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

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

ELLIOT STOCK'S NEW BOOKS.

NEW VOLUME OF SERMONS BY CANON WILBERFORCE.
In crown 8vo., cloth, gilt lettered, **5s.**

FEELING AFTER HIM.

Sermons Preached for the most part in Westminster Abbey.

(SECOND SERIES)

By BASIL WILBERFORCE, D.D.,

Archdeacon of Westminster, Chaplain to the Speaker, Select Preacher before the University of Oxford.

"What a feast for reflective minds the whole volume provides!"—*Christian Commonwealth.*

"The sermons are eloquent and inspiring, and made interesting and instructive by apt illustrations from life and literature."—*Scotsman.*

In foolscap 8vo., paper boards, price 3s. 6d.

ST. PAUL. Addresses delivered in London. By the Rev. ROWLAND W. CORBET, late Rector of Stoke-on-Tern, Author of "Letters from a Mystic of the Present Day."

"Mr. Corbet has evidently been a careful student of St. Paul, and of the expounders of his doctrine, the bearing of which in its personal, social and general relations he discusses in a manner which by its earnestness cannot fail to command respect."—*Glasgow Herald.*

In crown 8vo., cloth, gilt lettered, price 3s. 6d.

SERMONS OF THE AGE. Thirteen Sermons. By the Rev. T. MEREDITH WILLIAMS, B.A., Vicar of Llanarth, Cardiganshire.

"Mr. Williams treats the various topics embraced in this volume most skilfully. The whole volume deserves attention, and we hope it will have an extensive circulation."—*Llan.*

In crown 8vo., gilt lettered, price 1s. 6d. net.

THE WORK OF THE MINISTRY. Five Ordination Addresses. By the Rev. R. G. HUNT, M.A., Vicar of St. Mark's, Wolverhampton.

"A wise and timely contribution to the subject of pastoral training. Admirable in tone and spirit, thoroughly sane, and profoundly evangelical. The truth is put with great clearness and directness."—*Weekly Leader.*

In large crown 8vo., cloth, gilt lettered, price 6s.

PREACHING and PREACHERS: Criticisms and Suggestions. By JOSEPH GOWAN.

"A quaintly interesting volume. Mr. Gowan has swept his net through many seas, and brings to land some interesting captures."—*S. S. Chronicle.*

"It is altogether one of the most thoroughly practical works on the subject we have read."—*The Rock.*

In demy 8vo., tastefully printed on thick paper, price 1s. net.

EVIL, NOT EVERLASTING. A Paper read in outline before the Rugeley Branch of the Society of Sacred Study. By Rev. OSMOND DOBREE, M.A., of the University of Dublin, Prebendary of Lichfield, Vicar of Colwich.

"The author treats the subject in admirable spirit."—*Christian Commonwealth.*

In paper cover, price 6d.

THE DISPUTED PUNCTUATION OF THE CHURCH CATECHISM. By the Rev. N. DIMOCK, A.M.

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

The National Protestant Church Union.

To Maintain the Principles of the Reformation as set forth in the Prayer Book and Articles of the Church of England.

President—W. D. CRUDDAS, Esq.
Chairman—The Rev. Prebendary WEBB-PEPLOE, M.A.
Treasurer—T. F. VICTOR BUXTON, Esq.
Secretary—Sir C. ROBERT LIGHTON, Bart.

The National Protestant Church Union witnesses for—

1. The supremacy and sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures as the Word of God.
2. The sole and sufficient efficacy of the sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ upon the Cross.
3. The justification of man by faith only in the Lord Jesus Christ.
4. The right of every believer to direct and unimpeded access to God, through Christ.
5. The freedom and sovereignty of the work of the Holy Spirit in sanctification.

WILL YOU HELP THIS IMPORTANT WORK?

For List of Publications, Terms of Membership, etc., apply to the Secretary, N.P.C.U.
324, REGENT STREET, LONDON, W.

EDUCATIONAL.

WEYMOUTH COLLEGE.

A fully equipped Public School

in which Boys are definitely prepared for the Universities, any of the Professions, or for Business Life. Very healthy situation by the sea. Splendid Fields for Cricket and Football. Reduction made for the sons of Clergy and Officers. The religious teaching of the school is Protestant and Evangelical.

Apply to H. C. BARNES-LAWRENCE, M.A., The College, WEYMOUTH, Dorsetshire.

ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE,

Near TENBURY, WORCESTERSHIRE.

BOYS thoroughly prepared for Public Schools. Most healthy situation; large playing fields and Fives Courts; separate cubicles. Head master, REV. W. A. RENWICK, M.A., late Scholar of Hertford College, Oxford.

APPLY: REV. THE WARDEN.

DAVENTRY GRAMMAR SCHOOL.

Founded A.D. 1600.

PUBLIC SCHOOL EDUCATION at moderate cost. Resident staff of University Graduates in Honours. Entrance scholarships. Special terms for sons of clergy and medical men. Sound Church teaching. Healthy situation, 800 feet above sea-level. Good buildings. Large Playing-fields, Laboratory, Gymnasium. Fives' Court. Experienced Matron.

Entrance Scholarship for Sons of Clergy materially reducing Fees.

For Prospectus apply: REV. H. JOHNSON, *Head Master*.

THE

CHURCHMAN

SEPTEMBER, 1903.

ART. I.—ST. STEPHEN'S SPEECH.

THE first martyrdom was illustrated by striking incidents and a dramatic scene, by deliberate testimony and vehement passions, by a vision of the Lord in glory, and by last words of faith and love, which teach us how to die. It was also the occasion of the first crisis to the Christian community—in its persecution, its scattering abroad, with the consequent diffusion of the Word, and yet further by its connection with the spiritual history of the "young man whose name was Saul." It has therefore afforded ample subjects for the commentator and precious topics for the preacher; but these are not within the present purpose, which is concerned only with the speech—first, in its relation to the situation at the time, but more especially in its office in the scheme of Scripture, and its permanent and present value for the faith of the Church.

Probably many readers besides the writer have at one time felt some slight surprise that the speech should have been what it was, and still more that it should be reported at such length by a narrator so accustomed to summarize action and abbreviate discourse. That would not have been done if he had not had a lively sense of the importance of the speech, and of its bearing on the whole history which he had in hand.

1. Stephen is before the hierarchical tribunal of his nation on a capital charge. "This man ceaseth not to speak against this holy place and the law; for we have heard him say that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and change the customs which Moses delivered unto us. Then said the high priest, Are these things so?"

