaufmann). We have carried out the promise of the last Preface in having accounts of the work done by *Great Societies* in the Church of England; there has been a paper on "The Social Work of the Church" generally, on the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, on the Church Pastoral Aid Association (Mr. R. G. Fowell), the National Society (Mr. J. Studholme Brownrigg), the Church of England Young Men's Society and other Societies of the kind (Mr. W. M. Farquhar), the East London Church Fund, the Queen Victoria Clergy Sustentation Fund (Chancellor P. V. Smith), and Aid of Clergy in very Poor Parishes (Mrs. Fanshawe). For *Literary* subjects we have not had as much space as could have been desired. There has been a translation from Prudentius, by Principal Moule, a paper on novels and plays in regard to unmarried women, and a review of recent books on Hegel by Mr. E. H. Blakeney. The *Places of Interest* which have been treated are Canterbury (Dean Farrar), Winchester (Mr. John Vaughan), Glastonbury (Prebendary Vernon), Bethlehem (Dr. Preston), Oxford (Religion of the Undergraduate, Mr. E. N. Bennett), and Norway (Lutheran Services, Mr. Lawrence Dewhirst). The part devoted to *The Month* and to *Notices and Reviews* has been extended with advantage.

The conductors of THE CHURCHMAN desire that their work should be constructive, impartial, sympathetic to all that is good, and loyal to the Church of which they are members. Suggestions as to increased interest and greater usefulness they will be always happy to receive. If subscribers desire specimen copies in order to make the Review known to friends they will be glad to supply them. They earnestly wish to take their part in the promotion of that mutual understanding, toleration, sympathy, and respect, both within and without the Church of England, which the reports and resolutions of the Lambeth Conference of 1897 urge so strongly on Churchmen, and they look in all things for the guidance and blessing of the Holy Spirit of God.

WILLIAM SINCLAIR.

PREFACE.

MANY friends have come round the CHURCHMAN in the past year, and made valuable suggestions for an increased usefulness. As the great movement, inaugurated by Newman, is revealed by its pious, zealous, lovable, and trusted leader, Lord Halifax, as a school of thought which knows no difference in sentiment or opinion from the unreformed Roman Church, which ardently longs for full recognition from the Pope as he is, which yearns for admission to the privileges of the Mass in foreign churches, and which binds itself to consider that recognition as a step towards full corporate reunion, those portions of the English Church which are not affected by this movement naturally draw together for mutual support and self-preservation. They think they see signs of this devotion and reverence for the Papal Church becoming thin and threadbare, and their faith and prayer lead them to believe with all their hearts that the English people will never give up their hold on the simple principles of the eternal and glorious Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.

It has been suggested that the part of this review which deals with the events of the previous month might be greatly extended, and should become the permanent record of the more important societies of the Church of England which are in the main in sympathy with our object. The younger men are conspicuous for zeal and activity, and they are invited to ventilate their ideas and to record the good works of which they are witnesses in these pages. It is amongst these that the hope of the Church of England for the future lies; it is from the younger men that we look for those adaptations which will fit the Church for its ever-increasing responsibilities.

The societies will be represented in the first instance by those who know most about them. The Church Missionary Society is to be described by Mr. Eugene Stock; the Church Pastoral Aid Society by the Rev. J. Barton; the Society for

Promoting Christian Knowledge by the Rev. Edmund McClure; the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel by one deeply interested through long years in its welfare, whose name is not to be known; the National Society by the Rev. J. Studholme Brownrigg; the other societies in like manner.

There will be full opportunity for the discussion of all contemporary movements, such as the position of Old Testament Criticism, Home Reunion, the Condition of the Unbeneficed Clergy, the Sceptical and Secularist tendencies of the day, the Marriage Laws, questions affecting public and private Morality, the Rights and Duties of Laymen, Philanthropic Movements, Private Benevolent Institutions, Social Schemes, and the like. Those who are specially interested in these matters are earnestly invited to see that their principles are advocated in a reasonable and earnest manner.

The Forward Movement of the Church Pastoral Aid Society, with its noble ambition of supplying all poor parishes which can accept its aid with abundant resources for carrying on their work, and with which all must sympathize who have no wish to walk step by step towards Rome, will here find room for the discussion of its aims and the application of its principles.

The CHURCHMAN is also a very suitable vehicle for conveying information to the English Church about the various Old Catholic Churches, and for the movements for Church Reform in Spain and Italy.

Sketches of localities interesting to Churchmen as connected with the history of the Church will also from time to time appear. Dean Farrar has most kindly found time to provide a vivid and most interesting sketch of the history of Canterbury Cathedral; Dean Purey-Cust, the Dean of York, of York; the Archdeacon of Durham, of Durham; and others of Winchester, Lincoln, Dublin, etc.

The CHURCHMAN desires to be wide in its sympathies, while true to the principles of the English Reformation as expressed in the Prayer-Book, under the authority of the Bible. Its object is the strengthening and extension of Christ's kingdom in this country in harmony with these principles. It desires to judge or condemn nobody, but rather to promote peace and goodwill. On all its aims and works it looks alone to the blessing and guidance of God.

WILLIAM SINCLAIR.

THE

CHURCHMAN

OCTOBER, 1896.

ART. I.—THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE PENTATEUCH.

PART VII.

IN resuming the examination of the Book of Genesis with a view to ascertain the evidences it presents of a common authorship of the books of Moses, it may be well to remark that the question has never, as yet, been approached from this side. All that has been hitherto done has been, first, to assume that it is the work of several different authors, and then to note certain phrases as characteristic of one or other of these authors. But until the investigation has been fairly carried out on both sides, it is simply trifling with the question to pretend that the problem has been solved.

We come next to the actual narrative of the flood itself, in Gen. vii., viii. It will be convenient if at the outset we mention the alleged sources of the narrative, and if the reader will place these portions of his Bible in brackets, he will be the better able to follow the discussion. The Jehovist (or writer who uses the word Jehovah) leads off with the first five verses of chap. vii. To him also belong verses 7-10, 12, 17, 22, 23; viii. 2b, 3a, 6-12, 13b, 20-22.[1] The rest is taken from the post-exilic writer or compiler of the Priestly Code. The general reader is quite as able to judge as the Hebrew expert of the *a priori* probability that the narrative, considered as a history, would be so compiled. And it will be seen that the linguistic peculiarities in the passage are not by any means striking or numerous. Nor does it seem very clear why the Elohistic passages[2] should not be assigned to the North Israelite con-

[1] Kautzsch and Socin's arrangement differs somewhat from that of Professor Driver. The former assigns vii. 17a to P ("forty days" to the redactor), 23b to the redactor, the *whole* of viii. 13 to P.

[2] Those in which Elohim or God, not Jehovah or Lord, is used.

temporary (E) of the Jehovist (J), instead of to the post-exilic Elohist (P), the writer of the Priestly Code.

The first point which strikes us as remarkable is, that both these writers, assumed to be entirely independent of, and even sometimes contrary to, one another, have obtained their narrative from the same source—Babylonian tradition. We have now more than one translation of the famous Babylonian tablet discovered by Mr. George Smith nearly a quarter of a century ago. I do not wish to overload this paper with detail, so I shall refer my readers to the version of it given in Professor Sayce's "The Higher Criticism and the Verdict of the Monuments." The general accuracy of his translation has not been seriously disputed. And on consulting it we are struck by several facts: (1) The Babylonian story and that contained in Genesis have a common origin. (2) The Israelite story is based on monotheistic, the Babylonian on polytheistic, religious ideas. Whether the Israelite is the earlier monotheistic account, or whether Israelite monotheistic sympathies have supplied us with a later monotheistic recension of the older story, is a point on which I will not enter. My only object is to discuss the modern theory of the manner in which the Pentateuch was composed. (3) The monotheistic and the polytheistic story agree in regarding the deluge as a punishment. (4) The Jehovist, in his reference to the dove (viii. 8, 9), and to Jehovah "smelling a sweet savour" (viii. 21), makes use of the same Babylonian document as the author of the Priestly Code does when he speaks of the measurement, the stories of the ark (vi. 15, 16), as well as its contents (vii. 14). And (5) the technical sacrificial expression "odour of a sweet smell" (ריח הניחח), implying a sacrifice of a particular kind, was in existence some thousands of years before the ritual which gave the phrase its technical character.

Let us pause a moment, and see what this involves. First of all, it involves the fact that a writer in Judea in the eighth or ninth century B.C. is acquainted with a Babylonian document of very early date. He must have been acquainted with it, for he uses its language and relates incidents which it contains. If oral tradition, handed down from Abraham, or even Moses, through some six centuries, accounts for these coincidences, we have here a marvel which almost competes, as far as miracle is concerned, with the story of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, or of Balaam. But if J is consulting a document which had been handed down from the time of Moses, and embodying earlier Babylonian tradition, we have here a considerable Mosaic element in the narrative. And, if this be the case, why may not the whole narrative be Mosaic? On the other hand, it is at least a curious coincidence that the post-exilic writer, coming

from Babylon with an intensely bitter remembrance of the Captivity, and a still intenser hatred of Babylonian polytheism, should have followed an ancient Babylonian and polytheistic narrative of the deluge, the more especially when, *ex hypothesi*, he was writing with a strong anti-polytheistic object. One would have expected him to betray the passionate hatred of the Jew during and after the exile for Babylonian idolatry, polytheism, and superstition, a hatred which would lead him to cast away with anger, mingled with contempt, the "lying vanities" in which he had learned not to "put his trust." It is doubtful whether the appearance of this ancient Babylonish document is calculated to surprise us more in the ninth-century J or the post-exilic P. It is still more surprising to find them both using the same document. But there is yet another surprise in store for us. That very inscrutable person the redactor had before him two accounts of the flood by two separate authors. These accounts were in themselves presumably coherent, and not self-contradictory. They were derived from the same original story. The redactor might have followed either with satisfactory results. But he takes the trouble—very unnecessary trouble, one would have thought—to dovetail the one into the other in such a way as to produce the *maximum* of inconsistency and confusion. Mr. Wilkie Collins, in one of his clever stories, introduces a character who astonishes us by successively displaying an English, a French, and a German side. Modern criticism has painted a companion picture of an ancient editor who displays by turns superhuman acuteness and superhuman folly. Here his folly is in the ascendant. He might have saved himself and posterity a great deal of trouble by following either of his authorities, with the result that a clear and intelligible story would have been handed down. He has perplexed posterity and immortalized himself, we are asked to believe, by picking his narratives to pieces, and patching verses and half-verses together, so as to produce the greatest possible amount of bewilderment.[1] Then there are "recurring features" in each narrative, which are supposed to display the characteristics of the two authors. But it may be observed that these "recurring features" may as easily be characteristic of one writer as two, unless they are plainly antagonistic. Emphasis was given to early Hebrew narrative by repetition. And in repetition "recurring features" would

[1] Small apparent inconsistencies in a writer unversed in the modern art of literary composition need not surprise us, and fuller information would easily enable us to explain them. But on the theory canvassed above, these inconsistencies are deliberately pieced together out of two discordant accounts.

naturally be found. It is at least quite as probable that the theory is responsible for the "recurring features" as that they suggested the theory. Then again, as for the supposed contradiction between the selection of the beasts by pairs and sevens, to which exception has been taken, the word "clean beasts" points to the only reasonable explanation—the explanation which, until the microscopic criticism came into fashion, was invariably given. The *clean* beasts were for *food* and for sacrifice (viii. 20), as well as to preserve the species alive. The rest of the beasts were not for food, but for preservation. I may add that I do not propose to discuss the literal credibility of the story. My business at present is with the authorship alone.

We proceed to examine how far the story, as we have it, lends itself to the dissection and reconstruction which we are asked to regard as proved. We have already seen[1] that the supposed two separate narratives presuppose one another a good deal. And when one portion of a narrative presupposes another, it is a sign of unity of authorship. First of all, then, the later narrative (P), in chap. vii. 6, introduces an abrupt transition. In chap. vi. 22, supposed to be taken from this narrative, God's commands to Noah come to an end. So far as we at present know from P (v. 32), he is but five hundred years old. In a brief space we pass over a hundred years, and the flood of waters is already on the earth. All that P tells us between these two passages is God's prophecy of the flood just before it began. It is true that P in chap. vii. 11 refers to the flood. But it is far more in accordance with the ancient Hebrew style that there should be here a repetition of the narrative in verses 1-5, than so startling an inversion of the order as is involved in the critical reconstruction. Then, in verses 7-10, assigned "mainly" by Professor Driver to J, we have the word "God," which is the sign of the Elohist. How it got there he does not explain. Moreover, J in verse 9 agrees with P in chap. vi. 19, and is at issue with itself in verse 2. Therefore J itself must be "composite" here. Why verses 7-10 are not assigned to P or some other writer it is impossible to say, the more so as the supposed contradiction has been made much of by some critics.[2] Moreover, as we have already seen, the words "flood of waters" (vi. 17, vii. 6), and "waters of the flood" (vii. 10), seem to indicate unity of authorship. Precisely the same may be said of verse 12. It is assigned to J simply because verse 4 has been so assigned, and for no other reason whatsoever. The same, once more, may be said of verse 17, supposed to have been inserted from J

[1] CHURCHMAN, May, 1896.

[2] Kautzsch and Socin, with others, see the hand of the redactor in verse 9. Why, if he adapted verse 9 to suit vi. 20, he did not also alter verses 2 and 3, it "passes the wit of man" to say.

between verses 16, 18 (P). For it contains details similar to those in verses 18, 19, and were we to imitate the infalliblity of the modern critic, we should pronounce it to be indubitably by the same hand.

We proceed to ask whether the author of the earlier narrative (J) betrays any signs of being acquainted with the later document (P). In the first place, there is the distinction of clean and unclean beasts (vii. 2, viii. 20). Here the author recognises a distinction, probably in the ninth century B.C., which many critics would tell us was not then in existence. But if it were thus early in existence, the fact opens out some interesting subjects for discussion. If this enactment were then in force, why may it not have been part of the Mosaic law? And if this particular provision dates back as far as the ninth century B.C., why should not many more have been then—and even yet earlier—in existence? A careful inquiry into the contents of the Old Testament Scriptures thus yields the result that a large portion of the Jewish law is older than some critics have supposed. *Some* ceremonial enactments, and some laws and ideas specially connected with sacrifice, were already in existence as far back as the eighth or ninth century B.C.

We need not dwell on the precise similarity of the statement in chap. vii. 1 (J), with that in chap. vi. 9 (P), and we have already remarked upon the incidental mention of the ark in this verse, which seems only consistent with a continuous narrative. But in verse 16 the exclusion of the words "and the Lord shut him in" from P's narrative, and its assignment to J, seems a little singular. For the words are in close connection with the rest of the verse. The animals went in with Noah into the ark, "and Jehovah shut him in." But the last words the redactor has taken from J are "and the rain was upon the earth forty days and forty nights," and he now adds a passage which has no apparent connection with the former, "and the Lord shut him in, and the flood was forty days upon the earth," etc. Again the redactor's principle of selection is not a little puzzling. Moreover, the narrative of J here approaches the bald formality supposed to be characteristic of P. But on the supposition that the theory is responsible for the alleged facts, and not the facts for the theory, all is clear enough. For, by the hypothesis, all passages containing the word "Jehovah" are from the Jehovist, and the word ויסגר occurs in the Jehovistic passage (ii. 21). Consequently these words, however awkward the transition may appear, had of necessity to be assigned to the Jehovist. So, again, verse 22, which follows naturally on verse 21, had to be assigned to the Jehovist, because of the נשמת חיים, which is one of the supposed characteristics of the Jehovist (see chap. ii.

7).[1] Moreover, as has already been shown,[2] the expressions found in verses 21, 22, though assigned to P and J respectively (especially the word רמש, which also occurs in vi. 7, assigned to J), are all characteristic of Gen i., which is assigned to P.

The next passage selected by the redactor from J presents him again in rather a remarkable light. "Noah only remained alive, and they that were with him in the ark." These are the last words he has taken from the Jehovist. The next are: "And the rain from heaven was restrained, and the waters returned from off the earth continually" (viii. 2b, 3a). Now, we are told that he took these from J, and no doubt, if we are so told, we ought to accept the statement with docility. Nevertheless, the old Adam within us will sometimes assert itself. And we cannot, therefore, refrain from asking ourselves, What on earth made the redactor take this curious little passage, consisting of two half-verses, from J just at this point? And why did he take the account of the cessation of the rain which we find in viii. 1, 2a from P? We shall see presently that the style of 3a agrees remarkably with that of P in verse 5. But for the present we are lost in admiration at the redactor and his inscrutable ways. Why did he take this passage from J? It does not add any particular information. But his next selection from J, that in verse 6 *et seq.*, suggests considerations yet more perplexing. The "hundred and fifty days" belongs strictly to P. J "knows nothing" whatever about them. From whence, then, are J's forty days, at the end of which Noah opened the ark, to be reckoned? Supposing the narrative to be by one author, the answer is obvious: At the end of the hundred and fifty days. But if we are forbidden to see here the work of one author, or of any redactor who does not confine himself strictly to copying what he has before him—if it is the practice of Hebrew compilers to take their matter bodily from one author or another—from whence is the end of the forty days to be reckoned? The last forty days mentioned by J are those in which "the waters increased, and bare up the ark" (vii. 18). After that we learn from him (1) that all which had life was destroyed, that the rain was restrained, and that the waters returned from off the earth continually, and that at the end of the forty days (presumably the forty days during which the flood had taken place) Noah sent out the raven! But let us suppose that J meant to say that the forty days are to be reckoned from the date at which the waters began to abate.

[1] The words here are נשמת רוח חיים, which, if the critical system were correct, would require a *third* writer here, and neither J nor P. For P (vi. 17) writes רוח חיים.

[2] CHURCHMAN, March, 1896, pp. 284, 285.

Then, what was the redactor thinking about to copy this statement from J when he had before stated twice over that one hundred and fifty days had elapsed before the waters began to abate at all? Once more the folly of the redactor was in the ascendant. He had not sense enough to see that the two accounts he had before him were palpably inconsistent. And, more astonishing than all, the Jewish public preferred this stupidly incoherent narrative to two other older and better ones, which they most surprisingly allowed to perish. There is nothing more to call for particular remark in the alleged selections in this chapter, save that there is no apparent reason, beyond the critical theory, why viii. 13b should be assigned to J, and that J appears to "know nothing" of Noah having got out of the ark. Or, if he did, then the spirit of inquiry which it is the duty of every orthodox disciple of the critics to repress, incites us to ask why P's narrative of the going out of the ark should be preferred to J's. Another trifling matter, too, may demand a moment's attention. P's narrative of the prevailing of the waters on the earth, and of the ark being borne on the face of the waters (vii. 18) is decidedly more graphic and picturesque than that of J in the preceding verse. Once more this is contrary to the hypothesis.

So far every one of our readers is as competent a judge of the question before them as the most profound Oriental scholar in the world. I conclude with a brief notice of the phraseology of P in these two chapters, which will, as usual, display a sufficient number of points of similarity to the rest of the narrative as to support the traditional view that the narrative in Genesis was written by one author. My first remark is that there is a point of contact between vii. 1 (J) and vi. 9 (P) in the use of the word דור (generation) in connection with Noah, though in the one case the word is in the singular, in the other in the plural. Next, the causative voice of the verb מטר (to rain) only occurs fifteen times in the Old Testament. Of these six are in the books of Genesis and Exodus—that is to say, more than one-third of the times it occurs in the whole of the Old Testament. The word occurs three times in J (Gen. ii. 5, vii. 4, xix. 24), and three times in P (Exod. ix. 18, 23; xvi. 4). Here, then, we have another sign of common authorship. Nor is this all. In vii. 4 (J) we have the expression אנכי ממטיר, "I am causing it to rain." Exod. ix. 18, xvi. 4 (P), has the same construction, save that we find הנני, "behold me," for אנכי, "I." This use of the participle of the causative voice of מטר occurs *nowhere else* in the Old Testament. Here again, then, we find signs of common authorship between J and P. The verb מחה, again, to *wipe out*, a characteristic word for "to destroy," occurs in

the Old Testament thirty-five times in this sense, in the active and passive voice. Of these eleven, or nearly one-third, are in the Pentateuch. Four are in Deuteronomy, seven in J. Thus, there are signs of common authorship between J and Deuteronomy. These voices occur but seldom in any other single book. Once more, in vii. 2 (J) we have the unusual expression איש ואשתו (man and his wife) for male and female, whereas, in verse 3 (J) and verse 9 (P) we have the more usual expression, זכר ונקבה. If difference of expression involves diversity of authorship, why are verses 2 and 3 assigned to the same author?

I have already[1] adverted to the fact that in chaps. vii. 11 and viii. 2 the poetic expressions "windows of heaven" and "fountains of the great deep" (which in vii. 11 are spoken of as cloven asunder—בקע) are assigned, under pressure of necessity, to the formal P, and the prosaic "rain" to the more lively J. The next expression which deserves notice is בעצם היום הזה (literally, in the *bone of* this day, *i.e.*, on this very day). Wherever this phrase occurs in Genesis-Numbers, it has been found possible, by a dexterous manipulation of the passages, to assign it to P. But it is worthy of remark that it only occurs in the Pentateuch (including once in Deuteronomy), twice in Joshua, and in Ezekiel. Yet Professor Driver ("Introduction," p. 124) regards it as characteristic of P. But Josh. x. 27 he assigns to "the compiler." I venture to assert that the phrase is characteristic of the author of the Pentateuch, and that the author of Joshua had the Pentateuch before him when he composed his work. We ought not to pass over the use of "wing" for "species" in vii. 14, which seems rather to savour of the simplicity of early language than the period of decay. So, again, the expression "all flesh" only occurs here (where it is carefully, however, assigned to P), and in poetic passages. There is once more an archaic simplicity about it which suggests that the poets and prophets found the word in their ancient books.

In verses 17-19 there is a delicate *nuance* of construction which has escaped the notice of the dissectors. In verse 17 (J) the waters are said to have increased, in verse 18 (P) to have increased *greatly* (מאד), and in verse 19 (P) to have increased *very* greatly (מאד מאד). We have thus in this passage, though it is said to have been taken from different authors, the positive, the comparative, and the superlative. Yet no one has detected the hand of the redactor here.[2] The poetic word "expired," which occurs here in the formal P, is

[1] CHURCHMAN, February, 1896, p. 246.

[2] It is true that in P we find גבר instead of רבה. Verse 18 has *both!*

remarkable. It has been carefully assigned to P wherever it occurs. But it once more strikes one as curious, and suggests some doubts whether the theory is correct, that the dry and formal post-exilic writer should have made use of a word which, save in Josh. xxii. 20, occurs only in poetry.[1] Then, in verse 22, assigned to J, we have the expression "breath of the spirit of life" (נשמת רוח חיים), which ought by rights to be found in the latest writer of all, because it combines J's expression, "breath of life" (ii. 17), and P's expression, "spirit of life" (vii. 15). Moreover, this passage very markedly recalls to mind P's language in Gen. i. 24, 25, as well as that of JE in Gen. ii. 7. In verse 18, again, we have the word גבר in the sense of prevail, in which it occurs four times in this passage. It only occurs in this voice and in this sense seven other times in the Old Testament. Of these one is Gen. xlix. 26 (where it is followed by על, as in vii. 19); and another is Exod. xvii. 17 (JE). We have thus another sign of unity of authorship in the Pentateuch, and yet one more point of connection between Jacob's song and the rest of the book in which it appears. I must reserve the examination of the diction of chap. viii. till a future occasion.

J. J. Lias.

Art. II.—Professor Cheyne on Deuteronomy.[2]

The school of criticism to which Professor Cheyne belongs is that of the "candid friends" of the "men of the Bible" and of Holy Writ itself. The guiding principle of candid friendship, announced long ago by Canning, that "black's not *so* black, nor white so *very* white," may be illustrated from various pages of "Jeremiah: His Life and Times." I will take one only from p. 23: "A fair-minded student is bound to say that Jeremiah and his opponents were both right. . . . The Baalim of the different cities and villages . . . were not necessarily, in the mind of the worshippers, 'other gods beside Jehovah'; and even when they were, their worship did not exclude that of Jehovah." But if so, Elijah and the Baal prophets were "both right," Elijah's exclusiveness (1 Kings xviii. 21) was unfounded, and Jehu's distinction in his massacre (2 Kings x. 23) was unmeaning. Then, how about Ashtoreth and the Asherah? Are they, too, mere synonyms or duplicates of Jehovah "in the mind of the worshippers"?

[1] In Numb. xx. 3 half a verse is severed from a coherent narrative because גוע is characteristic of P.

[2] "Jeremiah: His Life and Times."

And, then, what becomes of the First and Second Commandments? Where shall we draw the line at which true religion ends and the false begins? Is not the confusion of all religious tests and the obliteration of all religious distinctions, so far as the Old Testament is concerned, consummated in the above sample? Jeremiah, we learn, was, when called, a young and self-distrustful man; may possibly have expected "that his readers would take his so-called visions as pure literary fictions"; was given to exaggeration, especially of his own failures, and to despondency of any success in his missions. He had a threefold call, but waited for "a sign from heaven," and recognised it in the invasion of the Scythians. He had a hand in the Book of Deuteronomy, and helped the "*il*lusion" (not "*de*lusion," remember) that it was a genuine work of Moses, as it unmistakably purports to be. At one time he went about preaching it, but recognised later that it, too, was a failure, and got beyond it. Habakkuk likewise "miscalculated." Thus, our critic enables us to sit on the shoulders of the prophets and see much further than they, and, in particular, to see that the idolatries of Judah were not "so black" nor the true religion "so very white" as prophecy paints them.

The theory that the Book of Deuteronomy was first written at or about the same time that the Book of the *Torah* was found in the temple by Hilkiah the priest is probably most widely known and most popularly commended by this work of Professor Cheyne, with its powerful appeals to feeling and to fancy. When the Elgin marbles, after being sunk and fished up again on their voyage from Greece to England, were unpacked before the eyes of the Dilettanti Society, Payne Knight, the classical art oracle of our grandfathers in the teens of this century, pronounced them to be Roman imitations of the time of Hadrian. Long and furious was the strife of critics and connoisseurs; it passed away at last in the universal homage of Europe to the genius and the school of Phidias, as shown in the established genuineness of these its products. With the present age and Deuteronomy the question is more complex, in proportion as a literary treatise of some fourteen thousand words is necessarily more involved than the purely objective series of a few torsos and friezes. But one need not hesitate to expect that, when the sieve and the alembic of the higher criticism have done their worst, and its critics have spoken their last word, the substantially genuine auto-Mosaic character of the laws, and the contemporary character of the record which imbeds them, will shine out all the clearer from the storm of controversy in which, perhaps for a generation, they will have been involved.

It will be impossible to even summarize in the course of this brief paper the various converging lines of argument on

which the affirmation of that Mosaic and contemporary character may be made to rest. It must here suffice to touch, however briefly, the chief supports alleged for the opposite opinion, and expose their insufficiency; and meanwhile, as regards the former or affirmative branch of the argument, barely to point to the grand and unique character of Moses himself, self-delineated in the most artless unconsciousness, but at fuller length and in more salient relief than most other characters of the Old Testament. Could such a conception have been due to the imaginative powers of a committee of priests and jurists *in fœce Romuli*, in the decaying period of the Judæan monarchy? Of course, inspiration might at any time include such powers. But there is nowhere in the Hebrew record another instance of such self-portraiture *ex post facto*, and nothing but the most positive and cogent external evidence could induce us to accept it. To this may be added—nay, must be added now—the Tel-el-Amarna tablets; not so much in respect of their matter as of their form, style, and evidence of literary advancement a century or two before Moses became "learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians." They have come to light since Ewald's masterpiece of criticism and Dillmann's masterpiece of commentary. It is not too much to say, and here it must suffice to say, that in the light of those tablets the entire field of controversy will have to be reviewed.

As "in the land of the blind the one-eyed is king," so in the realm of criticism, where decisive arguments fail, men rely on slender presumptions. There is nothing, perhaps, to be said against them. Then the absence of weight on the other side is treated as though it added affirmative weight to them. The negative quantity does duty rhetorically, as if it were positive. This is, in fact, arguing from darkness to light, and its result is hardly less misleading than the attempt to draw from a negative premise an affirmative conclusion. This, therefore, must be marked as, strictly speaking, a fallacious method, prone to conclusions not of course demonstrably false, for certainty is *ex hypothesi* here out of reach, but untrustworthy. The minimum of presumption remains a minimum still; and if a writer of warm sympathies, active imagination, and rhetorical bias, proceeds to build upon it, the maximum of superstructure effectually masks the minimum of foundation, and we have a pyramid resting on its apex. To chill the warmth of sympathy and check the activity of the imagination is an invidious and repulsive office, nor have I here space to attempt it in detail. It must here be enough to caution the reader against "chambers of imagery," enriching the rather bare wall of nude fact with idyllic and elegant vignettes of what may have been, and finding sometimes in the gaps of ruin a niche here and there for the statuesque of fancy.

There is, however, one chapter—the seventh—which approaches more closely than the rest to logical method, and with which I propose here to deal. It is rather copiously fringed with foot-notes showing the eminent authorities, chiefly German, whom the writer has followed, and therefore making little claim, if any, to substantial originality. This, however, on such well-travelled ground is no disparagement; rather, indebtedness is the condition of even approximate completeness. The late origin, *i.e.*, *temp.* Josiah, is the thesis maintained. It is the alleged proofs of it which this chapter proposes to exhibit.

1. "The evidences of the Deuteronomist's dependence on the Yahvistic narrative in the Pentateuch—written at earliest (Dillmann) in the middle of the seventh century B.C.," we are told—"are embarrassing from their very abundance." Then follow a number of coincidences, which evince, so far, agreement, but do not prove dependence, from Jacob's descent into Egypt to Balaam's baffled curse. It is, so far, just as likely that "the Yahvist" depends on Deuteronomy, or that both might depend on some older embodiment than either of the same tradition. But how about the many Deuteronomic deviations from or additions to "the Yahvistic narrative"? We are told "they only prove that our author derived his material from more than one source, his secondary authority being sometimes popular tradition, sometimes, perhaps, his own creative imagination." We are told there is "no reason why criticalness and sympathy should not be combined," and we hear of discoveries to be made by "a critical but religiously sympathetic spirit." We may, therefore, charitably surmise that the fulness of his sympathy led our critic to ascribe to the author (Deuteronomist) criticised that "creative imagination" which he himself so largely embodies. A mere cynic might suggest that the same substratum of sympathy lurks in the proverb which bids us "set a thief to catch a thief." But to return to "the Yahvist." If coincidence of facts mentioned in him and in Deuteronomy shows the latter's dependence on him, what else does it show in Hosea? where we read, "sand of the sea which cannot be numbered for multitude" (i. 10; Heb. ii. 1; *cf.* Gen. xxxii. 12), "Go with their flocks and their herds to seek Jehovah" (v. 6; *cf.* Exod. x. 9, 24-26); and grasp the ethical character of Jehovah, "His righteousness, judgments, loving kindness, mercies, faithfulness" (ii. 19-23; Heb. iii. 5; *cf.* Exod. xx. 6, xxxiv. 6, 7; Numb. xiv. 18); read of the sin of Baal-Peor in the wilderness (ix. 10, xiii. 1; *cf.* Numb. xxv. 3 foll., Deut. iv. 3), and of various incidents in the life of Jacob (xii. 3, 4, 12; *cf.* Gen. xxv. 26, xxxii.