The answer is ready: "Brethren and fathers, hearken." Yet it seems scarcely relevant. As desiring to place himself and his hearers in the line of thought common to them both, he begins far back in the ages with the ancestor of the race and the commencement of revelation, and proceeds with deliberate detail through the history of God's dealings with the people till he reaches the building of the Temple and the days of the prophets. Is not this line of argument a far-fetched answer to the judicial question? It is really an answer to a much larger question—that of the whole situation which is involved in the trial itself. Whether the accused had or had not said this or that was of no consequence, in view of the great fact which was before the mind of the speaker, and which he had to bring before the mind of the judges. The comprehensive fact (if it can be so described) is the action of God in revelation through the course of time from the call of Abraham to the resurrection of Jesus. Separate prophecies had been alleged by Apostles, but Stephen will adduce the whole course of things as one predestined scheme. The grandeur of the view so exalted his soul that it gave a serene glory to his countenance, "and all that sat in the council, looking steadfastly on him, saw his face as it had been the face of an angel." He proceeded to unfold the story of this Divine action in the gradation of its stages and the unity of its plan; but the narrative, as he presented it, became an offence to the prejudices and an accusation to the conscience of his hearers. The institutions and prerogatives of Israel were seen, not as fixed and final, but as provisional and preparatory for what was to follow, so that, by inference, even the holy place and the customs which Moses delivered might be liable to the changes which he was accused of predicting. But worse than this was the history of opposition and enmity, which was shown to have accompanied the history of grace—in the jealousy and almost fratricide of the sons of Jacob, in the first rejection by the people of the mission of Moses, in their turning against him after their deliverance, in the apostasies and idolatries in the wilderness, and long afterwards in the persecutions and murders of the prophets. It was an undeniable history, and the men before whom it was unfolded were the true sons and followers of their fathers now, in their own generation "resisters of the Holy Ghost." Unhappily for themselves, it had been in the fatal day of decision; for as the record of grace had been consummated in the person of Jesus of Nazareth, so the record of enmity had been consummated in His rejection and crucifixion, and these were the men who had done it. The defence had become an indictment—a terrible indictment. As the speaker proceeded,

they caught the drift and felt the pressure of his argument, and their visible attitude of passionate fury precipitated the inspired denunciation at the close.

"They were cut to the heart, and gnashed upon him with their teeth. But he, being full of the Holy Ghost, looked up stedfastly into heaven, and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God, and said, Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God. But they cried out with a loud voice, and stopped their ears, and rushed upon him with one accord; and they cast him out of the city, and stoned him; and the witnesses laid down their clothes at the feet of a young man named Saul. They stoned Stephen, calling upon the Lord, and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit. And he kneeled down, and cried with a loud voice, Lord, lay not this sin to their charge. And when he had said this, he fell asleep."

2. This short survey of the speech in its character, aim, and effect may be sufficient to show its fitness in relation to the actual situation at the time it was delivered. But the fulness of the report indicates something more—namely, a sense of its importance in the scheme of Christian doctrine, and of its permanent value for the faith of the Church.

The relations between the Old Testament and the New are intimate, manifold, and fundamental; and the instinct of the Church has ever recognised them as, in their very different measures, constituting an organic whole, one written Word, one Bible. But this result was secured through an early conflict. When the Messiah had "come to His own, and His own received Him not," Christianity was born in the midst of a Judaism which rejected and denounced it, while it claimed to be the predestined consummation of the religion of Israel, and the fulfilment of the promises and prophecies. This conflict was brought to a head in the trial of Stephen, in Jerusalem and before the rulers, while the Church was still only Jewish. His full assertion of the Christian position, crowned by an illustrious martyrdom, was a testimony which the dispersed disciples carried with them in all the movements which followed—to Samaria, Phœnicia, Cyprus, and Antioch. It was a prelude to the conversion of Saul and to St. Peter's baptism of the first Gentiles, and a preface to the Gospel which was preached throughout the world.

How largely the substance of that preface entered into the teaching of the Gospel, how truly that historic sketch involved a doctrinal scheme, the most cursory view of the Apostolic writings is sufficient to show. The place of "our father Abraham" in the speech is the same which in those writings he always holds. His call and obedience, the promises given to him, and, above all, the faith which received them, afford continual lessons in their application to the promises of the Gospel and the faith of Christians. The bondage in Egypt

and the deliverance from it are types of spiritual facts, and supply illustrative language for the doctrine of redemption. Moses at Sinai and the "living oracles" represent the dispensation of the law, which had so great a part in the Divine plan, and on which so much of St. Paul's exposition and dialectic argument is employed, showing it as a parenthesis in the greater history of grace. The rebellions and idolatries in the wilderness, with the sentence that ensued in the case of those who had been "baptized unto Moses," supplied a lasting warning to the recipients of the Christian Sacraments. "The tabernacle of witness," made according to the pattern showed in the Mount, opened out into the heavenly sanctuary and priesthood, as set forth in the Epistle to the Hebrews (an Epistle which has with the speech many close affinities). Thus, all the successive references which Stephen made to the Pentateuchal narrative were so many anticipations of its future use in the Christian Church, as well as so many testimonies of adherence to the national traditions; while, at the same time, his manner of citing them conveyed the true view of the events as changing scenes in a progressive drama. Very noticeable, too, is the perspicuity with which he sees the whole Mosaic economy of law and ritual as a stage in the course of revelation, truly Divine, yet given through created agency by the ministry of angels. "An angel," he says, "appeared to Moses in a flame of fire in the bush." "He was sent to be a ruler and a redeemer with the hand of the angel which appeared to him in the bush." Again, "He was in the Church in the wilderness with the angel which spake to him in the mount Sinai." And at last the charge is made: "Ye received the law as it was ordained by angels, and kept it not." Why this insistence on the angelic ministry? Was it to glorify the law? It did glorify the law, by showing the human mediator as acting under immediate direction of heavenly powers, receiving what he delivered. Yet was there another comparison in Stephen's mind, lessening the glory of the law by a glory that excelled. He spoke from the level of a higher dispensation than that of which angels were the ministers. His thought is interpreted by his successors, who represent the law as "ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator, *till the seed should come to whom the promise was made*" (Gal. iii. 19). And it had come in the person of One "made so much better than the angels, as He hath inherited a more excellent name than they" (Heb. i. 4).

From the standpoint of the revelation in Jesus Christ, Stephen beheld in the past religious history of his race a great scheme of God, typical, prophetical, preparatory, leading on to its predestined end, through successive stages, changeable

forms, and transitory localization in Land or Temple. This was the view of things on which he reasoned with the men of his own sort, the Hellenist Jews of the African and Asiatic synagogues, who could not resist the wisdom and the spirit by which he spake. This was the view which they characterized as blasphemy against Moses and against God, and which they formulated into an accusation of treason "against this holy place and the law, for we have heard him say that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place and change the customs which Moses delivered to us." This was the view which was intended in the judicial question, "Are these things so?" the view which he maintained in his defence before the council, which brought down their passionate condemnation, which he sealed by martyrdom and left as an enduring testimony to the Church.