24 foll., xxviii. 12, 19, xxix. 20, 28).[1] But Hosea, moreover, knows of a permanent prophetic ministry which forms the substratum, with frequent outcrop on the surface, of "the Yahvist narrative" throughout, and dating from the Exodus itself (vi. 5, xii. 10, 13). Again, the same "dependence," if so it be, on "Yahvistic" sources must be ascribed to Amos; for he refers to the deliverance from Egypt, to the giant stature of the Amorites cast out before Israel, and to the forty years' sojourn in the wilderness (ii. 9, 10, iii. 1, v. 25). He also knows of Edom as a treacherous brother (i. 11), ascribes to Jehovah the universal act of creation (iv. 13, v. 8), and a guidance of Israel by means of prophets (ii. 11, 12, iii. 7, 8b). He names the chief sacred places—Bethel, Beersheba, Gilgal—stamped with sanctity by events of the Yahvistic record, and, contrariwise, of Sodom and Gomorrah as a standard of desolation and an evidence of Jehovah's vengeance (iii. 14, iv. 4, 11, v. 5). He has also several references to such laws as are embedded in the same record, as of that of the Sabbath (viii. 5), that relating to clothes taken in pledge (ii. 8; *cf.* Exod. xxii. 26 foll.); and since he speaks of a "law and commandments" as notorious facts, and of the close and unique connection of Jehovah with Israel (ii. 4, iii. 2), it is reasonable to refer such incriminations to that law as a known standard. The same is true of his notice of judicial bribes as a means of extortion and oppression (v. 10, 12; *cf.* ii. 6, 7a, and Exod. xxiii. 1, 6, 8). Hosea also knows of a law, and that, too, as a written record, with Jehovah as its Author. His words even probably point to multiplied copies of that law, although this is less certain, and yet of the whole set aside as "alien" (viii. 12).[2] But whether this, or the copiousness of its precepts, or their weight and importance, be intended, is of secondary moment. The thing to notice is that Hosea knew of a written law for Israel, and of Jehovah as its Author, and that the higher criticism insists on rejecting Deuteronomy—and I suppose the entire

---

[1] Some of these passages are given to E by the critics, but their *consensus* as to priority of date between J and E is too precarious to make the distinction relevant to the argument here.

[2] The passage in the k'ri stands as follows, the k'tib having merely ל twice by error for י: אכתיב־לו רבי תורתי כמו־זר נחשבו. The last verb throws light on the modal force of the first, as meaning, "I was writing from time to time." Thus, "thousands of my *Torah*" is literally the sense of the nouns. It may, of course, be conceived as regarding the *parts* as being manifold. But no one, I think, would resort to this secondary meaning unless driven to it. I use the word "thousands" above in the indefinite sense of "a great many." The Revised Version has, "My law in ten thousand precepts," with margin, "the ten thousand things of My law," "things" being necessary in English for a complete sense. The expression seems analogous to the familiar use in our own day, when books or pamphlets are reckoned literally by the "thousand."

"middle Pentateuch"—as forming any part of it. The same prophet (iv. 6) attests the "priest" as its keeper,[1] but "the knowledge" of it kept back from "the people,"[2] who "perish for lack" of it. The same relation of "law" and its "knowledge" to "priest" and to "people" is set forth with greater preciseness by Mal. ii. 7, and the helplessness of the people when law fails by Isa. v. 13, "My people is led captive for lack of knowledge." Whether the *Torah* was of equal bulk and range in the time of Hosea and in that of Malachi cannot be absolutely settled. But we establish the fact of a *Torah*, written, Divine in origin and authority, and yet set aside and despised, alike in both. Jeremiah carries us further yet (viii. 8), charging its professional students with perverting or corrupting its text. That this process had already begun on Deuteronomy, assuming it to have been then newly written, is incredible. It must relate to an older *Torah*, on the knowledge of which the wise men plumed themselves. It is worth adding that Hosea's "priest," who kept the law yet despised it, held a hereditary office. This is plain from the terms of his threat.

The argument, then, stands as follows:

The Deuteronomist, who mentions incidents found in the Yahvist, is dependent upon him.

But Hosea and Amos also mention incidents so found, and must be similarly dependent.

But the date of "the Yahvistic narrative" is "at earliest" 650 B.C.; also Hosea's date is apparently 780-730 B.C., or thereabouts, and that of Amos 760-750 B.C. Therefore, these prophets flourished and wrote a century or more before the earliest possible date for the narrative on which they are dependent—a rather distressing absurdity. The dependence is therefore unduly assumed in *every* case, Deuteronomy included.

We further read, "The fact that in Deut. xx. the lawgiver distinctly contemplates foreign conquests, brings down the date of the law below the period of David." This manifestly implies the repudiation of a predictive element in a law given by prophetic authority. Yet on p. 37 we are told, "Prophecy is simply the declaration and illustration of the principles of the Divine government, sometimes in the past, sometimes in the present, sometimes in the future." Does not, then, a Divine law illustrate Divine government? Or was war such an

[1] Exactly as appointed in Deut. xvii. 9 foll., 18; xxiv. 8; xxxi. 9 foll., 24 foll. *Cf.* also Lev. x. 11. This appointment is such a notorious fact, that in Jer. xviii. 18 the prophet's enemies throw it, as a proverb, in his teeth.

[2] Observe the article, "*the* knowledge" (*bis*), *i.e.*, of God; *cf.* Jer. xxii. 16, xxiv. 7.

unheard-of novelty in human affairs that even a purely human lawgiver might not be conceived as *proprio motu* contemplating and regulating it? Criticism seems to assume the function of limiting the prophet's outlook into the future, of saying, "Thus far shalt thou see, and no farther," or even, as the argument here implies, of barring any such outlook at all —at any rate, when the prophet presumes to legislate.

But the curious fact, when we compare the text of Deuteronomy with Professor Cheyne's comment, is, that in some essential features it exactly contradicts those of the Davidic wars. In all the wars of David's earlier life he leads the host in person, and this is among the understood functions of royalty as contemplated by Samuel (1 Sam. viii. 20). The first king, Saul, leads the host from first to last, and perishes with his sons in so doing. He appoints the captain of the host—in Saul's case his own kinsman, Abner, and so, later, in David's case. Indeed, as soon as a king is on the field, the choice of all leaders, chief and subaltern, is from above by himself, and not from below by popular voice (1 Sam. xiv. 50, 52; *cf.* viii. 12, xvi. 21, xxii. 7). Now, with these strongly-marked features, contrast the utterly archaic and highly popular features of Deut. xx. The difficulty here is, how to make *any* king fit the situation at all. The priest, the officers, and the people, have all their functions; where is the monarch's, or even the chief captain's? Nor is there any word or phrase in the law of the kingdom (chap. xvii. 14 foll.) which assists us. The direction terminates with the "officers" (*shoterim*), who appear elsewhere to have only a civil status; and, according to the Authorized Version and the Revised Version, these are to "make captains of the armies to lead the people," or "captains of hosts at the head of the people" (xx. 9), unless, which is constructionally possible, the people themselves are to make them. The "officers" are, we know from xvi. 18, popularly elected. Thus, the entire basis is, so to speak, democratic, and the only chief functionary is "the priest"; and when we turn to the parallel of Phinehas in Numb. xxxi. 6, this is, at any rate, conceivable. But the whole is, if not out of harmony with military royalty, at any rate in need of much adjustment to harmonize it thoroughly.

But taken as ordinances for the time then present in Moses' day, with the recent precedents of Sihon and Og, who both are represented as the aggressors, and with whom the war is therefore extern (Numb. xxi. 23, 33; Deut. ii. 32, iii. 1), and, further, with the post of chief captain already filled by Joshua (Numb. xxvii. 16, 18, 21; Deut. iii. 28, xxxi. 3, 7, 8), the conditions fit the situation without the least strain. And with the monarchy left as a mere possibility in the future, *not* enjoined, the question of royal function in war is, by xx. 1-9,

left open with it. The "captains of hosts" to be chosen, if the Authorized Version and Revised Version are right, by the "officers" are, then, the chiefs of the tribal contingents who are always prominent in rudimentary war[1]—more so, indeed, than the individual who leads the whole. We may reasonably take it that, with prophetic advice and authority always presumed, the needful adjustments, in case of royalty becoming an institution, would easily be made, and that the lawgiver was content so to leave it. Nor is the military the only function in which such adjustments would be required. And here one may notice how exactly one function of the law is reflected in the pre-monarchical period of Josh. iii. 2, 3, in the "officers passing through the host and charging the people"; and another in the proclamation dictated by Jehovah Himself to Gideon in Judg. vii. 3, "Whoever is fearful and afraid," etc.; while in the earliest monarchical war the king takes his command at the prophet's bidding against an extern enemy (1 Sam. xv. 3 foll.). We may notice also that when actually in the field under the earlier monarchy, it is still "the hosts" (plural) of Israel, as, indeed, also of the Philistines, presumably under their "five lords," that are spoken of (1 Sam. xvii. 8, 10, 23, 26), just as in Exod. vii. 4, xii. 17, 51; Numb. xxxiii. 1. This prominent distinctness of contingents, traceable under the Judges, as in the general summary of results (Judg. i.), where each tribe, or at most a pair (verse 3), seems pitted against its adversaries, in the case of Barak (Judg. iv. 6, v. 14, 15, 18), and in that of Gideon (vi. 35), was exactly what the monarchy tended to consolidate and efface. In the period of Josiah, the adoption of such a law as that of Deut. xx. 1-9, is clearly a gross anachronism. Indeed, its opening words, which imply that "horses and chariots" would *not* be found on Israel's host, by the emphatic assumption that on the enemy's they *would* be (xx. 1), is of itself contradictory to all the later monarchy's traditions of war—as much so as "captains of hosts" without *the* captain of *the* host.

But I venture with hesitation here to suggest that both the Authorized Version and the Revised Version are mistaken. The "princes" or "captains of hosts" could be no other than the chiefs of the tribes, who in every group of cognates or agnates —tribe, clan, sept, etc.—are always known and fixed, and in Israel too often mentioned to need here citation in proof. The notion of officers (or people) "choosing" them, and that on the eve of a battle, seems absurd. Each would be there

[1] *Cf.* Homer, "Iliad," iii. 9, *αὖταρ ἐπεὶ κόσμηθεν ἄμ' ἡγεμόνεσσιν ἕκαστοι*, *i.e.*, each contingent or group under its *ἡγεμών*. In the "Iliad" there is properly no Greek commander-in-chief; the Atreidæ are the *δύω κοσμήτορε λαῶν*, i. 16, and Agamemnon's leadership in "Iliad," xi., is more like the *ἀριστεία*, such as each noted chief by turn enjoys, *e.g.*, Diomedes in "Iliad," v.

already with his own tribal host. That they, thus met on the field, should choose a joint leader in chief, is, on the contrary, highly natural, if not necessary. I believe the sense to be, "The princes of the hosts shall choose[1] a head (*berôsh*) of the people," *i.e.*, chief in command. See Judg. x. 18, where "people [and] princes," mustered in host, raise the question, "Who will begin to fight against the b'ne Ammon?" which means, "Who will lead the host?"—a question answered by the sequel of chap. xi., where Jephthah is induced to accept the post of danger by the offer of the permanent chieftaincy in Gilead (verses 8-11)—"The people made him head and captain (*lerôsh ulegatzîn*) over them." The same is suggested, but less precisely, the vehicle being poetry, in Judg. v. There verses 12, 13 express the fact that Barak, who had been left "a remnant" when his tribesmen were "led captive" earlier by Jabin or Sisera, was by Jehovah—*i.e.*, through Deborah's oracle (*cf.* iv. 6, 14)—preferred, and by the "nobles" and "the mighty" (=chiefs of hosts) accepted, as commander. This implies that, but for Deborah's influence, they would have chosen their own leader, as did the Gileadites in x., xi., and as I am supposing intended in Deut. xx. 9. But all this is utterly heterogeneous to the military customs of the monarchy from the very earliest. On the contrary, it is exactly suited to such a patriarchal republic as the book contemplates, with its roots everywhere either in the elders or in the tribesmen; and with the monarchy left, as a possibility of the future, to adjust itself all round with the traditions found existing at the time.

But, again, we are told, p. 72: "The law regulating kingship is proved by its contents to be later than the time of Solomon, whose dangerous tendencies are not obscurely alluded to." If the argument which we are examining went to show that the Book of Deuteronomy was a production of, say, Solomon's later years, or of his son's or any near successor's time, the remark would at any rate be plausible. Or if among the fourfold cases of idolatrous seduction we had found in chaps. xiii., xvii. 2-5, a place reserved for the corrupting influence of idolatrous wives upon the king, and for that of the king upon the people, or even for this latter only, there would be at any rate a harmonious relevance to the supposed contemporaneous facts. But why a legislator *temp.* Josiah, masquerading as Moses, should found himself upon facts foreign to both, and gathered from a royal experience about midway

[1] The verb פקד, in sense of "choose," has here the construction often found with בחר, *i.e.*, by בְּ following.

between them, and refer to an example so far antiquated, is not easy to explain.

Indeed, one sees at a glance that the three chief temptations of all Oriental monarchy—apart, that is, from warlike ambition—are pointed at in the king's supposed tendency to "multiply to himself horses, wives," or "silver and gold" (Deut. xvii. 16, 17). As regards wives, we find the tendency in Gideon and Abimelech, the early forerunners of constituted monarchy. Gideon is, in fact, the first known polygamist in Israel. The tendency to amass the precious metals also appears in him. But, however closely in respect of all three Solomon coincides with the type, there is one clause of the prohibition which seems fatal to any development of this law *ex post facto* from his royal excesses. It is, "Neither shall he cause the people to return to Egypt, to the end that he may multiply horses." For a king to contemplate the deportation of his whole people, and his remaining *solus*, the royal lord of steeds and cars, is, as Dillmann *ad loc.* remarks, of course absurd, and a section or colony of them must be supposed meant. And this points plainly to the policy of earlier Egyptian dynasties, from the migration and sojourn of Abram, through the occupancy of Goshen, and to the end at any rate of the reign of Amenôphis IV., during which Semitic settlers appear to have been welcomed in Egypt. To suppose Egypt a similarly open country at any time from the invasion of Shishak (1 Kings xiv. 25, 26) onwards seems absurd. But without such openness, how is the suggestion feasible? An alliance, political or matrimonial, between royal houses is a totally different thing, and no more involved Israelite settlers in Egypt than Egyptian settlers in Israel. Nay, before Shishak's time the individual refugees, dynastic or other (Jeroboam, Hadad), who found an asylum there *against* the Hebrew monarch, shows a tendency equally adverse. The policy of a Judæan party *temp.* Hezekiah to rely on Egypt for a chariot force, hired by a deportation of treasure (Isa. xxxi. 1-3; *cf.* xxx. 6, 7), points exactly the opposite way—not to the settling Jews in Egypt to become horse-purveyors, but to the reception of a fully-equipped armament thence.

If it be asked, How can we assume an Egypt still open at, or soon after, Moses' death? I answer that no such assumption is here made, but that Moses was in a position to know, and that modern critics are *not*. When we remember Josiah's anti-Egyptian policy, and his death in pursuit of it, the notion of such a law being promulgated in his time gains yet more in absurdity. It is just at the date which critics assume for their pseudo-Moses that any project of a Hebrew recolonization of Egypt becomes on historical grounds too extravagant to be soberly suggested.

A still more stupendous because ubiquitous anachronism would be, in Josiah's time, the laws for the extirpation of the native races, conceived in all the stern relentlessness of the Mosaic period. Solomon's precedents, personal and political, must have destroyed the possibility of such a policy ages ago. The notion of a real law-giver aiming at practical reform, and clogging his own way by such elephantine impossibilities, is an outrage on common-sense.

We are told, further, that "there are ideas expressed in Deuteronomy which can only have arisen at an advanced stage of religious development." But it is one express office of the Spirit to "announce things to come" (*τὰ ἐρχόμενα*, John xvi. 13). What else is the entire idea of the Apocalypse? (Rev. i. 4, 8, 19; iv. 1, etc.). And it is the same Spirit who "spake by the prophets" from first to last.

That the anticipation of religious ideas of the future is not limited by what is in the human sense "psychologically possible" is no mere theory, but a fact written broadly on the face of Christian theology.

Compare the "religious development" of the Pauline Epistles with that of the sub-Apostolic and post-Apostolic ages, as sampled, *e.g.*, in the "Epistle of Barnabas," in the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," in that once highly-popular work, "The Shepherd of Hermas," or where you will, St. Paul utterly dwarfs all their conceptions put together, and shoots centuries beyond them. Take him and St. John together, and it is no hyperbole to say that the whole ante-Nicene period fails to grasp their range and fill their outline.

On the contrary, the leading idea of this fascinating monograph is that in the mysterious compound of the Divine and human known as inspiration, and which resists analysis, the dominant factor is the human, and that human as controlled by its environment—a more subtle form of the old "leaven of the Sadducees," setting the *Zeit-geist* above the Spirit of God. It is consistent that Professor Cheyne should follow, as regards Isaiah, the lead of Stade and Geisebrecht, and adopt the "cock-sure" style of Wellhausen on many points on which a modest reticence would be more becoming, *e.g.*, that Jeremiah did not write until very late in his career. On p. 6 this is stated with a "perhaps," as regards the actual date of his commencing; but on p. 57 the fact is assumed absolutely, and made to account for something else. The impression left on a careful perusal will be probably that there are not a few short pieces written on the spur of the feeling of the moment as it arose (*e.g.*, Jer. x. 19-22, xiv. 7-9, xvii. 15-18, xx. 14-18), and left without matured arrangement.

But to return to Deuteronomy. It must have grown

between the vision from Mount Pisgah and the defilement of the Ge-Hinnom. Such a book was sure to grow; but I do not believe, apart from the last chapter, that there is any reason to suspect above 2 per cent. as non-Mosaic in period. Various other features of the laws, censured as modern, could be shown, if I had space, to fit the Mosaic period better than the Josian. But I may perhaps be allowed to return to this hereafter.

On the language of the book, I have only time for two observations: (1) Its laws, in their persistent urgency in support of a central shrine, are, in effect, a polemic against what were known from Samuel's and Saul's time onward as "high places" (Heb. *bamah*, *bamôth*) for worship (see 1 Sam. ix., x.). In that sense the word occurs *passim* in the Kings and Chronicles. The *bamôth* form the *bête noire* of the reformers alike in Hezekiah's day and in Josiah's, in which Deuteronomy is supposed to have been launched, to promote their extirpation. Yet in those emphatic reiterations of injunction against their use and practice the word nowhere occurs. It is found in the great lyrics of xxxii. and xxxiii., but only in its primitive sense of "natural elevations." In every one of the older prophets, except Isaiah, the sin of the *bamôth* is, on the contrary, rebuked by the express term; and Isaiah (xvi. 12) notices their use in Moab. If ever a negative argument can have weight, it is surely of vast weight here. It is as if our Poor Law statutes omitted the word "workhouse," or as if those of Walpole's time omitted the word "Excise." (2) The other point is rather an *argumentum ad hominem*. We are told that Jeremiah was a joint-author of Deuteronomy. In a later page occurs the remark that its Hebrew style is superior to and purer than Jeremiah's, and that the Aramaicisms frequent in him are in it rare; and, if we except the lyrics, this, I believe, is wholly correct. It is singular that the gifted writer should not have perceived that the criticism on the style tends to disprove the attribution of authorship.

HENRY HAYMAN, D.D.

ART. III.—THE INFLUENCE AND EFFECT OF MODERN SCIENCE ON CHRISTIANITY.

THERE can be no doubt that the advance in scientific discovery and knowledge has remarkably affected the religious faith of some who have pursued the study of Science, and attained to any high degree of knowledge of its laws; and the publication of such discoveries, the formulation of scientific

laws which had been apprehended, with the results that seemed to be so indicated, have loosened and lessened religious faith and feeling in the multitude, who, without actual individual engagement in such study, accept its teaching, and the inferences from it, on the authority of those who have devoted themselves to the study of Science, and who claim to be able to show in what direction it leads. Thus, the simple faith of old religions, which saw God in all things and everywhere, has been considerably displaced, and sometimes uprooted. The growths from the fresh religious instinct in man, often crude and wild, but always luxuriant, and in a sense beautiful, when the upspringings of that instinct were spontaneous and unrestrained, have withered and died under the hot light of the sun of Science :

> "The intelligible forms of old religion,
> The power, the beauty, and the majesty
> That had their haunts in dale or piny mountain,
> Or forest, by slow stream or pebbly spring,
> Or chasms and watery depths—all these have vanished :
> They live no longer in the faith of reason."

This exuberance of religious recognition of Divine power under which man lived, and moved, and had his being, is evidence of a human religious instinct which, from the first, led man to the outreaching after the object of that instinct; and even after revelation as to its object was begun, when the wild luxuriance of the growth was regulated, and in some degree directed, the freshness of the instinct showed vitality and vigour still. God was seen and felt in everything by the people of Israel; nothing was impossible to Him; no miraculous intervention by Him was unlikely: in fact, excess and error in manifestation by that people of the human religious instinct had to be restrained in the Decalogue—*e.g.*, "Thou shalt have none other gods but Me." "Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image, nor the likeness of anything . . . thou shalt not bow down to them, nor worship them."

We find a strange and startling contrast in the aspect and condition of religious faith and feeling in modern times, in places in the world where men have climbed the hills of Science and found from their heights a farther view of the universe: the increased knowledge attained through the larger outlook tends to expel the faith by which God was apprehended on the lower plains of limited observation. While men sojourned on these lower plains, everything that was unaccountable, or apparently incomprehensible, was ascribed to God, and the faith that could so account for all that was too high for human knowledge then, could import the same God into association with the ordinary circumstances

of human life; whereas now the discernment of natural causes for phenomena in the physical universe, which before were outside the scope of human knowledge, and were attributed to immediate Divine agency, tends to displace God from man's belief in His direct action in matters of the kind; and the apprehension of laws that work in accordance with an observed order of evolution, producing developments and changes in Nature, tends to dislodge the idea of Divine design in the arrangement of the visible universe. Searches into the forces of Nature and their methods of action, the bridling of them for subservience, and the display of their service in use, prove dominion attained; and man's experience of such dominion seems to enthrone him over the works of God's hands, and that vicegerency develops in him the disposition to usurp the sovereignty.

Thus, the scientific achievements of this present age would seem direct Divine miracles to ages past, and so, by such advance of Science, the former religious faith, which instinctively acknowledged God and loyally gathered close to Him, has been disintegrated and scattered.

However, the march of Science cannot properly intrude on and invade the sphere of religious faith. As Romanes remarks: "Science is essentially a department of thought having for its object the explanation of natural phenomena by natural or proximate causes; the aims and methods of Science are exclusively concerned with the ascertaining and the proof of the proximate How of things and processes physical. Religion, on the other hand, is a department of thought having no less exclusive reference to the Ultimate; it is not in any way concerned with causation, further than to assume that all things and all processes are ultimately due to intelligent personality. Thus, Science and Religion move in different mental planes." But when men, ignorant of Science, in time past introduced Religion as furnishing the explanation of natural phenomena by its supply of a proximate direct causation, they brought Religion out of its own peculiar sphere; and when the region of Science was entered for search and discovery, and its laws and their action as proximate causes of phenomena in the physical universe became known, then Religion was no longer required to furnish explanation of proximate causes in the region of Science; and, being not wanted in that way in that region, the impulse rushed in to exile it altogether from the region of faith.

The whole domain of Religion includes the visible and the invisible universe, the physical and the spiritual spheres, the region of Science and the region of faith. God works through laws and processes, producing proximate causes discernible in

Science throughout the material universe, but the exercise of Science is limited to the physical field; and though Science may be there seen as furnishing explanation of proximate causes of natural phenomena, God is the Ultimate even within that region. In olden ignorance of Science, God was made the proximate causality also; but when scientific knowledge was enlarged, proximate causes for phenomena were discovered, and God was found to be needless, as it was supposed, in the field of Science, and so was dethroned altogether as an object of faith.

But God's sovereignty is infinite. He governs and regulates in spheres beyond the region of Science, and His methods of action, so to speak, throughout His illimitable dominion are unsearchable and His ways past finding out. We can discern the scientific laws by which it pleases Him to rule in all of this material universe which is within our ken; but any further perception of His methods in spheres outside is impossible to us, and even inconceivable by us. Yet even within the limits of this little scene of His sway with which we are immediately concerned, and where observation and perception as to the general laws through which He works are to some extent possible, we may, if we will, reach to a discernment of His overruling ultimate power and wisdom and mercy in the exercise of His dominion. As Mozley puts it: "Wonder in the natural world differs from that wonder which has for its object the supernatural; but although the two wonders are not the same, it is not the less true that one of them points to the other, that physical wonder is an introduction to the belief in the supernatural—in this way, that it tends to raise in the mind a larger idea of possibility; the notion of the potential as distinguished from what is actual; the sense of the unknown."

There is much that is painfully perplexing in the surface aspect of many of the laws to which the life of God's creatures on this earth is subjected; much that seems practically to contradict beneficent design, and to testify rather to injustice or tyranny; much that we can only bow down under in faith with the submissive utterance: "It is the Lord; let Him do what seemeth unto Him good." But there are attainable glimpses of the all-wise and good God behind and above the surface seemings, regulating the order as to times and seasons in the detail of the discovery of the laws through which He governs here, and indicating that His human creatures on earth are now under temporary conditions only of government, out of which they may hope to pass to a permanent sphere under the rule of the infinite and eternal King. For instance, the researches of Science, and the discovery of its laws and

methods which God has appointed and adopted as ways of working in Nature, have suddenly and marvellously advanced with a rush within the last half-century or less; the wondrous forces and powers in Nature were there, but unknown to man, and dormant for him during the whole previous lifetime of humanity, so that, it would seem, such discovery was designedly prevented and delayed till man had been educated and established in the feeling and practice of Christian ethics, till humanity had been largely and deeply imbued with the spirit of Christ. If these forces and powers in Nature had been discovered and evoked beforehand, while human nature was in the rough, so to speak, and unsoftened and unmoulded, and in no degree sanctified under the influence of the teaching of Christianity, it is fearful to think what awful weapons would have come into the hands of man for mutual destruction, and of what internecine war this world of humanity would have been the battlefield.

And, again, in regard to evolution, which has tended to depose God from His rightful throne in human thought. Evolution is a law of Nature, which is discernible as working towards the development of animal life on earth. Nature seems the sole governess here: she nurtures some types of life, and leaves others to die out, as she finds ability for adaptation or otherwise, in accordance with the law of natural selection; but it is remarkable that Christ introduced a direct interference with that law. Those that were most unfit, as Nature would pronounce them, who would not survive under the law of natural selection, appeared to be the fittest for consideration and care and benefit from Him; and the like kind of obstruction to the operation of the law of natural selection is still being made by Christianized man. God is the Author of the natural laws and processes which work in connection with the progress of animal life on earth; but the partaking of such feeling as Christ inculcated, and the exercise of such action accordingly by which Nature's method in evolution is obstructed, as to the present environment, place man on a higher plane of evolution for the development of his spiritual life into a fitness for its nobler circumstance in a future state of being beyond this world. This conflict with the law of natural selection which is being carried on by the higher life, or, as we may say, the spiritual life in man, was recognised by the late Professor Huxley in his Romanes Lecture three years ago. He defines the higher life as man's "ethical nature," and says that "the practice of what is ethically best—what we call goodness or virtue—involves a course of conduct which in all respects is opposed to that which leads to success in the cosmic struggle for existence; that such influence is

directed not so much to the survival of the fittest as to the fitting of as many as possible to survive." He admits the conflict, but, in his agnosticism, cannot account for it or explain its object, or point to any ultimate permanent result as consequent on it; whereas the complex life in man—the spiritual and the animal—the prospect of a future environment which waits for him, and for which he is now passing through a state of preparation and discipline, would suggest an explanation of this conflict between his "ethical nature," or, rather, his spiritual life, and the cosmic process working by laws which distinctly belong to the present sphere of his being.

The sudden discovery of proximate immediate causes for natural phenomena, which had been instinctively ascribed to direct Divine action, came as a shock on the old, easy, and seemingly settled belief in God, and disturbed it and displaced it in some. It is piteous to read the pathetic laments over their lost faith made by not a few of those that were thus bereaved; but a reaction has set in already. True, some leaders of thought and quest in Science have still preserved their faith in God; but others, from whom it has departed, are beginning to rise and look over the framework of the system of laws which God uses in His government here, and to perceive, beyond, the illimitable immensities under the sway of the Almighty, and the infinite complexity of the methods of His rule—to catch indications also from the exercise of His government of man in his environment on earth, of the destiny appointed for God's human creatures in the spiritual sphere of God's eternal kingdom, where a place is prepared for them: and so the errant faith returns, and is welcomed to their hearts; others seek for it, again, in the wilderness, and, having found it, rejoice; so that, I believe, while the suddenness and the amazing character of the revelations of modern Science have, for the present, disturbed and frightened faith in God, yet ultimately the larger views of God and of His illimitable kingdom, and of His methods of rule in this department of His dominion, will re-establish man's belief in Him, and root faith more firmly than ever in the human heart. The fresh force of Christianity, too, which in the fulness of time has come into influence on humanity, and its unparalleled results for enlightenment and benefit and blessing, will help man to a closer comprehension of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God; and thus vague searchers for truth through the mazes of Science will at length come to Christ with the confession: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life." And that loving Lord will look on them, and say: "Ye believe in God; believe also in Me"; and

He will repeat the assurance which He uttered from the lips of His incarnate Divinity: "This is life eternal, that they might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent."

A. D. MACNAMARA.

ART. IV.—CARDINAL MANNING'S ADMISSIONS.

WITH the personal character of Cardinal Manning as it is portrayed in Mr. Purcell's "Life" the following paper is not concerned. But we may be excused if we say that, while it is hardly surprising to find English Roman Catholics in high quarters expressing disapproval of the work, it is matter for some surprise that Cardinal Vaughan should not have preferred the silent contempt, which is always dignified and often astute, to an apology for his predecessor which has betrayed how little there is to be said. In his article, published in the February issue of the *Nineteenth Century*, no attempt is made to explain the unhappy episode of the Errington case, or reconcile the conflicting self-revelations of public utterances and private correspondence. The biographer is attacked; the unwisdom, the lack of good taste, that mark his work, are severely criticised. But no vindication of his subject appears. The Cardinal closes with the hope that a worthier biography may one day be produced; but as he counsels the delay of a quarter of a century as healthy and judicious, unless an unbroken series of editions of the present work can be guaranteed, the tardy vindication of a buried memory will have to include its exhumation.

Our present business is with the contents of the twenty-seventh chapter of the second volume. The title of this chapter is, "Hindrances to the Spread of the Catholic Church in England." It consists of a most interesting series of auto-biographical notes, written in the summer of 1890. They are introduced by a sentence the sentiment of which we gladly echo: "The candour and openness with which he does not fear to rebuke his own people, and the just and generous tribute which he offers from his own experience, both as a Catholic priest and an Anglican, to the piety, religious-mindedness, and exemplary lives of so many Anglicans of every rank and condition of life, is a noble legacy which cannot fail to soften antipathies and lessen any lingering prejudices in the hearts of the people of England."

We do not purpose offering a digest of this remarkable chapter. It is to certain instructive admissions and concessions

to be met with in it that attention is here directed. These are found in connection with the handling of two topics: first, the condition of the Roman Catholic clergy, and the religious orders existing among us; and, secondly, the Christian standing of non-Papal communities, with special reference to the Church of England.

I. (1) It would be an ungracious task to dwell at any length upon the admissions that occur under the first head. When a bishop considers himself called upon, in the faithful discharge of his office, openly to animadvert upon the failings of his clergy, the world may take impertinent advantage of his faithfulness. But the Christian will hardly care to join it. And the chuckle is some degrees less refined when the strictures appear in notes which were not intended to see daylight in the lifetime of the writer.

Let it at once be said that these criticisms of the priests and monastic orders at no point touch their honour. Unstinted praise is accorded them on the score of their moral worth, their devotion, and their zeal. No reflection, therefore, which *as men* they might justly resent, is cast upon them in the brief reference to this class of admissions which follows.

In the first place, it is worthy of remark that Cardinal Manning should have broken to the extent he did with the spirit of mediævalism as represented by the religious orders. In this Cardinal Wiseman had led the way. In a pathetic appeal to Father Faber to assist him in missionizing among the poor, he complains that the Jesuits, the Redemptorists, pleaded their "rules" for abstention; the Passionists "have never done him a stroke of work amongst the poor"; the Fathers of St. Philip Neri ought to read their founder's directions in the light of the necessities of the nineteenth century, but they do not.