3. By it he, being dead, yet speaketh, and in our own generation with a force and effect beyond what the words had before, receiving as they do a fresh emphasis from contrast with voices of the day. We were wont to hear in this review of Old Testament history an exposition of its character: we now also hear it in affirmation of its truth. This testimony is all the stronger for the signs of independent knowledge or opinion which the speech contains. "No less than twelve of his references to the Mosaic history [as Dean Stanley has observed[1]] differ from it, either by variation or addition. The general fact of the adoption of these variations by Stephen is [he says] significant, as showing the freedom with which he handled the sacred history and the comparative unimportance assigned by him and his reporter to minute accuracy." However this may be, such shades of difference in incidental detail make more conspicuous the unhesitating confidence in the substantial facts. That, it may be said, could not be otherwise, when confidence in the sacred records was touched by no breath of suspicion; and Stephen could only speak as a man of his nation and time, as a Jew and not a German, of the first century, not the nineteenth. Still, the language of a man of illumination and insight has importance, not only at the time, but for perpetuity. It is to us an affirmation on a question of the day, that of the origin of the revelation which we have. We know what it is as given in the Scriptures—an origin of Divine initiation by intervention of God in definite acts and communications, through Abraham and the promises, through Moses and the law, through a course of special providence and the institution of significant ritual. This Divine initiation is recorded in a consecutive history as the ground of Israel's covenant relation to God.

[1] In Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible."

The present contention is that such special interventions did not take place, and the record of them must be put aside as quite unhistoric, a compilation of imaginative legends showing ideals of a late date, and composed largely in the interests of the priestly class; that the real history was one of evolution, as in other races where the religious ideas pass by degrees from their lowest elementary forms to the development which they ultimately attain, only that in Israel this process was distinguished by a more ethical character, and one that made for righteousness. There are various speculations how this was caused, but we are allowed to recognise in it a secret influence from God.

This hypothetical history has its ground in linguistic criticism of the documents, which are at present alleged to discredit the earlier stages of the written history; leaving it to be reconstructed out of inferences, probabilities, and resemblances elsewhere, a kind of argument which experts may advance, but of which others can judge as well as they. The result obtained is the disappearance from the region of truth and fact of the characters and events which have hitherto been most closely entwined with the commencements of revelation and the foundations of the faith, which in Psalms and Prophets are assumed as conditions of the national life, and which with us have afforded the most effective lessons in religion to students and to children, to the wise and to the unwise. We cannot but marvel at the complacency with which this great effacement is accepted by men whom we might have expected to feel deeply the loss which they endorse. As, for instance, when that accomplished writer George Adam Smith, in his "Lectures on Modern Critics and the Preaching of the Old Testament," summarily puts out of court the records of the Patriarchs and the Exodus, just granting them, if it be wished, such use for edification as belongs to parables or instructive fiction. Or, again, when we hear an eminent Churchman at the Church Congress of 1902 descant upon the good intentions with which "the authors of the Pentateuch took old traditions, and built up around them their spiritual creations," ascribing to these narratives the character of poetic dramas, with only such relation to actual fact as the tragedy of Macbeth has to the real history of Scotland. Yet it is not the supposed action of men, but the recorded action of God, which is thus airily treated. When Abraham is lost in the mist which has been raised, the promises and covenant which rule the after-history of the people have disappeared with him; and the successive ages, which looked back to that origin of their faith and hope, looked back to what was not there.

In this connection St. Stephen's testimony comes in. It is upon those earlier narratives which the critics set aside that the speech dilates with fulness and persistency, a compass measured by forty-five verses being given to the period from the call of Abraham to the settlement in Canaan, as compared with only eight devoted to the period of the Temple and the Prophets, though the latter included the most crucial topics and involved the decisive conclusion. Whatever was the reason, the effect is plain: it asserted the origination of the religion of Israel by distinct acts of Divine intervention. How directly does this testimony encounter the allegations of the critics! On the one side, the personality of the great ancestor is scarcely admitted, and his story counted as invention. On the other rises the unfaltering witness, "The God of glory appeared to our father Abraham when he was in Mesopotamia," with commemoration of covenant and promises made to him and to his seed. On the one side the traditional work of Moses as leader of the nation is just allowed, while his part in its religion is reduced to the narrowest limits and a few uncertain sentences. On the other, he is seen as the mediator of the law "with the angel that spake to him in Mount Sinai, receiving the living oracles to give unto us." On the one side we are told to regard the sacred Tabernacle as an ideal afterthought of a late age, to give the prestige of a Divine prototype to the Temple of the Monarchy, or (more likely) the Temple of the Return. On the other, we hear the firm statement: "Our fathers had the Tabernacle of testimony in the wilderness, even as He appointed who spake unto Moses, that he should make it according to the figure which he had seen; which also our fathers brought in with Joshua when they entered on the possession of the nations."

Here are two opposite views of the history, the one in accordance with the documentary narrative, the other a reversal of it. St. Stephen sees the revelation of God as communicated through certain persons at certain times, giving guidance by promise, law, and symbol, to faith, duty, and worship, and so creating a religion differing from all the religions of the world. He sees it opposed and resisted through all its stages, never more so than now in its last stage, when the final revelation has come. He sees in it a great plan of God, to the beginning of which he testifies by word, to the completion of which he will testify by death.

St. Stephen's view is that of the previous generations of his people and of the Christian generations since. That constitutes an overwhelming mass of authority. But authority, though claiming reverence, cannot preclude inquiry, and the traditions of ages are subject to review. The question of the

origination of the Jews' religion, and therefore (in some sense) of our own, has been raised in a manner which compels attention, and is now before the general court of Christian opinion, where results are not reached abruptly, as by conciliar or Papal decrees, but by the longer process in which conviction is matured. I say the court of *Christian* opinion, where the supreme question is held as settled; not in quarters where the supernatural as such is ruled out of court. The Church is founded on Incarnation and Resurrection; there is therefore no such exclusion at the door. Preparatory interventions and preliminary revelations have there to be considered in relation to the final and stupendous intervention, which revealed the Father and the Son and effected the redemption of the world.