In these expostulations with mediæval orders, or their more recent imitations, Cardinal Manning goes considerably further than his predecessor. Indeed, his action with regard to them is distinctly unfavourable. He refuses to regard the regulars as in any sense superior to the seculars. For years he declined to employ the latter word to describe the working clergy. The priesthood "is the first religious and regular order." He looks upon all religious orders as of ecclesiastical institution as contrasted with the priesthood, which is of Divine. "It is an axiom that the priesthood is a sign *perfectionis jam adeptæ*. The imperfect enter religious orders *ad perfectionem adquirendam*. The secular priesthood is supposed to be already in moral, intellectual, and spiritual maturity. 'He is only a secular priest' was often heard, and it revealed a whole world of prejudice, depreciation, and mistrust; and the priesthood

accepted the depreciation, which depresses and paralyzes the will." And again: "The bishops are tempted to turn away from their own priests, and to call in regulars to do what they need to be done. The effect of this is to chill and depress the clergy still more, and even to confirm them in their lower state."

Two things seem to stand out luminously from these passages indicative of Manning's attitude towards the fraternities modelled on the mediæval pattern. He declines, in the first place, to credit them with embodying the true idea of the higher life, and then he charges them with being more or less out of harmony with the spirit of our age.

(2) In dealing with the subject of the condition of his clergy, the writer of these Notes places among the hindrances to the spread of Catholicism in England two drawbacks, for which the priests are responsible. These are certainly not such as are obvious to outsiders. One is "what, for want of a better name," he must call "sacramentalism." It is perhaps needless to say that the term is used in a specific sense. "Priests," he says, "are in danger of becoming mass-priests or sacrament-mongers. It is easily possible for a priest to neglect his meditation, examination of conscience, and spiritual exercises, and therefore to become unspiritual and dry. Still he administers sacraments exactly and mechanically." He then urges "higher subjective piety."

Now, this is only the line frequently taken in spiritual addresses to the clergy among ourselves; the perils of officialism conductors of clerical quiet days seldom fail to enlarge on. And we would not unduly magnify this peril, as it exists in another community. At the same time, it is not without its instruction for us to listen to an admonitory voice within a fold not our own, attributing much of this danger to the objective character of the worship and the mechanical efficacy of its sacraments. With the tremendous assumptions of the sacerdotal theory, how immensely must the liability be increased to substitute an official piety for a personal. And this is actually admitted in plainest words in the document we have under review: "It is certain that, as the objective is over-valued, the subjective is under-valued." The second drawback to the efficiency of the priests is, we learn, the inefficient state of the seminaries in which they are trained. "We have"—we quote the Notes—"boys from twenty-one to twenty-four. If they are ordained without 'interior spiritual perfection,' who is to blame? Who is responsible? Where is the remedy? With a postulancy of eight years and a novitiate of four, we ought to bring them up to spiritual perfection. And so we should if we ourselves were spiritually perfect. Is it not a want of higher aspiration in ourselves

that depresses the standard of our seminarists? The consequence of this is, that when they grow up and become prefects and professors, *they have no unity of mind, no union of will,* for the college, no zeal *in solidum,* so as to take to heart, not only their own class, but the studies and discipline of the whole house. How can men work together if *they have no community of heart or spirit?*"

We were certainly not altogether prepared to hear this frank avowal of the absence of cohesiveness in the members of these clerical seminaries. It is something of a revelation to us that the absolute surrender to the principle of authority in the intellectual sphere does not invariably nourish the sentiment of *esprit de corps.* A rebel individualism survives even in a postulant.

II. (1) The admissions made in treating the second topic we have named call for a less cursory glance. The allusions to the religious condition and theological position of the Church of England, and the generous tributes to the piety of many of its members, including those of some other bodies, are distributed sporadically through the chapter. The reader shall be spared the citation of the several pages. All the passages quoted lie between pp. 772 and 796.

It is perhaps unwise to lay much stress on the kindly expressions of approval that come from an opponent, and insist that they involve logical modifications of his own dogmatic position. Such a phrase as, "the singular goodness and piety of non-Catholics," such a large-hearted testimony as, "I have intimately known souls living by faith, hope, and charity, and the sanctifying grace with the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost, in humility, absolute purity of life and heart, unceasing prayer; in a word, living lives of visible sanctification, *who are out of the Church,*" may be read with the caution that friendly rhetoric may not be always pressed into the service of theology.

And here we may digress for a moment, to point to the altogether admirable liberality of mind shown in the recognition of the good work done by Protestants in the cause of philanthropy. In a paragraph such as the following the best side of the writer is seen:

"All the great works of charity in England have had their beginning out of the Church; for instance, the abolition of the slave-trade, and the persevering protest of the Anti-Slavery Society. Not a Catholic name, so far as I know, shared in this. France, Portugal, Brazil, have been secretly or openly slave-trading. So the whole temperance movement. It was a Quaker that made Father Mathew an abstainer. Catholic Ireland and the Catholics of England until now [he is writing in 1890] have done little for temperance. The Anglican and

Dissenting ministers are far more numerously abstainers than our priests. The Act of Parliament to protect animals from cruelty was carried by a non-Catholic Irishman. The Anti-Vivisection Act also. Both are derided, to my knowledge, among Catholics. The Acts to protect children from cruelty were the work of Dissenters.[1] There are endless works, for the protection of shop-assistants, over-worked railway and tram men, women and children ground down by sweaters, and driven by starvation wage upon the streets. Not one of the works in their behalf was started by us; hardly a Catholic name is to be found on their reports. Surely we are in the sacristy."

(2) There are, however, other passages in these Notes of a definitely theologic colouring. They are evidently meant to be taken in a dogmatic sense, as embodying calm and settled convictions. And the greater weight attaches to them as Cardinal Manning is at pains to assure us that he is also the mouthpiece of the general clerical mind on the points raised.

It will be convenient to place these passages together, reserving comment.

"I have found among hereditary Catholics a belief that the English people are without faith, without Christian doctrine, without means of contrition, and that, therefore, the hope of their salvation is most uncertain. This *error* paralyzes their hopefulness."

"I have found not only laymen, but priests, ignore absolutely the fact that the greater part of the English people are baptized, and therefore are in the supernatural state of grace. They take for granted that they have lost their baptismal grace by mortal sin; and that therefore, as they have not the sacrament of penance, they have no means of rising again to the grace of baptism; that for this reason their life is without merit; and their salvation most uncertain."

"I do not believe one of these propositions to be true, and I am convinced that no one ever believes them without being checked in his action and chilled in his charity towards the non-Catholic people of England."

"I understand . . . that to all men, *etiam infidelibus et hæreticis*, is given grace sufficient *ad evitandam mortem;* that the *virtus penitentiæ* is universal from the fall of man; that to those to whom the sacrament of penance is physically or morally impossible, the virtue of penance is sufficient; that to those who use the grace they have received an *augmentum atque proportionatum* is given; that to all who seek the truth is given so much as will bring them to the soul of the Church,

[1] This is not quite correct.

if not to its visible body; that no member of the soul dying in union with God can be lost."

"Will anyone affirm that souls born again of water and the Holy Ghost cannot be penitent or cannot love God?"

"Now, a life of forty years out of the Church has taught me what I have written."

"And the experience of a priest's life of nearly forty years has confirmed all I have written."

Proceeding from a Roman Cardinal of the most thorough-paced ultramontane views, the above sentences are very noteworthy. They contain the following concessions to a Christian community not in communion with Rome; and they are, be it remembered, the statements of one more Papal, it might with justice be said, than the Pope. The English people have faith, have Christian doctrine. True repentance is within their reach while in a state of schism. They are truly baptized, and, through the efficacy of that sacrament, their salvation is *not* most uncertain. Heretics may escape eternal death.

Then we have the distinction between "the soul and the body of the Church," and we are told that to all seekers of the truth enough is given to secure membership with the soul. What is this but the Protestant distinction between the visible and the invisible Church between the spiritual family and the external corporation? And the solemn asseveration is made, that no member of this invisible spiritual Church, whether or no a member of the body, can be lost.

Now, these admissions represent an elasticity of thought altogether out of harmony with the teaching and immemorial attitude of the Papal Church. Her whole history, her authoritative treatment of non-Papal religious bodies, her aggressive efforts, are all based upon the axiom, "Extra ecclesiam nulla salus." When Manning seceded, he expressed the conviction that his soul's salvation depended upon this step. This is but an echo of Newman's words when he took the same road. "Our Church is in schism, and my salvation depends upon my joining the Church of Rome."

Here, then, is the validity of Anglican baptism asserted. And as there appears little probability of the Roman authorities recognising the validity of our orders as the result of their present investigations, they will surely find themselves on the horns of this dilemma: Our orders being invalid, all persons baptized in our Church during the past three centuries have been baptized by laymen; and an amazingly wide interpretation will have to be given to the phrase "a case of extreme necessity," which ever since Augustine's day has limited the Western Church's permission for lay baptism. "Extreme necessity" has covered the case of each individual of the scores

of million souls that have been admitted to membership with the "soul of the Church" since corporate union ceased between us and Rome.

For the distinction between the "soul" and the "body" of the Church, we claim that it is the natural property of Protestant thought. It was the outcome and the intellectual refuge of the reforming spirit. No such distinction is known to the Fathers. It was as the growing corruptions of the West forced thoughtful men into the acceptance of a strengthening individualism, and the great evangelic truth of personal religion pushed through and thrust back the subsidiary, though necessary, tenet of corporate Church life, that the theory of "a Church in a Church" took substance and shape.

That the liberality of the sentiments expressed by Cardinal Manning in his old age is not so fully shared by his fellow-Bishops was evidenced a few months ago, on the occasion of the consecration of a Vicar-Apostolic for Wales. Writing a few days later in the *Catholic Times* and *Catholic Opinion*,[1] Dr. Hedley, Bishop of Newport and Menevia, says, "The Catholic Church in England persists in claiming to be the one true Church, outside of which, *unless there is the excuse of pardonable deficiency of information*, there is no salvation."

The italicized words, read in the light of Dr. Manning's admissions, involve a singular view of the English Reformation. They who have accepted the Reformation without thereby imperilling their salvation pass within the pale of the "invisible" Church under the saving clause of "pardonable deficiency of information." The phrase on which such a stupendous fabric is reared as the salvation of an indefinite number of souls is surely vague enough. If by "information" be meant knowledge of the actual tenets of the Roman Church, is deficiency in this at all pardonable, with such appliances at hand for securing adequate knowledge? And were the Reformers themselves so deficient in this respect, who had been born and trained, and some of them lived half their lives, within the Roman Church? Cardinal Newman, in the brilliant *argumentum ad hominem* of his first lecture on "Catholicism in England," held up to ridicule the ignorance of Catholicism that supplies the sinews of war to the Protestant attack. But we find it hard to believe that his acuteness did not detect the fallacy running through his own racy brochure, did not save him from mistaking his prolix parody for a parallel. Anglicans and Romans alike may enjoy the humour

[1] September 20, 1895. See the Rev. David Jones's article on the Ancient British Church in the CHURCHMAN for June last, p. 470.

of the scene in the Moscow Square, but neither can be deceived into admitting the cogency of the application.

The question presses for an answer. Have these "Notes" the *imprimatur*, or at any rate the *nihil obstat*, of his Church? It is difficult to believe it. Her son had breathed for forty years the free airs of a reformed communion, and as, when nearing the end of the journey, men have often acknowledged a strange yearning for their native place, and, seeking it, passed from it to their rest; so it almost seems as if, with a maturity softened and expanded by the philanthropic sympathies of its latest decade, while "the doors were shut in the streets, and they that look out of the windows were darkened," the hard dogmatism of mid-life yielding insensibly to the windless quiet of the eventide, the aged Cardinal had grown broader than the measure of his creed.

And had these admissions been introduced, let us say, into a thesis to be submitted to the Holy Office among the preliminary exercises of the Accademia Ecclesiastica, we suspect the neophyte would have had many a week added to the ten of his probation, ere he had been admitted to the priesthood.

For the Church of Rome could never have endorsed them. The Catechism of the Council of Trent gives no uncertain sound. In the eighth question, under chap. x., "Of the Ninth Article, 'I believe in the Holy Catholic Church,'" those who are excluded from the pale of the Church militant are divided into three classes: I. Infidels, *i.e.*, heathen; II. Heretics and schismatics; III. Excommunicated persons. Under the second head the following words occur: "But heretics and schismatics (are excluded), because they cut themselves off from the Church. For they have no more to do with the Church than deserters belong to the army which they have deserted."[1]

From the point of view of a Roman theologian, there can be no question but that we are both a heretical and a schismatic body, and, as such, we have nothing to do with the Church. Is it possible to reconcile with this allegation that of Dr. Manning, that we "are in the supernatural state of grace"? We leave the subject with one remark. In any future biography of the Cardinal which may be produced to correct the mistakes of Mr. Purcell's, the publication of which Cardinal Vaughan denounces as "almost a crime," it will be curious to see how the papal orthodoxy of the opinions enunciated in this deeply interesting chapter will be vindicated.

ALFRED PEARSON.

[1] "Heretici vero atque schismatici, quia ab ecclesia desciverunt. Neque erim illi magis ad ecclesiam spectant, quum transfugæ ad exercitum pertineant a quo defecerunt."

ART. V.—THE CUNEIFORM RECORDS AND THE FALL OF BABYLON.

TO all lovers of the Bible Professor Sayce has rendered incalculable services by his labours in the field of Assyriology, and by those many able writings in which he has pointed out the various important lights which the archæological discoveries of recent years have shed over the Old Testament Scriptures, and the remarkable confirmations which they have afforded of the general accuracy of the Bible narrative.

In reviewing the Book of Daniel, however, in his work, "The Higher Criticism and the Monuments," Professor Sayce comes to the conclusion that the cuneiform inscriptions of the age of Cyrus contradict the account of the Fall of Babylon which has come down to us from the classical authors of antiquity, and has been accepted as the true one down to the present day, and also contradict the account of the same event which would seem to be implied in the fifth chapter of the Book of Daniel.

The point at issue between Professor Sayce and the general tradition and history of antiquity may be put in this way: The classical authorities say that the Babylonians, after one encounter with the troops of Cyrus, in which they were worsted, retired within the apparently impregnable walls of Babylon, within which there had been stored up provisions sufficient for many years: that upon this Cyrus invested Babylon; he commanded his soldiers to dig deep trenches surrounding the city, as if he were throwing up lines of circumvallation, but contrived that these trenches should be dug in such a way that, at a moment's notice, the waters of the river Euphrates could be turned into them, and the depth of the river so much reduced in that part where it flowed through the city that his soldiers should be able to advance up the bed of the river and enter the city through the unguarded river-gates. The Babylonians, secure within the walls of Babylon, "took no heed," Herodotus says, "of the siege," whilst Xenophon says they "laughed at the Persians and turned them into ridicule," in consequence of which the work of digging the trenches was conducted without any attempt on the part of the besieged to interfere with it; and the siege was carried on consequently "without fighting." This bloodless character of the siege is an important point to remember. To dig these trenches was not such a very difficult operation in the purely alluvial soil of Babylonia, which, in the vicinity of the great rivers Tigris and Euphrates was entirely free from rock or stone; and Herodotus states expressly that Cyrus, in carrying out his design, made use of channels which, for a

similar purpose, a queen of the Babylonians had dug years before.

But when the trenches were dug, Xenophon relates, Cyrus selected a night on which he heard there was to be some great feast in Babylon, at which the Babylonians were wont to drink and revel all the night, and as soon as darkness fell, taking a number of his troops, he opened the trenches; the water poured into them, and soon the river became fordable. Then Cyrus commanded his lieutenants, Gôbryas and Gadatas, because they were acquainted with the streets of Babylon, to lead the troops up the now shallow bed of the river, enter the city by the river-gates, which they seem to have expected to certainly find open, and lead the way by the shortest possible route to the palace of the King. This they did, and Cyrus appears to have followed. The city was that night *en fête*—Babylon was holding high festival. The soldiers who entered with Gôbryas and Gadatas struck down some of those they met, and a shouting arose. The soldiers of Gôbryas joined in the shouting, as if they were revellers like the rest; and so they pressed on through the streets to the palace. There they struck down the guards at the palace-doors; a tumult arose, and the King sent some of his attendants out to see what it was. The moment the doors were opened, Gôbryas and his men burst in and penetrated to the hall where the King was. They found him standing up with his sword already drawn; but, soon overpowered by numbers, he fell, sword in hand, slain by the soldiers with Gôbryas.