From the present as from past controversies we may expect increase of knowledge and enlargement of thought. Such expenditure of labour, ingenuity, and expert scholarship, must leave results of value in respect of the documents so thrashed out and winnowed. The cloud which has been raised from them of inferences and hypotheses which efface or reverse the history is another matter. Later generations will probably see the most of it as "the chaff which the wind scattereth away from the face of the earth." Let the word of anticipation be pardoned. Old experience is inclined to the prophetic strain. But the present purpose is not to predict the issue, nor yet to argue the case; but to claim a thoughtful hearing for an illustrious witness, and to assert the importance of his testimony in the scheme of Scripture. It is a testimony which most deliberately and explicitly adopts the Jewish Scriptures as the heritage of the Christian Church, and more particularly endorses the records of the Patriarchs and the Exodus and the forty years in the wilderness, affirming the origination of the religion of Israel in interventions and communications of God. It is a testimony borne at the decisive moment of separation, when Judaism condemns the faith in Christ as blasphemy, and the Church disperses on its mission to the world. Finally, the report of the speech stands in the heart of the New Testament, a central and monumental testimony on its own subject. Behind it are the Gospels, with their frequent references, made by the Lord Himself, to Abraham, to Moses, to the Law and the Prophets, and the persons and things of the past. Beyond it are the teachings of the Spirit in the Apostolic writings, referring ever to these same persons and things, as appointed sources of holy instruction and revealing exhibitions of truth.

We may safely say that St. Stephen's speech made the first Christian martyrdom to be also the greatest, in respect of the extent of its significance and in its bearing on that whole course

of revelation, which had now culminated in "the coming of the Just One," of whom the judges present had been the betrayers and murderers. But that was not the end of the story. It was time to bring the great argument to a head, to speak of Resurrection and Ascension, and to testify that God has made that same Jesus whom they have crucified both Lord and Christ. But the speaker's words are arrested. There is momentary silence. His eyes, entranced, are gazing upwards. There is a cry of recognition, adoration, and joy: "Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God." The argument is finished for him. The testimony is supplied.

T. D. BERNARD.

ART. II.—LEO XIII.

TWENTY-FIVE years have gone by since Cardinal Pecci was elected to the vacant chair of Pius IX. He had been for two years Camerlengo of the Roman Church, and that office, by unbroken precedent, was thought to exclude its holder from the keys and triple crown. Indeed, it was believed that Pius had given the office to Cardinal Pecci, in order to exclude him. He was elected, however, after a Conclave of two days, and against only one serious competitor. Cardinal Bilio was young; he withdrew in favour of a much older man, saying that his chance would come again, and in a few months he was dead. Gioacchino Pecci was sixty-eight at his election, and gave out that he was in feeble health. The Cardinals were said to have calculated upon a reign of ten or a dozen years, which might enable them to judge, and if necessary to revise, the policy of the Holy See towards united Italy and the disconcerting posture of affairs in Rome. Leo XIII. was intended to be a transitional Pope. Instead of answering to this expectation, he frustrated it signally by living on till he was ninety-three, and by reigning for a quarter of a century. He enjoyed the longest reign, with one exception, which is recorded in the authentic history of the Popes. It is too early, no doubt, to judge fully or finally of this exceptional pontificate. We cannot remove ourselves far enough from Leo XIII. to see him in his true perspective and proportion. We cannot decide whether he will or will not rank among the greatest Pontiffs; but we may examine his completed reign, and estimate his character as it appears to us, and see what his influence has been upon contemporary politics. We may recall the position of the Roman Court at

the death of Pius IX., and point out a few obvious changes in the power and influence of the Papacy at the close of Leo's twenty-five years of strenuous and perhaps tortuous activity.

Leo XIII. was no doubt intellectually superior to Pius IX. His personal influence upon the whole Roman hierarchy was assuredly stronger. At the same time, his reign was not so conspicuous in decisive and great events. It will not stand out as a landmark in Church history among the reigns which symbolize the development of beliefs and the fatal progress of ecclesiastical ambition. It was given to Pius IX. to define a couple of new dogmas. One of them was the Immaculate Conception, and that definition closed a long controversy which no mediæval Pope had ventured to decide against either one or the other of two powerful Religious Orders. It also gave an official sanction to that extravagant Mariolatry which the later Middle Ages had initiated, and which modern enthusiasts like Alphonso Liguori had increased. That fabricator of devious morality and of credulous devotion was proclaimed by Pius a Doctor of the Universal Church. The second dogma imposed by him was the decree of Papal Infallibility, which was certainly required by the arrogance of his words and actions. This decision completed the secular process of absolutism and centralization, which had already become aggressive under Hildebrand in the eleventh century, which was organized under Innocent III., and extended by Boniface VIII., and imposed forcibly on the Papal section of the old mediæval churches at the Council of Trent. Besides these two momentous definitions, Pius IX. drew up and issued the Syllabus of 1864, which was a declaration of open and uncompromising warfare by the Papacy against the most cherished principles and institutions of our modern society. To balance these defiances and triumphs, Pius had to endure the gradual diminution of his temporal power. The States of the Church were absorbed, slowly and inevitably, by the growing Italian monarchy. The Pope was maintained precariously in Rome for about thirteen years, against the wishes and aspirations of his subjects, by a French garrison, and when France withdrew those regiments in 1870, Rome asserted her natural prerogative, and became the metropolis of a free and United Italy. These events will make the reign of Pius IX. conspicuous in Church history. It remains to be seen whether the definition of infallibility will prove to be the logical and final stage of an obsolete theology, or whether it will be a destructive and stultifying legacy, to which the reactionary elements of the Roman Church will cling, and from which the Papacy will never be able to escape. So far the unerring voice has been dumb or exhausted since it pro-

claimed its own infallibility. The loss of the temporal power marks a fresh era in the annals of the Papacy, which is no less clear for the purposes of history than was its acquisition of territorial possessions. That state of things which was inaugurated by Charlemagne was ended formally by Napoleon. The restored Papacy of 1814 lingered on precariously and artificially for little more than half a century, and then, like some others of the restored monarchies, it yielded to the inevitable forces of a newer and healthier society. For these various reasons the name of Pius IX. will be connected in historical summaries with striking and momentous events, as are the direful names of Gregory VII. and Innocent III.