Such appears to have been the tragic end of King Belshazzar. His attendants were slain defending themselves as best they could.

But Cyrus instantly sent cavalry through the city, and caused proclamation to be made in Aramaic that the Babylonians should keep within their houses, and that if any ventured out they should be slain.

Then, Xenophon says, Gôbryas and Gadatas first thanked the gods because the impious King was slain, and next they kissed the hands and feet of Cyrus.

But when it was morning, Cyrus commanded the Babylonians to give up all their arms, which was done. The towers of the city were surrendered to him, and thus, almost without fighting or bloodshed, great Babylon was his.

And so there is little or no exaggeration in the boast of the cuneiform inscriptions of Cyrus, which we shall presently discuss, which say that without fighting and battle the great god Merodach, as they put it, caused Cyrus to enter Babylon.

Now, Professor Sayce declares that he has discovered that the Babylonian cuneiform inscriptions of the age of Cyrus

show that all this hitherto received account of the fall of Babylon is wrong; that, in point of fact, there was no siege whatever, no night surprise of the city, no king slain.

In the "Higher Criticism and the Monuments," p. 522, he writes: "The inscriptions of Cyrus have revolutionized our conception of the history of his reign. There was no siege and capture of Babylon. The capital of the Babylonian empire opened its gates to his general, as Sippara had done before. Gôbryas and his soldiers entered the city 'without fighting.' . . . All this is in direct opposition to the story of the conquest of Babylonia, as it has hitherto been received. According to Herodotus it occupied a long space of time. Babylon itself was besieged by Cyrus for months, and was taken only by a stratagem. The Persian invader drained off the waters of the river, and his army, under shelter of night, crept into the city through the empty channel. Herodotus was repeated by historian after historian, and the Book of Daniel seemed to set its seal upon it. But we now know that the siege never took place." And again, on page 531, he says: "The same monumental evidence which has vindicated the historical accuracy of the scriptural narrative in other places has here pronounced against it. The story of Belshazzar's fall is not historical in the modern sense of the word 'history.'"

The ancient documents on which Professor Sayce principally relies in making these statements are a Babylonian clay tablet to be seen in the Assyrian and Babylonian Room in the British Museum, inscribed in cuneiform characters, first translated by Mr. Pinches, of the British Museum, in the year 1880, and a clay cylinder, known as the Cyrus cylinder. The tablet gives, in the form of annals, a summary account of the reign of Nabonidos, the last king of Babylon, and his conquest by Cyrus, and it will be referred to in this article as "the annalistic tablet," the other as "the Cyrus cylinder." The important portions of the tablet, bearing upon the fall of Babylon, will be given presently, but first just one word about the political situation at the moment.

At the time when Cyrus, in his career of conquest in Western Asia, marched against Babylonia, the King of Babylon was named Nabonidos—called by the Greeks "Labynetos"—and was in the seventeenth year of his reign. Belshazzar was his son, and would appear to have been associated with his father, towards the end of that father's reign, in the kingly power. His name very frequently occurs in the cuneiform inscriptions as "the son of the king." In one of these inscriptions Nabonidos calls him "his eldest son, the offspring of his heart"; several contract tablets record business trans-

actions of "Belshazzar, the king's son," and we also have records of his offerings to the temples of the gods. The annalistic tablet informs us that for several years in succession he was in command of the army in Northern Babylonia, whilst his father Nabonidos remained in Babylon. Subsequently he and his father would appear to have exchanged places—his father taking command of the army in the field, whilst the son Belshazzar remained in Babylon, where he was on the night that the city fell. In connection with the fall of the city the annalistic tablet, as we shall see presently, appears to record his death.

Professor Sayce, indeed, says that Belshazzar would seem to have been dead, or at least to have disappeared from history, before Cyrus entered Babylonia. But, in making this statement, Professor Sayce would seem to have overlooked a remarkable cuneiform tablet—the translation of which is given by Mr. Pinches in his article "Belshazzar," in the new edition of Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible"—which records that on the fifth day of the month Ab (July-August), in the seventeenth year—which was the last year of Nabonidos—Belshazzar paid a sum of money on behalf of his sister, who is named, being tithe due by her to the offertory-house at Sippar. This inscription proves clearly that Belshazzar was still living in the last year of his father Nabonidos.

At this point it may be remarked that Pusey, the learned and able defender of the Book of Daniel, had no opportunity in his lectures on the subject of discussing these particular inscriptions which we are considering. The third edition of his lectures is dated 1869, whilst this annalistic tablet was not decyphered until 1880. He was fully aware, however, that the name of Belshazzar had been found in the cuneiform inscriptions, and quotes the one already referred to—in which the father, Nabonidos, calls his son "the offspring of his heart." "Rationalists must now," he writes, p. 404, "retract the assertion that 'the last King of Babylon has a false name in Daniel,' since it is now an admitted fact that the name of Belshazzar occurs on Babylonian cylinders, as that of the eldest son of Nabunahit (the Nabonidus of Berosus, the Labynetus of Herodotus), the last King of Babylon, and being associated with his father in the empire, and slain at Babylon. . . . The fact," he continues, "that Belshazzar was slain is illustrated," and then he quotes from both Sir Henry and Professor Rawlinson, "by the inscription of Behistun, in that the impostor, who caused the Babylonians to revolt against Darius Hysdaspes, and who personated the heir to the throne, did not take the name of the eldest son, Belsharezer, but of the second son, Nabukudurusur." "Berosus," continues Pusey, "then gives

the history of the open campaign of the father, Nabonetus, who, having been defeated, shut himself up in Borsippa, and was there taken after the capture of Babylon." The view of the history taken in this article coincides with that of Pusey.

But now it is time to particularly notice the important passages in the annalistic tablet which bear on the actual fall of Babylon. I shall give them, for the most part, according to the rendering of the original translator of the tablet—Mr. Pinches—and shall call your attention to some very important differences in the version given by Professor Sayce.

The document would seem to be a brief abstract, drawn probably from the annals of the Babylonian kingdom, but composed by priestly scribes, the flatterers of the conqueror Cyrus. It is much concerned about the various movements and processions of the Babylonian idols, but its references to political and military events are brief and laconic in the extreme. The inscription is also imperfect in parts. There is a great gap or lacuna between the eleventh and the last year of the reign of Nabonidos. When the tablet becomes again legible, it states that the lower sea (the Persian Gulf) revolted ; and then, after recording that certain of the idols were moved from some of the cities down to Babylon, in the Babylonian month Elul (corresponding to our August-September), the next sentence goes on to mention certain events which happened in the month Tammuz (June).

It will thus be seen that between these two sentences in the inscription there is an interval of eight or nine months —that is to say, from August to the following June. About the events which may have occurred during this period the inscription is absolutely silent. And yet that period must have been a critical moment in the history of the Babylonian kingdom, and events of supreme importance must have been passing. It shows how precarious it is to rest any proof of a negative on the capricious silences of a document such as this.

The next sentence in the tablet records: "In the month Tammuz (June), when Cyrus had delivered battle against the soldiers of Accad, in the city of Ripe, on the banks of the river Nizallat, when the men of Accad also had delivered battle, the men of Accad raised a revolt—some persons were slain."

This would appear to be the engagement mentioned by Herodotus, in which the Babylonians were worsted.

"The warriors, on the 14th day, Sippar, without fighting, took—Nabonidos fled."

King Nabonidos seems to have been in command of the army which was worsted, and to have taken refuge in Sippar, whence he subsequently fled.

"On the 16th day, Gôbryas, governor of the country of

Gutuim and the army of Cyrus, without fighting, to Babylon descended."

In regard to this last sentence, there is a difference in this translation given by Mr. Pinches and the version of Professor Sayce, which is of crucial importance. The words which Mr. Pinches translates "to Babylon descended" Professor Sayce renders "entered Babylon." If this latter were the proper translation, then, of course, all would be over, and Babylon would have surrendered, without fighting, to Gôbryas, the lieutenant of Cyrus, on the 16th of the month Tammuz (June).

And this is what, Professor Sayce maintains, did occur. On the other hand, the translation of Mr. Pinches, "without fighting to Babylon descended," would merely mean that Gôbryas and the soldiers of Cyrus marched down to Babylon without experiencing any opposition, and took up a position outside the walls.

I hope to be able to show reason for believing that this was what really took place.

The Babylonian word in the original, the translation of which is in question, is the word "erêbu." I have had some correspondence with Mr. Pinches on this subject, and he says that "erêbu" means "to descend," "to enter," and "to set" (of the sun). "The translator," he says, "uses his judgment in his choice between the first two possible renderings, and often the preference for the one or the other hardly changes the sense." In this case, however, it makes the greatest possible difference—in fact, it is of crucial importance. The preposition in the sentence, it may be remarked, is "ana" "to," which does not seem to involve any idea of "entering." The translation, "to Babylon descended," would therefore appear to be a sufficient rendering of the passage. Now, if it were said that Gôbryas, in time of peace, "to Babylon descended," or went down, it would no doubt be natural to understand from those words that he not only went down to Babylon, but entered the city. It is quite different, however, when these words refer to a time of war. If in this present time of peace we were to say that a Frenchman went down to Strasbourg, we might well infer that he not only went down there, but that he entered the city. But if in the time of some future war between Germany and France it were said that a French general went down to Strasbourg, we should hardly feel justified in assuming from those words that he entered that city, so strongly fortified, even though it should happen that he arrived there without fighting. We should require a more definite statement than the words, "went down to Strasbourg," before we should feel justified in assuming that he entered the city. *In point of fact, by pressing the words of the passage in question* to this

more extended signification of "enter," Professor Sayce begs the whole question at issue, and on this forced interpretation bases the very drastic conclusion to which he comes, that all classical history and tradition on the subject of the fall of Babylon has been utterly at fault.

The annalistic tablet next has the following passage: "Afterwards Nabonidos when he (Gôbryas) had bound, into Babylon he took."

We are not told how long "afterwards" this event occurred, but it agrees with what is mentioned by the classical writers—namely, that Cyrus spared the life of Nabonidos, to whom he subsequently allotted a habitation in Carmania. The annalistic tablet goes on: "In Marchesvan"—the Babylonian month answering to our October-November—"In Marchesvan, the third day Cyrus to Babylon descended—the roads before him were dark," or, according to Professor Sayce, "dissensions were allayed before him." You will observe that an interval of three months—from Tammuz (June) to Marchesvan (October-November) separates the arrival of Gôbryas before Babylon from this arrival of his master Cyrus. Professor Sayce, on the assumption that Babylon had been actually taken possession of by Gôbryas in the month Tammuz, writes: "Three months later Cyrus himself arrived, and made his peaceful entry into the new capital of his empire. We gather from the contract-tablets that even the ordinary business of the place had not been affected by the war." And in a note he says: "Even after the entrance of Gobryas into Babylon on the 16th of Tammuz (June) the contracts made there continued to be dated in the reign of Nabonidos." He then gives the dates of certain contract-tablets published by Dr. Strassmaier, which shall be fully considered presently.

Now, in this passage also the words in the original are "Ana Eki erêbu," and Professor Sayce renders them once more "entered Babylon." Mr. Pinches, on the other hand, translates them, "Ana," to; "Eki," Babylon; "erêbu," descended; which would seem to be a literal and natural translation, and would merely mean that on the 3rd of Marchesvan (October-November) Cyrus took up a position outside the walls of Babylon, where his army had been already, for the last three months at least, encamped under the more immediate command of Gôbryas. During that time the troops had been employed, we may assume, in digging those trenches by which Cyrus intended, when a favourable opportunity offered, to render fordable the part of the river which flowed through Babylon. That opportunity presented itself on the night of a great festival—a night which I hope to show was the night of the 11th of this very month Marchesvan.

It would seem that it was on that date really that Babylon fell, as will, I trust, appear from the passage we are about to notice, from the dating of the contract-tablets, and from other considerations.

This passage which I am about to particularly notice records an event which occurred in this month Marchesvan, but in the annalistic tablet is somewhat out of its proper chronological position. It is a passage of supreme importance, but, most unfortunately, is somewhat mutilated. According to Professor Sayce's version, it runs: "The 11th day of the month Marchesvan during the night Gôbryas was on the bank of the river . . . the wife of the King died." Whilst Mr. Pinches' translation is: "On the night of the 11th of Marchesvan Gôbryas [descended] against [Babylon], and the son of the King died."

I called the attention of Mr. Pinches in an interview which I had with him last year in London to this difference in the two translations, and he said that he was writing a paper which he was to read at the Norwich Church Congress, and that he would make some remarks on this point. The following are the remarks accordingly which he made in his paper:

"Finally, I have a few words to say anent my translation of the part of the Babylonian chronicle referring to the capture of Babylon. The translation which I adopted some years ago, and which I do not as yet see any reason to abandon, is: 'On the night of the 11th of Marchesvan, Gôbryas [descended] against [Babylon], and the son of the King died.' Two words are here restored—namely, 'descended' and 'Babylon'—but as there is hardly any doubt that those or similar expressions stood in the original when it was in a complete state, and as the sense seems to demand some such completion, this restoration can hardly be regarded as unreasonable. Sayce restores this passage, 'Gôbryas [was] on the bank of the river,' apparently referring to the fact that the city was taken by draining the river-bed. In whatever way the lacuna is to be filled up, however, one thing is certain, and that is, that on the 11th of Marchesvan Gôbryas did something 'against' or 'upon' some place, and some royal personage died. . . . As this event took place in 'the night,' it is not going too far to say that it probably refers to the event narrated in Daniel, which tells us that Belshazzar, King of the Chaldæans, was slain in the night, after he had held a high festival. According to the Greek writers, Nabonidos, father of Belshazzar, surrendered to the army of Cyrus, who gave him a habitation in Carmania, where he died. Nabonidos, by his surrender, may be regarded as having abdicated, and his son would then become by his birthright King. It does not, therefore, matter whether we read

(as I did on first translating the tablet) 'the King died,' or, as I now propose, 'the son of the King died.' Belshazzar would in either case be meant. . . . This improved translation presupposes that Belshazzar was holding out in some part of Babylon, and, if it be the right rendering, shows that Daniel v. 30 is substantially correct."

From all this, then, it would appear that there is the very strongest reason for believing that it was not on the 16th Tammuz (June), as held by Professor Sayce, that Babylon fell, but three months later—on the night of the 11th Marchesvan (October), and that on that night King Belshazzar, the son of King Nabonidos, was slain. And this view receives further strong confirmation from the dating of those contract-tablets of the merchants of Babylon, already referred to, published by Dr. Strassmaier, and mentioned by Professor Sayce. Professor Sayce himself notices that many of these contract-tablets, although drawn up subsequent to the 16th Tammuz, the date on which, according to his own supposition, Babylon had surrendered to Gôbryas, the lieutenant of Cyrus, were, nevertheless, dated still in the seventeenth year of King Nabonidos. He attempts to account for this by assuming that the supposed surrender of the city to the general of the conqueror Cyrus caused so little excitement that the mercantile community of Babylon went on for three months calmly dating their contract-tablets in the reign of Nabonidos as if nothing had happened.

One may well ask: Does this seem likely? Is it likely that Gobryas would allow the new sovereignty of his master over Babylon to be thus so contemptuously ignored, even if we could conceive the merchants of Babylon to have been guilty of such folly.

In opposition to this view of Professor Sayce's, and in support of my contention that it was on the night of the 11th of Marchesvan that Babylon fell, I would call attention to the dating of these tablets, which will show that all the tablets which are dated earlier than the 11th Marchesvan are dated in the seventeenth year of King Nabonidos; whilst all the tablets which are dated later than the 11th Marchesvan are dated in the "accession year of Cyrus," showing that it was on the night of the 11th Marchesvan that the kingdom passed into the hands of Cyrus.

To this state of things I called Mr. Pinches' attention, and he said that he had always considered that the dating of these tablets was of the greatest importance in determining the exact date of the fall of Babylon; and he subsequently alluded to the subject in the paper which he read at the Norwich Church Congress in the following words:

"It is to be noted that the contract-tablets point to the 11th Marchesvan as the date when the Babylonian empire ceased to exist, and the country yielded up its independence into the hands of the Persian conqueror."

The following are the dates of the contract-tablets in question. Professor Sayce, it is to be remembered, holds that Babylon surrendered to Gôbryas on the 16th Tammuz (June). That event, if it had happened, would have terminated the reign of King Nabonidos. And yet we find a number of contract-tablets, subsequent to the 16th Tammuz, still dated in the 17th year of Nabonidos. There is one, for instance, on the 22nd Tammuz (June), another on the 5th Ab (July-August), and another (to be seen in the case at the British Museum), for sale of a slave, dated the 21st Ab, in the city of the King's Palace, in the seventeenth year of Nabonidos, King of Babylon. And yet Professor Sayce maintains that Nabonidos had been deposed a month before.

A tablet dated the 5th of this same month Ab, "in the seventeenth year of Nabonidos," records that Belshazzar paid arrears of tithe, due by his sister to the offertory-house at Sippar—a transaction already referred to. This Belshazzar might have done through his servants or agents, even though, as is most probable, he was at the time himself besieged in Babylon, and even though Sippara was in the hands of the enemy.

Again, in the next month, Elul (August-September), there is a contract-tablet dated 3rd Elul, in the seventeenth year of Nabonidos, King of Babylon"; another, dated 5th Elul, in the same year, "in the city of the King's Palace, Babylon"; and others dated the 11th, 18th, 21st, and 28th Elul, "in the seventeenth year of Nabonidos, King of Babylon."

Surely Babylon cannot have been held for Cyrus—as yet. On the 3rd Marchesvan the annalistic tablet records: "Cyrus to Babylon descended" (not "entered Babylon," as Professor Sayce has it).

There is a contract-tablet in this month also, even after Cyrus "to Babylon descended," dated the 10th Marchesvan, "in the seventeenth year of Nabonidos, King of Babylon."

On the very next night—the night of the 11th Marchesvan—that occurrence took place, recorded in the passage which Mr. Pinches translates: "On the night of the 11th Marchesvan Gôbryas descended against Babylon and the son of the King died."

And after this occurs the first tablet dated in the "accession year of Cyrus." It is a tablet—to be seen in the case in the British Museum—referring to workmen's rations, and it is dated the 24th Marchesvan, in the "accession year of Cyrus."

From this time forward there does not occur any contract-tablet dated in the reign of Nabonidos, but there is one in the next month, Chisleu (November-December), dated "Babylon 7th Chisleu in the accession year of Cyrus."

From the dating of these tablets the conclusion would seem to be almost irresistible that it was on the 11th Marchesvan that Babylon fell.

It is a curious circumstance also to be observed that the month Marchesvan would be the exact period of the year most favourable for executing the stratagem conceived by Cyrus of draining the river, having regard to the annual flooding of the Euphrates. In his work "Ancient Monarchies," Canon Rawlinson writes:

"The Euphrates first swells about the middle of March, and is not in full flood until quite the end of June. It then continues high for about a month, and does not sink much until the middle of July, after which it gradually falls until September. The rainy season of Chaldæa is in the winter time. Heavy showers fall in November, and still more in December, which sensibly raise the level of the rivers." Thus, in October, the Babylonian month Marchesvan, the river Euphrates would be at its lowest level.

The annalistic tablet goes on to say that Cyrus established peace to Babylon, and that Gôbryas, his governor, appointed governors in Babylon; whilst the Cyrus cylinder says, "his city of Babylon he spared."

All this agrees with what Xenophon relates, that Cyrus, almost immediately after entering the city, proclaimed peace to the Babylonians if they remained within their houses; and the next morning confirmed that proclamation of peace provided they delivered up their arms. The cylinder says: "The men of Babylon—all of them the nobles—and the high priest bowed themselves beneath him; they kissed his feet, they rejoiced at his sovereignty." And, in remarkable agreement with this, Xenophon relates how, on the day after Babylon was taken, Cyrus held a reception, and the Babylonians came to pay him homage in unmanageable numbers.

And now to recapitulate.

I have endeavoured to show in this article that there is no contradiction, practically speaking, between the Babylonian cuneiform records of the fall of Babylon on the one hand, and the account which has come down to us from the classical writers of antiquity on the other. I have tried to show that it was not, as asserted by Professor Sayce, on the 22nd Tammuz (June), without any previous siege, in the absence of Cyrus, and by absolutely peaceful surrender to his lieutenant, Gôbryas, that Babylon fell; but, on the contrary, three months later—

which three months gave time for a siege—on the 11th Marchesvan (October), when Cyrus *was* present, and by a night attack led by Gôbryas, in which the son of the King, Belshazzar, was slain, that the city fell into the hands of Cyrus. All this is in agreement with the classical records of antiquity. And although the Babylonian cuneiform inscriptions say that Cyrus took the city without fighting, yet the classical account practically agrees with this, because the siege, according to that account, was a mere feat of engineering, unmolested by the enemy, and, therefore, unaccompanied by fighting or bloodshed; whilst in the night surprise of the city there was practically no resistance, and only King Belshazzar and a few of his immediate attendants were slain.

And, therefore, I submit that there is no necessity for the reconstruction of that account of the fall of Babylon which has come down to us from antiquity, and that the words of the fifth chapter of the Book of Daniel stand unrefuted—"On that night was Belshazzar the king of the Chaldæans slain."

The whole subject has a most important bearing on the historical character or otherwise of the Book of Daniel. The pronouncement of Professor Sayce, which I have quoted in the early portion of this paper, has already been eagerly adopted, not to say pounced upon, by those who assail the historical character of the Book of Daniel, as if his dictum were finally decisive of the whole question. And no doubt the lead of so eminent a writer will be very extensively followed.

For my own part, however, I think that it is never wise to tie ourselves on to any great names, however illustrious. The greater number of questions of this sort will be found, when we look closely into them, to turn, not so much on abstruse questions of erudite scholarship, as on considerations of logic and common sense.

It requires, indeed, a skilled expert to translate these cuneiform inscriptions, but when they have been translated, we can all then form a judgment as to whether the conclusions attempted to be drawn from them really follow or not.

It requires a skilled huntsman to find the fox and turn him out of covert, but when he is once fairly afoot, every horseman in the field can ride after him.

ANDREW C. ROBINSON.

Notes and Queries.

Psalm LXXVIII. and the Pentateuch.

A writer in the "Notes and Queries" of your June (1895) number finds in the omission of the third, ninth and sixth of the ten plagues of Egypt by the author of Psalm lxxviii. an indication that he "may have happened to have beside him the MS. which is called J, and not the supposed E and P MSS. of the New Critical School. If, however, we carefully compare this part of the Psalm with the corresponding chapters of Exodus, there will be little room for doubt but that the Psalmist *had beside him* no MS. at all, complete or incomplete, of the Pentateuch, but that he had previously made himself conversant with it so as to carry in his head all the leading features and phraseology of the sacred text. When composing, then, this poetic appeal, probably addressed to the northern tribes either after their revolt from the house of David in Rehoboam's days,[1] or possibly at the time of some earlier outbreak of disaffection, he enumerated the provocation of their forefathers and God's merciful interpositions on their behalf, he did so, not by unrolling a book of the law and quoting passages here and there, as a writer might do in these days of multiplied and handy Bibles, but by recalling from *memory* appropriate incidents to illustrate the truths he would impress on his readers.

That he had not the text beside him is, I think, shown by the order in which he enumerates the plagues he does mention. He passes from the first to the fourth, then incidentally notes the second, and, omitting the fifth as well as the sixth, he goes on to the eighth, and, returning to the seventh and omitting the ninth, concludes with the destruction of the firstborn. This is, to say the least, a most improbable arrangement if the text of Exodus or of the hypothetical J MS. had been before him. And this improbability is greatly confirmed if we compare his language with that of the Exodus narrative. The word used by the Mosaic writer for locusts in the account of the eighth plague is ארבה; the Psalmist, however, though he uses the word, relegates it to a secondary place, and gives prominence to what was then probably a more familiar name of the insect חסיל. Again, in the first plague he substitutes the poetic נוזלים for the אנמים and מקוה מים of Exodus; so, too, the destruction caused by the hail is altogether independent of the details given of it in Exodus, and, while in the latter the cattle are spoken of as מקנה and בהמה, the Psalmist uses מקנה and בעיר; the employment of רשף instead of the more detailed description of the lightning in the earlier history may be due to the poetic style of the later composition.

The supposed undesigned coincidence in favour of the use of J only by the Psalmist is, however, finally done away with when we observe that he not only omits the three plagues mentioned in the June paper, but also the fifth (the murrain on the cattle), and Exodus ix. 1-7 is assigned by the critics also to J. It is true the writer under review considers the murrain is mentioned apparently in ver. 48*b*, for his ver. 49 is

[1] The defeat of Ephraim mentioned in ver. 9 seems either to be one not recorded in the Bible, or else possibly their overthrow in Jephthah's days. I cannot think myself it was so recent as the one described in 2 Chron. xiii. as the illustrations of our author are all taken apparently from the early history of the nation; indeed, the children of Ephraim of ver. 9 reads as if in opposition with "their fathers" of ver. 8.

clearly inapplicable, regarding רֶשֶׁף perhaps as meaning pestilence, as in Deut. xxxii. 24 ; but the parallelism of tho verses is altogether against this hypothesis, for then we should have three half-verses given to the hail, followed by one half-verse only for the murrain.

Although, therefore, it is clear that the Psalmist had not a copy of the law or of J[1] before him, his language is so permeated with Mosaic expressions that we are justified in holding that it was from the Law substantially as we know it to-day that he borrowed his illustrations. The account of the plagues is set out in ver. 43 as אתותיו ומופתיו, the very language of Exod. vii. 3, and six times used in Deuteronomy and always of this Egyptian Deliverance. In ver. 44 the יאריהם יהפך לדם is a distinct recollection of the language used in Exodus of the turning the Nile water into blood so as to render it *undrinkable* ; the ערב of ver. 45 is nowhere used but of the plague of flies in Exodus, and in Psalm cv., which, like the present ones, borrows the word. Equally restricted is the use of צפרדע (frogs) in the second part of the verse. Again, the first part of ver. 51 is almost a literal quotation from Exod. xii. 29. Then the expression that the waters *covered* the Egyptians is clearly borrowed from the language of Exod. xiv. 28.

Not to pursue these illustrations further, we think we have established on such evidence as sensible men would act on in daily life that the Book of the Law, substantially as we have it to-day, was as familiar to a pious Israelite living in the days of Rehoboam, or possibly as early as those of Absalom's and Sheba's revolt, that is anterior to the supposed composition of J, E P, and D, as the Authorized Version is to Englishmen now, and that he knew its authority was so recognised by his fellow-countrymen that he feels he may draw from its pages what they will acquiesce in as being an account of God's dealings with their ancestors. Mr. Chancellor Lias, in his interesting and weighty essay in "Lex Mosaica," at page 238, draws a valuable inference as to Samuel's environment from his resemblance to the Covenanters of the seventeenth century, and by similar reasonings we may safely infer that in the days when our Psalm was written the Law of Moses held in Palestine the same unquestioned pre-eminence that the Bible now holds in Christian countries. It is not to be wondered at the critics feel how essential to their theories it is to push the Psalms down to a very late date indeed in the history of the Israelitish people. Fortunately for the cause of Truth, most of the Psalms harmonize as little with this "New Light" as the Pentateuch itself does.

Much critical learning would be saved and many brilliant discoveries of facts which never existed would be spared us if critics could only project themselves back from this book-abounding age into one in which books and records were rare and only to be found at certain centres often far removed from one another.

J. D. TREMLETT.

DALETHORPE.

---

[1] That the knowledge of the Psalmist was not limited to the J portions of the Law may easily be shown from earlier parts of the Psalm. When describing the passage of the Red Sea, he dwells on the division of the water (בקע ים) and the waters standing במו־נד, thus referring to Exod. xiv. 16 assigned to P, and to Exod. xv. 8 assigned to E. Then the giving water from the rock refers to Exod. xvii. 6 assigned to E, and to Num. xx. 8-11, given by the critics to JE ; the wind bringing fowls for the people to eat rests on Num. xi. 31, which is also assigned to JE.

Review.

Rome. By EMILE ZOLA. Paris: Charpentier.

THIS is the second book of the trilogy which M. Zola is known to be writing—Lourdes, Rome, Paris—to deal with aspects of modern faith. Those of us who had the patience to wade through the almost interminable pages of the first book will remember that it dealt with the so-called miracles and faith-cures of the priesthood at the little town in the Pyrenees. "Rome" continues the story, if that term can be used. The young abbé, Pierre, who visited Lourdes, has written a book, "La Rome Nouvelle." In this he tries to free faith and dogma from the accretions with which twenty centuries of councils and bulls have surrounded them. The attempt is approved, and the book is commended by a French cardinal and a French count, a leader of the new Catholic-Socialist working-men's party, the identity of each of whom is easily guessed. The young priest is filled with a radiant hope that his book will help to reconcile the old doctrines of Rome with the eager, restless spirit of to-day. Unfortunately, and much to his innocent surprise, it is viewed with disfavour at headquarters, and even threatened with inclusion in the dreaded "Index." Pierre goes to Rome to seek an audience of the Holy Father. After heart-sickening delays and numberless intrigues, he gains a hearing, but to no purpose. The book is forbidden, and the young abbé bows beneath the yoke.

Such is the thread of the main story, but it really plays a very unimportant part in the whole construction of the book, which is not so much a novel, in the usual acceptation of the term, as a literary guide-book to Rome. Some see in the troubles of the abbé a fragment of autobiography. Pierre, whose book has been put on the Index, is Zola. He it is who industriously visits all the show-places of the great city, and describes them with a wealth of technicality and a microscopic minuteness of detail. He it is who weaves the recollections of ancient history into the actualities of to-day, and sees in the Pope an embodiment of the defeated desire to wield the sceptre of Augustus, to continue the Church as the succession of the empire. It is Zola in person who vainly solicits an audience, and who is reduced to catch shadowy glimpses of the frail white figure walking in the Vatican gardens, and who at the same time notes on his shirt-cuff the technical names of Italian carriages. This may or may not be, but it is as certain as it is natural that M. Zola has transferred many of his own experiences and ideas into the record of his young priest.

All who have visited Rome know that one of the greatest difficulties towards properly understanding the city is that its interests, its aspects, are so many and varied. This has made itself felt in M. Zola's book. It is a succession of magic-lantern slides, and the story of Pierre is simply the commentary of the lecturer who explains the pictures, only it must be admitted that he is often confused and loses himself. For this reason the book would not have the smallest interest for anyone outside two classes—those who know the city and like to see their knowledge revived, and those who wish to learn the impressions of a great French author regarding the probable influence and power of ecclesiastical Rome. To the ordinary novel-reader the great, tedious guide-book and catalogue—for it is nothing more—would prove a burden to the flesh. M. Zola, probably to counteract this, has introduced somewhat of a love-story which has no real connection whatever with the book itself. Benedetta, niece of Cardinal Boccanera, of a family devoted to the papacy, has

married Count Prada, of a royalist family. It was hoped that this marriage would draw the white and black worlds, the temporal and spiritual powers, closer together. It turns out badly. Each side wishes a divorce. Benedetta loves her cousin Dario, and will marry him when the divorce is granted. But it is fated that the marriage will never be, for the Jesuits, not wishing Cardinal Boccanera to be a candidate for the tiara, send him some poisoned figs, which Dario eats by mistake and dies. In the death-room Zola gives us in his characteristic style what might be termed a scene of pathetic filth, where Benedetta and Dario die in each other's arms.

Even this, however, does not prevent the book, as we have said, from being intolerably dull to the general reader. At the same time Zola's descriptions of the Papal court, and his forecasts of the Papal power, the sketches of different cardinals, and the effect on the young and ardent mind of Pierre caused by the hollow intrigue and jealousy of ecclesiastical circles in Rome, are very interesting, and not without their lessons. The descriptions of ancient Rome are disappointing. Zola is more of an observer than a reader. One can readily detect misapprehensions in his ideas of Augustus and the Rome of the emperors. Cicero is not named once, and Virgil never appears. Evidently the Abbé Pierre has not read Livy, let alone Grote and Niebuhr. History is not Zola's *métier*. One is surprised that so shrewd a man should have left the hard track of the present, and floundered about in what to him is evidently the marsh of the bygone past.