The name of Pius, however, will not be so highly esteemed by those who study the details of his reign, and who understand the vital movements of his time. His arrogant and irritable words had little force behind them. They were the querulous and petulant complaints of weakness, not the assertions of confidence and talent. Pius IX. left the Roman Church at war with almost every government, and estranged as it had never been before from all that is most living and progressive in the modern world. When Leo XIII. was elected he was welcomed as a liberal Pope, and many changes were foretold. Those who misjudged him thus had short memories. They forgot his previous career at Benevento and in Perugia. In the latter place he was the vindictive and implacable executioner of those Italian patriots who had risen against the tyranny and misrule of the Papal administration. Both as Apostolic delegate, and afterwards as Archbishop, Monsignor Pecci was resolutely opposed to liberal institutions, and to the aspirations of United Italy. In 1859 he published a letter to the Pope, in which he described the liberation of Italy as "revolt and schism," as "an impious attempt to rob the Sovereign Pontiff." Every utterance of Leo XIII. about the temporal power was consistent with that early and uncompromising letter. With regard to Italy, he never swerved from that position. He continued the tactics of Pius IX., and fixed himself immovably in the Vatican. So far as he could, he withdrew Italians from politics and from their national life. They were to be neither electors nor elected. The Roman Court opposed itself to a constitutional, an orderly, and a liberal monarchy. It withheld the conservative and stable part of the nation, so far as it had influence, from public life, hoping that the kingdom would be overthrown by Republicans and Socialists. Its policy aided those factions negatively. How far the Vatican may have intrigued with them or have aided them actively is a dubious question, about which there are many suspicions and only too many

just grounds for them. However the world may have been deceived in the Liberalism of Leo XIII., the Cardinals probably had no illusions. They wanted an uncompromising Pope. So far as Italy was concerned, they wished the tactics of Pius IX. to be prolonged, and they obtained what they wanted in his successor. Leo, then, was not more liberal than Pius, but he was far more diplomatic. We should not forget that he was a diplomatist in the first place, and a clergyman only in the second. He never had any parochial charge nor any pastoral work until he was made Archbishop. Perugia, it must be remembered, had been in the Papal States, and Archbishop Pecci was there always as a politician who represented the old Order and protested violently against the new. What he had been at Perugia he continued to be on a larger scale in Rome. It is extraordinary, and perhaps significant, that these facts, and the inferences to be drawn from them, should have been so generally ignored by the press, both when Pope Leo was elected, and throughout his reign, and even in the obituary estimates of his life and work. The attitude of Leo XIII. towards the temporal power gives us the chief clue for estimating his character and policy. Everything he did and said was calculated with a view to gaining his main object. At his accession he reiterated the protests of Pius IX., and he never ceased to repeat his protests in language of increasing bitterness. No Englishman will forget the indecent words about an allied and friendly power which were put into the mouth of the Duke of Norfolk during the late war, or the answer of the Pope, which was an outrage not only to the Italian Government, but to the principles upon which modern society is founded. The interests of religion in Italy were sacrificed in the most callous way to the temporal ambitions of the Roman Court. Everything else was made subservient to that end, and was favoured only as it might serve that purpose. Nevertheless, history will record that the Italian policy of Leo XIII. was a failure. He did not regain his temporal power, and he undoubtedly has weakened the moral and spiritual influence of his Church. Even the faults and follies of Italian politicians were not able to restore the credit of the Vatican, while the scurrilities and sophistries of the clerical press were perpetually revealing and damaging its character. During the last thirty years the monarchy has been gaining ground, and the Papacy has been losing. The attitude of the royal Government has been correct and dignified, in spite of incessant and outrageous provocation. It has more than fulfilled all its pledges, and has refrained from even the suspicion of interference. The powers have learnt that the Roman Court in ordinary times, and the Conclave when

the See is vacant, have more liberty under the guarantee of Italy than they ever had when the Papacy was nominally a Sovereign power, and was really protected or coerced by alternate foreign governments. The protests of the Vatican will be regarded henceforth in the light of these facts, and they will be accepted as expressing merely the disappointed ambitions of the Curia and its hungry diplomatists.

The larger diplomacy of Leo XIII. was always directed to the same end as his Italian policy. He made use of every instrument and every influence which might help him to damage Italy, and to recover the Papal States. One of his main objects was to discredit the Triple Alliance, or to detach Austria and Germany from the Italian Kingdom. To gain his ends Leo did not repeat the ineffectual tirades of Pius IX. He worked by diplomacy instead of by denunciation. Though he disapproved of Liberal institutions, he was adroit enough to utilize them. He found the new German Empire at war with the Papacy over education and ecclesiastical appointments. The repressive policy of Bismarck had welded together a compact and disciplined Catholic party. This organization was inspired and encouraged by the Pope until it grew into the Ultramontane Centre, which has held the balance of power in the Reichstag for the last twenty years. The Imperial Government has always to reckon with a party which takes its orders from Rome, and obtains full value for its help. Concentration was of advantage to the Pope in Germany. Dissensions and national jealousies have served his purposes in Austria. He has extorted much from the German Government, and he has inflicted serious damage upon the interests and peace of Austria-Hungary; but he has not succeeded in detaching either of them from their alliance with Italy.

The clerical minority in France was able to embarrass and finally to ruin Napoleon III. After the war of 1870, there was a French party always willing to revenge the occupation of Rome, partly out of Ultramontane zeal, and partly out of wounded *amour propre*. Leo XIII. made use of this minority. It was able, for many years, to embitter the relations of Italy and France, and to be a cause of genuine anxiety and expenditure to the Italian Government. The clerical minority has also been a cause of perpetual disturbance and danger to the Republic. It cannot be accidental that Royalists, Nationalists, and Bonapartists have all been favoured by the clericals and supported by their press. It is true that Leo XIII. advised French Catholics to rally to the Republic. They rallied so effectually that they obtained a monopoly of education, and dominated both the army and the Civil Service, while the

Religious Orders grew to an alarming extent in wealth, in power, and in numbers. A government return made in 1900, has estimated their property in lands and buildings at £40,000,000. To this must be added their enormous annual revenues from pious and commercial enterprises, and from their exuberant press. All this wealth and influence was not used in favour of the existing government. The machinations of the Père Du Lac and of the Assumptionist Bailly were exposed in the stages of the Dreyfus affair. The country saw its danger, and has dealt with it strenuously. In spite of Leo's pacific and conciliatory words, the fact still remains that the clerical press and the Religious Orders, who are his most zealous adherents, have been the most active, the most persistent, and the most uncompromising enemies of the Republic. The Orders would have been restrained, and the press could have been re-tuned, if the Vatican had not approved their policy and utterances. These facts, and the inferences which must be drawn from them, have not been lost upon intelligent Frenchmen. They have made the legislation of the present Ministry both necessary and possible. Either Leo XIII. himself has been playing a double game, or the Pope has been made to say one thing for the mystification of the public, while his Secretary of State has been prescribing an opposite policy to the confidential agents of the Vatican in France. In any case, the Papacy is far more discredited in France than it was under Pius IX.; and, if we may judge by innumerable signs, the French clergy are far less Ultramontane.