The finest piece of pure narrative in the book is the description of Pierre's interview with the Pope. He is brought in secretly—almost smuggled, in fact, in the evening. He sees the Pope at home, *le pape intime*, as the French say, in an old white cassock stained with snuff, slowly sipping his *sirop* drop by drop, as he talks to the young priest like any old bourgeois tradesman taking his rest after his day's work is done. What a contrast with another scene which Zola describes, and of which we translate a part! It occurs after the Pope has celebrated a mass before a pilgrimage:

"A signal was given: Leo XIII. hastened to come down from his throne to take his place in the procession and get back to his rooms. The Swiss guards tried hard to keep the crowd back and the passage clear. But at the sight of the departure of His Holiness, a thrill of despair had arisen, as if the gates of heaven had suddenly been shut in the faces of those who had not been able to approach them. What a frightful deception, to have had God visible and to lose him, before gaining salvation just by touching him! The crush was so terrible that the most extraordinary confusion reigned, and swept away the Swiss guards. Women were seen to cast themselves behind the Pope, drag themselves at full length over the marble squares, kiss his footmarks, and drink in the dust of his steps. A tall dark lady shrieked and fainted; two gentlemen of the committee held her, in the nervous attack which convulsed her, so that she could not hurt herself. Another, stout and fair, devoured and frantically mangled with her lips one of the arms of the armchair on which the poor frail elbow of the old man had rested. Others noticed her, and fought for the place, glueing their lips to the two arms, to the wood and the velvet, their bodies shaken by deep sobs. Force was necessary to drag them from it."

What an astonishing, a terrible description! Surely idolatry is not dead when such an explosion of religious frenzy leads to scenes like this! At that rate, Reunion is ridiculous. There is little need to talk about the "Corybantic Christianity" of the Salvation Army when Mænads of this description exist. We do not want to be inoculated with delirium.

But in Pierre's interview with the Pope he is quite another person. He talks quietly to Pierre, and in simple surroundings, The room was

bare; there was nothing but three armchairs and four or five chairs recovered with silk to fill the vast space, which was covered by a carpet already very old and worn. A bed disappeared in the distance. There were the chests, the famous chests, which are said to contain, under a triple lock, all the Peter's pence which these pilgrimages bring to Rome. Leo persuades him to submit.

We do not think, by the way, that the Pope will feel flattered if ever he reads M. Zola's description of his person. Perhaps we may trace a little of the pique of a rejected candidate for an audience under the lines which describe Leo XIII., amongst other things, as "simian"! Even realistic novelists have their feelings, we suppose.

But there is no reason to suppose that Zola has allowed anything personal to bias his discussion of ecclesiastical Rome and her probable influence. He is too shrewd a man for that, and writes with restraint and great apparent fairness. Nevertheless—or perhaps we should say consequently—his book is a scathing indictment of Rome's system. Pierre went to Rome to try and revive his faith; it was strangled instead. We see the dull obstinacy which incessantly leads the Romish Church, in the long-run, to a retreat before the progress of science, instead of the open-minded and honest welcoming of new light shed on an old and intrinsically unalterable truth. We see the deceit and hatred which lead different orders in the ecclesiastical body to an intestine warfare amongst themselves. We see the stealthy underhand working of the Jesuit, always aiming at more power—for his order in the first place, for his Church in the second. We see noble aspirations remorselessly stifled, and dictation substituted for an intelligent devotion. We see policemen in cassocks, jealous of their narrow regulations, and eager to arrest intelligent inquirers. A lurid light rests over the whole uneasy scene.

The book, of course, has met with attacks from the quarter whence they might be expected. But they can be narrowed down to one point—the question of its accuracy or otherwise on matters of fact. There is no complication, no side-issue. As we have said before, the book is not a novel, and so no questions can arise similar to those which have rendered the reading of some of the author's former works impossible in Christian families. Not that we should say that even "Rome" is suitable for the general reader; to begin with, he would not care for it. But it remains a colossal monument of formidable qualities of work, of assimilation, of shrewd and serious reflections on men and things. And as such, it is a strong attack on the Church of Rome.

Short Notices.

Records of the Life of Stevenson Arthur Blackwood, K.C.B. Edited by his WIFE. Pp. 595. Price 12s. Hodder and Stoughton.

THIS very handsome memorial contains a most interesting record of a very powerful and striking personality. Sir Arthur Blackwood was for many years a leader of all that was good on the Evangelical side of National Christianity. He was a cadet of the family of the Marquis of Dufferin. His religious convictions were finally fixed by the ministrations of the celebrated Miss Marsh in 1856, and from that day to his death he was an earnest and devoted Christian, using his social gifts,

personal popularity, and official position, to the utmost extent of his power, to the glory of God.

Memories of Archdeacon Blakeney. By the Rev. W. ODOM. Pp. 306. *Home Words* Office.

Although the life of such a man as the late Vicar of Sheffield should form the subject of a separate biographical article, we must mention this biography without further delay. It is already in its second edition. "For more than a generation," says the Bishop of Ripon in the Introduction, "he was identified with every social, moral, and religious movement in the town. He threw his untiring energy into every effort for the extension of spiritual work. Under his guidance, or with his sympathy, churches, mission-rooms, and schools were built. His benevolent heart made him foremost in every philanthropic enterprise; his quick, intellectual sympathies made him ardent and interested in all educational work. In the midst of all this varied labour he was diligent in the spiritual work of his parish."

Archdeacon Blakeney's leading characteristics were geniality, good sense, practical ability, and earnest spiritual Christianity. He won the hearts and complete confidence of the working men of Sheffield, and it is not too much to say that nowhere has the Church of England been more respected, loved, and efficient, than in Sheffield during the time that he was Vicar.

Church History in Queen Victoria's Reign. By the Rev. MONTAGU FOWLER. Pp. 245. S.P.C.K.

This is a manual of modern Church history, intended, as the preface says, for the use of schools. Mr. Fowler writes as a moderate high-churchman. His style is pleasant, and he has placed in a readable form a great deal of useful information. Perhaps Evangelicals would not like to be told that their teaching was to a great extent limited to a few chapters in two of St. Paul's Epistles. The thirty-seven volumes of Simeon's "Outlines" on every book and chapter in the Bible, which was to be seen in every Evangelical parsonage in the country in the first half of this century, is conclusive evidence to the contrary. Nor would Evangelicals accept his account of the Ornaments Rubric; nor of the general tendency of Ritualism; but these are minor points, and the main facts of the book are well brought out. It contains eleven chapters: Tractarianism, Ritualism, Convocation, Laity, Essays and Reviews, Colenso, the Lambeth Conference, Irish Disestablishment, Growth of the Episcopate, Religious Education, Church Building and Restoration. Mr. Fowler's position as Chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury has given him special opportunities for information and observation, which he has used to great advantage.

The Revelation of St. John the Divine. By JOHN H. LATHAM. Pp. 368. Elliot Stock.

Mr. Latham gives an original translation with expository notes. The Book of Revelation has suffered much from divisions into chapters and verses; Mr. Latham separates it according to subjects. The meaning of this book will always be mysterious; but the writer enters with care, modesty, and originality into the various symbolisms, and never tries to be unwisely dogmatic. He has produced a helpful and thoughtful work. Perhaps the book would have been more useful if he had quoted the opinions for and against various interpretations.

The Best of Both Worlds. By the Rev. THOMAS BINNEY. Pp. 182. London: Knight.

Mr Knight has done well in re-issuing this well-known and wholesome work for young men.

Family Prayers. By the Rev. GEORGE CAIE. Pp. 194. Edinburgh: Gardner and Hitt.

This is a volume of prayers for five weeks, with a few prayers for special occasions, and private prayers for one week. Mr. Caie is minister of the church at Forfar. Every short service has a passage of Scripture and short prayers suitable to quite simple people. The writer is well acquainted with the English Prayer-Book. A new book of family devotions will be heartily welcomed, as the phraseology of familiar ones becomes stereotyped by repetition. The writer's language has a simple and restrained dignity, and his prayers breathe the spirit of the New Testament.

On Sermon Preparation. Pp. 230. Seeley and Co.

These eleven papers appeared originally in the *Record*, and they are by writers who are known as supporters of the principles of the Reformation, including Bishop Boyd Carpenter, of Ripon; Dean Lefroy, of Norwich; Dean Farrar, of Canterbury; Principals Moule, Chavasse, etc. It must be remembered that they are not intended to form a critical treatise on rhetoric, but are written for that great majority of young clergymen who have had no preparation for sermon preaching or public speaking at all.

The Month.

CHURCH PASTORAL AID SOCIETY.

THE sixty-first annual report of the Church Pastoral Aid Society says: "A population growing at the rate of 1,000 per day; the rich and the poor dwelling more and more apart; the parochial system, so admirable in theory, becoming more and more unequal to the demands made upon it; the increasing difficulty of obtaining volunteer help in all the great central parishes—these are difficulties which call for earnest consideration at the hands of English Churchmen, and which more than justify the existence of such a society as this as affording a means of coping with them."

The total income of the society for last year was £63,182, a decrease of £1,784, though considerably above the average of the last five years. During the year forty-nine new grants were made to forty-eight parishes, of which thirty-four were for assistant-curates, seven for lay agents, and seven for women workers. The total number of grants now on the books is 867, an increase of fourteen, representing a liability of £63,299 if all the grants were in operation. The actual expenditure of the year was £60,678. The average population of the forty-eight parishes to which new grants were made is 8,751.

BISHOP OF ST. ALBAN'S FUND.

The eighteenth annual report of the Bishop of St. Alban's Fund states that since the establishment of the fund in 1878, the population of that part of the diocese known as "London over the Border" has grown from 200,000 to at least 500,000. The year just concluded has shown the largest income yet received (£19,145); and though the increase has been mostly accounted for by legacies, the council thankfully report that the regular sources of income have been well maintained. In annual subscriptions, which are the most reliable source of support, there has been some slight increase. On the other hand, the amount from church collections has fallen from £1,662 in the previous year to £1,366.

"This is partly accounted for by the receipt of fewer extra-diocesan collections, but it probably also sadly reflects the increasing poverty of the country parishes, and also tells us of the efforts which have been made, at a great cost, to strengthen Church schools in the diocese. The council look back with gratitude to the kind support which, in these times of depression, has come from those to whom it meant a real sacrifice. They trust that no congregation will ever hesitate to send a collection because the amount will be necessarily small, since they feel that a special blessing is attached to the offerings and prayers of the poor."

The expenditure includes a first charge of over £10,000 a year on account of grants for living agencies (twenty-three Mission clergymen, fifty-nine parochial curates, seventeen Scripture-readers, and thirty-one Mission-women), rents of nineteen Mission-buildings, and working expenses—which amounted to £529 last year. More assistance is urgently needed, the provision of suitable sites coming first among requirements for the development of new work. A sum of £1,865 was expended last year on this department, in connection with which Mr. Richard Foster's gift of an admirable site, valued at over £1,000, for a new vicarage at St. Mary's, Plaistow, is gratefully acknowledged. Grants amounting to £1,200 in all were made for one new church and for the completion of two others; and a sum of £1,300 was granted towards the debts on seven churches recently built, on condition that an equal sum should be raised locally within a year. One grant was made during the year from the Special Building Fund, which is now quite exhausted, since the instalments still to come in will not meet the present deficiency. The reports from the Mission parishes and districts continue to show steady work. In 1890 the number of baptisms was 1,310; the number of confirmed 322; of those present at Easter Communion 1,558. For 1895 the numbers were 2,936 under the first head, 758 under the second, and 3,376 under the third.

Gifts and Bequests.

Mrs. Holt, of Bardney Hall, Barton, Lincolnshire, has given £1,000 towards the restoration of St. Peter's Church, Barton. Four years ago the same lady presented the parish with school buildings at a cost of £1,300.

An anonymous donor has just given £1,500 to the Church Army, for the purpose of providing and furnishing a lodging-home for men adjoining the society's Labour Home for the Outcast in Holloway. The St. John's Lodging Home, in Lisson Grove, which was presented to the society by one of its central staff, who are all honorary workers, has been filled to its utmost capacity every night since it was opened, nearly three years ago.

By his will, recently proved, Mr. James William Langworthy, of 15, Prince's Gardens, bequeathed £1,000 to St. Mary's Hospital, and £500 each to St. Thomas's and St. George's Hospitals, the London Hospital, University College Hospital, Charing Cross Hospital, the Ormond Street Hospital for Sick Children, the East London Hospital, and the Friedenheim Home of Peace.

The Marquis of Bute has signified his intention of contributing £10,000 to the University of South Wales, to be applied for the purposes of technical education in Wales, the sum to be handed over to the authorities as soon as required. The Drapers' Company have also promised £10,000 towards the fund for providing new buildings, and the Government have promised £20,000 on condition that an equal amount is raised by public subscription.

The Duke of Norfolk has given £13,000 for a site for a Roman Catholic College at Oxford.

The Post-Office.

The forty-second annual report of the Postmaster-General, which the Duke of Norfolk has submitted to the Lords of the Treasury, and which has just been officially published, states that, during the year ending March 31st, 1,834,200,000 letters, 314,500,000 post-cards, 672,300,000 book packets, circulars, and samples, 149,000,000 newspapers, and 60,527,000 parcels, a total of 3,030,527,000 postal packets of one sort or another, being an average of 77 per head for the population, were delivered in the United Kingdom. The Duke points out that in the year 1839, which immediately preceded the establishment of the uniform penny postage, the number of letters (including 6,000,000 franks) which passed through the post was 82,000,000, rising the next year, the first under the new *régime*, to 169,000,000. In 1870 post-cards were introduced, and considerable concessions in the rates for books, newspapers and samples were made. The total revenue in 1839 was £2,435,040, and the expenditure £756,999. In the year just ended the revenue was £11, 759,945 postal, and £2,879,794 telegraph—£14,639,739 in all, with an expenditure of £11,007,617, leaving a net revenue of £3,632,122.

Sunday Labour in Belgium.

The first question inquired into by the recently-established "Office du Travail" in Belgium has been that of Sunday labour, the first instalment of the Report on which has now appeared in a volume of over 500 pages. The present volume practically deals with all the chief industries carried on in Belgium, except transport trades, mines, and quarries. According to the *Labour Gazette* the number of typical establishments or branches of establishments selected for investigation numbered 1,459, employing 119,477 workpeople on weekdays. Of these establishments 946 employed Sunday labour to the amount of 41,679 workpeople. A distinction is made between regular and irregular Sunday labour, *i.e.*, between the establishment (of which 430 were included in the inquiry) in which workpeople are employed on every Sunday in the year, and those (516 in number) in which they are employed on occasional Sundays only. Of the above 41,679 workpeople, 13,651 (or 11·5 per cent. of the total number employed in the establishments) work every Sunday; 14,712 (12·3 per cent.) every other Sunday; and 13,316 (or 11·2 per cent.) on occasional Sundays. For the great majority (11,916 out of a total of 14,712) of those described as working every other Sunday the hours of such employment are from midnight on Saturday till six o'clock on Sunday morning.—*Record.*

Obituary.

THE death is announced of the Rev. Thomas Green, M.A., perpetual vicar of Friezland, and Honorary Canon of Manchester. He was a Hulmeian scholar of Brasenose College, Oxford, where he graduated in the Second Class *Lit. Hum.* in 1844, having been ordained the previous year by the Bishop of Chester. He held the perpetual curacy of Bardsley from 1844 to 1849, when he was appointed to the newly-formed parish of Friezland. He remained there until 1858, when he became Principal of the Church Missionary Society's College at Islington. In 1870 he returned to Friezland, where he officiated until his death. He was elected Proctor in Convocation for the archdeaconry of Manchester in 1879, and was appointed Honorary Canon of Manchester Cathedral in 1881. He was, says the *Times*, a life governor of the Church Missionary Society, and at the same time gave an ardent support to such home Mission work as that carried on by the Church Pastoral Aid Society, the Jews, and the Irish Church Mission Societies.—*Guardian.*