As Leo XIII. has had one chief object in his policy, namely, to regain the temporal power, so he has adopted two methods or instruments in order to pursue it. He has understood the conditions of the modern world; and he has worked by inspiring the press, and by manipulating votes. In Italy he strove to obtain his ends, as we have seen, by withdrawing his adherents from public and Parliamentary life. In Germany he organized his party until it dominated Imperial politics. In Belgium the clericals have been able either to hold office, or to form a restraining and influential minority. In the United States the illiterate Irish voters have been a powerful weapon in the hands of the Roman Bishops, who have been able through their means to exercise much influence upon the politicians of both sides. On a much smaller scale, the Nationalists in our own Parliament have been able to serve English Roman Catholic interests; and the solid Irish vote, which is generally given as the hierarchy may direct, has to be reckoned with in almost every large town constituency. The clerical press throughout the world, which is almost entirely in the hands of the Bishops or of some religious

organization, is nothing less than a portent, which deserves a much more systematic study than it has received. Besides the avowedly clerical organs, the influence of Roman Catholic writers and interests on the general press of most countries is very large, and is very ably directed.

Besides utilizing the press and manipulating the franchise, Leo XIII. has posed as the friend of the working man, as the protector of labour, as the patron of many social and economical schemes which have dazzled the toilers of our time. The Pope, it must be confessed, has too often written about these problems without knowing the facts and elements which are involved in them. For instance, in 1877, whilst still Archbishop of Perugia, he issued a Pastoral Letter on the Labour Question which shows a complete ignorance of our own Factory Acts, and of all that legislation for protecting children, women, and the workers in unhealthy or dangerous occupations which were carried through Parliament by Lord Shaftesbury, by Mr. Plimsoll, and by other practical philanthropists. The Pope's socialistic utterances abound in platitudes and sounding phrases. He was willing enough to make use of Socialism as a possible weapon of disorder in Italy, and of support in France; but, when his Italian *protégés* began to take his precepts literally, and to apply them to the temporal power, they were very soon discouraged and disowned. The apparent liberality of the earlier Encyclicals was explained away effectually in the later. In the same way, Americanism was condemned as soon as it was thought dangerous to the absolutism of the Curia and the supremacy of the Roman Congregations. In all these matters the liberalism of the Pope began and ended in empty phrases. The mediæval Popes, in their conflicts with the Empire, were in the habit of praising liberty. They would favour the popular side in order to damage the Imperialists. We do not find, however, that popular government or liberty was preserved in a single place where the Pope had once obtained the mastery. We must be excused, therefore, if we suspect the liberality of any and every Pope, so long as the Syllabus be not repudiated, and the organization of the Papal Court be not reformed. The plea of liberty was misused in the past to weaken the civil power and to set up a sacerdotal absolutism. It would not be impossible in the present to utilize democratic forms and feelings in order to deceive the democracy, and then to destroy liberal institutions. It surely is not illiberal nor intolerant to restrain or to expel those who are suspected of these designs, and whose principles are opposed in every way to civil and religious liberty.

The prevailing desire for Christian reunion was also utilized

for the aggrandisement of the Papacy. By reunion the Pope and his adherents meant invariably complete submission to the claims of Rome, and a full acceptance of its current theology. Leo XIII. made several advances to the Eastern Churches, but none of them was deceived by his empty phrases. They all protest now, as they protested fourteen centuries ago, against Roman arrogance and alterations in the creed. In fact, during those fourteen centuries the Papacy has increased and strengthened the barriers which separate the East and West. The Russian Government refused to have closer relations with the Papacy, as it suspected a Polish agitator in every Papal ecclesiastic. In our own country, the Pope's judgment on English Orders has hardened the historical and theological differences between ourselves and Rome. Mr. Wilfrid Ward speaks rather disingenuously of the "charity and conciliation" shown in the Pope's letter *Ad Anglos*, because he has to confess that "no practical prospect of reunion had ever existed," either on the basis of recognising English Orders, or of making any other concession in doctrine and discipline. The Papacy is regarded with more tolerance now by the English public than it was fifty years ago, but the cause of Rome has not gained in strength or numbers here during that period. The zealous and compact Ultramontane body over which Cardinal Manning ruled has lost a great deal of its unity and zeal. The stream of influential proselytes has almost ceased. The leakage from the Roman body is continuous, and it does not hold its relative position either to the increase of population or to the growth of other denominations. The Anglophobia of the clerical press has turned the former Ultramontanism of the more thoughtful laity into a distrust of the Vatican and its methods. Both the parochial clergy and the educated laity are discontented with the arbitrary and secret administration of the Bishops and the Roman Congregations. There is a growing jealousy and friction between the Secular Clergy and the Religious Orders. There is also an eager struggle for supremacy between the Jesuits and Benedictines. The free atmosphere of our English life and institutions, the higher and freer standards of education to which children of all denominations must now attain, have transformed the English Roman Catholics. Similar influences are telling heavily against Romanism in the United States and in Australia.

Since 1870 the Papal Church has been more centralized, in consequence of the Vatican decrees, and also by our quicker methods of communication. The Roman Catholics are no longer a confederation of national Churches, communicating slowly and occasionally with Rome. They are

a compact and homogeneous international body, in touch continually with Rome, and controlled more systematically by the Vatican; but while the Papacy has gained in immediate influence, it has lost in ultimate life and power. A body of international or anti-national Ultramontane zealots is worth less than a confederation of Churches which are vigorous with national life and growth. The theory of Nippold, that the Papacy has gained in power during the nineteenth century, cannot be denied. Leo XIII. was far more influential than Leo XII. Pius X. is in a very different position from the restored Pius VII. It is necessary, however, if we would realize the truth, to make a distinction which Nippold has perhaps overlooked in his brilliant and startling volume.

The Papacy is no doubt more prominent in the world now; it has more influence with politicians and with the press than it had sixty years ago. It owes these advantages to the publicity of the present age, and to our instantaneous methods of communication. It is more than probable, however, that the Papacy has less hold on the majority of its adherents than it ever had before. The Vatican is not opposed in Italy merely or chiefly to the House of Savoy. The contention there is not so much between one dynasty and another, or even between the civil power and a theocracy. The Vatican is opposed really by the spirit and institutions of our modern world, reinforced as they are now by scientific, liberal, and popular systems of education, which are being absorbed by a whole nation that is inspired with a living patriotism and the glories of its past. Against these forces a reactionary and narrow oligarchy cannot in the end prevail. The Papacy is confronted by similar forces, not in Italy alone, but in France, in England, in the United States, in all countries which are really progressive and liberal. In all of them the Papacy is losing ground. Even in the more backward and reactionary nations the Roman Church is losing not only the educated, but the majority of the population. A Catholic authority reckoned not long ago that out of 18,000,000 Spaniards only 5,000,000 were practising members of the Church. The proportion of nominal Roman Catholics and of active anti-clericals is probably even larger in France. An accurate return of Roman Catholics who are technically "in the Church," that is who are practising its laws and fulfilling their sacramental obligations, would perhaps be equally surprising to themselves and to their opponents. It would make a considerable shifting in what are called religious statistics, as those mendacious figures are given in atlases and books of reference.

It is true that Papal activity, or, at any rate, Papal advertisement, has been more prominent of late years. We see and

hear more of pilgrimages. The Pope has had more visitors. New devotions have sprung up. St. Anthony of Padua has become the fashionable divinity of a new religion. St. Joseph has been elevated to a new height. The mother of Christ is held to be communicated in the Eucharist. The Vicar of Christ is held to be a continued manifestation in the flesh of Christ Himself. All these extravagances are now written and preached, and they are not condemned officially. They do not prove, however, the growth of Romanism. They only prove that popular Romanism has been driven to a lower level, and has to maintain itself by more desperate and excitable methods. The better educated repudiate these superstitions, or stand aloof from them; and the better educated grow steadily in influence and numbers. The Roman Church is at the parting of the ways. It has entered upon a new era. The temporal power has gone. The system of Charlemagne and Innocent III. is over. Mediæval and feudal Christendom is dead. That revival of it which the Jesuits arranged at Trent has had its day, and is incapable of living in the modern world. The Papacy must make its choice between reaction and reform. It may prefer to lean upon the Religious Orders, to obstruct all intellectual and administrative reform, and to rely upon the uneducated populace. In that case its days are numbered. Or it may accept modern scholarship and free inquiry, and act loyally with the better elements in modern society. In this case, the historical Papacy will have to be transformed, It is surely not necessary to believe that its spiritual use and influence would be weakened by the process. The Bishop of Rome represents traditions which might be of inestimable service to Christianity. No rival can dispute them. No enemy can deny them. No one but himself can deprive him of them, or make them worthless. It is lamentable that so many of his predecessors have succeeded in making them harmful to the Church, and a cause of scandal to religion.

It is not possible to think that the Papacy has gained on the whole under Leo XIII., who has merely continued the traditional policy of his predecessors. His principal object has not been achieved. The recovery of the temporal power seems more remote and unlikely than ever. Mr. Wilfrid Ward even says all hope of it has been abandoned. If so, it would be more politic for Pius X. to show himself again in Rome, where he would certainly be welcomed with reverence and enthusiasm as Bishop. If we consider all the elements in Leo's life and career, instead of eliminating those which are inconvenient for a preconceived theory, it is impossible to hold that he was a liberal Pope, or even a spiritual teacher.

He was, above all things, a diplomatist, and a diplomatist who failed in his chief object. Nevertheless, in spite of his failure, the Vatican is a dangerous power, not so much on account of its ostensible theology as of its political methods, and the financial weapons which it is still able to employ. It is a good omen, perhaps, that Leo's successor is a clergyman and not a diplomatist; that he has never held any of the higher and more intimate offices in the bureaucracy of the Vatican, though he may only be more easily manipulated in consequence by those who really direct the Roman Church. That Church will never reform unless it be un-Jesuitized. A Clement XV. would have been more welcome, as a sign that this necessity was recognised. We hope that Pius X. has not chosen his title from any devotion to the policy and methods of Pius IX. We hardly know which Pius is a desirable model, certainly not the Fifth. Pius I. is a legendary name, and Pius II., attractive as he may be to wits and scholars, will hardly commend himself as an ecclesiastic to this age of exterior decorum. A study of the Popes, however, shows that the individual matters very little, as the system moves on its way inflexibly to the appointed goal, in spite of the mutability and titles of its figure-head.

ARTHUR GALTON.

ART. III.—RECENT GERMAN CRITICISM OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

THERE are many persons who are far more impressed by the citation of a string of German names, when it is a question of Old Testament criticism, than with the clearest evidences of familiarity with the subject-matter of the Old Testament itself. Such persons should be asked to note the signs of reaction against the Graf-Wellhausen theory which is growing in Germany itself. We may cite as opposed to that theory the names of Von Orelli, Strack, Kleinert, Klostermann, Bredenkamp, Hommel, König, Kittel, and many others, including even the learned Dillmann, whose Lectures on Old Testament theology are positively indignant in their repudiation of Wellhausen's views. And now we have a work by Möller, a young German critic, who was once an enthusiastic disciple of Wellhausen, but who, having undertaken an independent investigation of the question, finds that it is impossible to maintain his theories. "Scholars," then, in Germany, at least, are no longer "agreed" on the subject. At Oxford, however, these theories are still represented as

the irrefragable conclusions of modern science, thereby recalling once more the saying of Mrs. Humphry Ward in "Robert Elsmere" that "Oxford is the paradise to which German theories go when they are dead."

The treatise written by Möller[1] has been translated by the Religious Tract Society. It has an introduction by Professor Von Orelli of Basel, who expresses his astonishment at the way in which "the most rash hypotheses" are "repeated as if they were part of an unquestioned creed." The author commences with Deuteronomy, because it was on that point that he first became doubtful of the results of the criticism of Graf, Wellhausen, and Kuenen. His method is the only possible one. He does not attempt to make a frontal attack on the positions of these critics. That would, indeed, be a difficult task, for they are established chiefly by bold assertions. He takes the only possible way of demolishing the structure which has been erected. He substitutes the conclusions of the critics for the Hebrew history as it stands, and proves that, where that history suggests one difficulty, the history it is proposed to substitute for it suggests twenty. He shows that the reformation of Josiah, recorded in 2 Kings xxii. *et seq.*, aims not so much at the establishment of a central sanctuary, where all public worship shall hereafter be offered, as at the abolition of idolatry. But idolatry was prohibited by the "Book of the Covenant" (*i.e.*, Exod. xx.-xxiii.), the Mosaic origin of which is admitted by the adherents of the school in question. Therefore, if their premiss is sound, that if a supposed ancient law is unhesitatingly violated at any given time, the law could not have been in existence at that time, it follows that the "Book of the Covenant" must itself have originated at the earliest in the reign of Josiah. "J" and "E," moreover, which this school of critics declares to have originated in "the eighth or ninth century B.C.," must likewise have had their origin in or after the seventh century B.C. Herr Möller makes much of the admission of Kautzsch that Hilkiah, by his use of the definite article before the words "Book of the Law," shows that he had not sprung a deceit upon King Josiah, but was himself "surprised" at its "discovery." But as our author justly remarks, the use of the definite article implies more than this—it implies a knowledge on the part of Hilkiah, not indeed of the provisions of that "Book of the Law," but of the fact that such

[1] "Are the Critics Right? Historical and Critical Considerations against the Graf-Wellhausen Hypothesis." By Wilhelm Möller. With an Introduction by Professor C. von Orelli, D.D. Translated from the German by C. H. Irwin, M.A. London: Religious Tract Society, 1903.

a book had previously been known to be in existence. But if so, we find at once the futility of the presumption on which the whole argument is based. He then points out how Kuenen insisted that Deuteronomy was a production of the priests, an assertion which his follower Kautzsch feels himself compelled to deny, and to assign it to a prophetic source. We have here again an illustration of the way in which these theories, so confidently asserted, are crumbling away of themselves. The props on which they rested are being one by one removed by their defenders, and the theories themselves are thus left unsupported in mid air. Once again, Deuteronomy is asserted by Cornill to have been written of necessity after the reign of Manasseh. But the Bishop of Winchester, if we are not mistaken, has found it necessary to fix its date in the days of Hezekiah or even of Ahaz; while Professor Driver no longer regards it as a composition, but as a *compilation* (a very different thing, by the way) of the period antecedent to Josiah. It is, according to Cornill, a "pseudepigraph," attributed to Moses in order to obtain acceptance for statutes which were not his. Professor Driver, on the contrary, appears to regard it as a "compilation," because it contains a good deal of matter which may not improbably be his. Herr Möller points out how extremely improbable it would be that a writer should obtain currency for legislation as Mosaic which *ex hypothesi* is "in sharp contradiction to that which was hitherto regarded as" such. According to the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis, he goes on to point out, the people were deceived into accepting the alleged "Book of the Law." The priests of the high places were also deceived, and so was the central priesthood. And yet they had every reason to protest against the new code. A marvellous thing, truly, this foisting of a forgery, or even what was partially a forgery, or, at the very least, an entirely new religious system, with such unqualified success, on persons who were in every way opposed to the regulations it desired to introduce. The Jews certainly were not "a critical people"; but they must have been amazingly—nay, even miraculously—the reverse if they allowed themselves to be so easily deceived against their will. Our author next goes on to remark how peculiarly ill-adapted Deuteronomy was to bring about the reformation under Josiah. The prohibition of idolatry, the one thing needful in Josiah's mind, the one object actually attained, occupies a subordinate position in that book. In the next place, we are reminded of the antiquated character of many regulations found in Deuteronomy—regulations quite unsuited to the date at which the book is supposed to have been written. Above all, the absurdity is pointed out of the recom-

mendation that the law should be inscribed on stones and placed on Mount Ebal at a time when the Israelites had already been carried away from their land, and when Ebal and Gerizim were inhabited by a foreign race. Some of Herr Möller's arguments may fail to convince; but even when those which fail to satisfy are removed, many formidable objections to the date assigned by the Graf-Wellhausen school still remain.

We turn now to the so-called Priestly Code, with the alleged late date of which Herr Möller deals in much the same way as with that of Deuteronomy. The critical school he opposes once regarded it as the production of the Exile. Their followers have been compelled to date it later still. Their reason we will briefly state. Ezra, we are told in Neh. viii.-x., assembles the people together and reads to them the "Book of the Law" (viii. 1-3). This, Wellhausen tells us (and he is supported by Robertson Smith), was the "whole Pentateuch." He adds in his usual infallible way that this is "quite certain." But Herr Möller proceeds to point out that Reuss, Kayser, and Kautzsch—the latter a follower of Wellhausen—find "this" very far from "certain," for the "Book" or "Books of the Covenant" are *ex hypothesi* strongly opposed to the Priestly Code, and it is impossible that Ezra could have persuaded the people to accept two codes so widely divergent. Wherefore it follows that the "Book of the Law" which Ezra read before the people was not the whole Pentateuch, but only the part of it known to critics as the "Priestly Code." Therefore the fusion of the Priestly Code with the "Books of the Covenant" and Deuteronomy must have taken place at a later date. How the Jews of a later date could be persuaded to accept the codes which those of Ezra's day would be sure to reject has not been made very plain. But Herr Möller shows without much difficulty that, whether we conceive that the "Books of the Covenant" and Deuteronomy were then recognised as the Jewish law, or whether we suppose them to have been entirely forgotten, it is equally inconceivable that the Jews of that or any later period would be induced to receive two codes of law so contradictory as the modern theory requires us to conceive the Priestly Code and those which preceded it to be. On the supposition that Exod. xx.-xxiii. contains the provisions called into existence temporarily by Moses until his legislation was completed, or even, as others—Dr. Hayman in particular—have maintained, the old patriarchal code which was in force among the Israelites in Egypt, and which contains provisions reminding us of the recently discovered code of Khammurabi (possibly the Amraphel of Gen. xiv.), no such difficulty presents itself.

Herr Möller proceeds to show that the contents of the Priestly Code itself do not fit in with the modern theory as to its date; that it is not adapted to the purposes for which the critics suppose it to be intended; that even if its framers were at once "so clever and so foolish," as, according to modern criticism, they must have been, they would never have directed the people of Ezra's day to set up a tabernacle instead of a temple, and given directions for making an *Ark of the Covenant;* that the persons by whom this new discovery (as the critics allege it to have been) was made, were not in the least likely, under the circumstances in which they were placed, to have drawn up such a set of regulations as are contained in the so-called Priestly Code, of which many enactments are quite unintelligible, if supposed to date from the period of the Captivity. For the arguments we must refer the reader to the book itself. But Herr Möller's conclusions, for which every impartial reader must admit that he brings forward arguments of considerable weight, may be briefly summarized in his own words: "The modern view, we can no longer have any doubt, is a chimera, a monstrosity. The Priestly Code can no more have originated in the sixth or the fifth century than Deuteronomy in the seventh." "At least the kernel of the ritual legislation goes back in reality to Moses," though Herr Möller refuses either to assert or to deny that further laws "may not" have been "added on to this kernel."

He next discusses the "auxiliary hypotheses" which have been added, in order to justify the supposition that Deuteronomy and the Priestly Code belong to the period of the decline and fall of the Israelite polity. By this he means the citations from the prophets which have been employed in defence of the theory, and the amazing use which has been made of Ezek. xl.-xlviii. in reference to it. His reasoning, like that of Mr. Spencer in "Lex Mosaica," is conclusive on the latter point. "Nothing," he shows, "is gained by the assumption that the Priestly Code is later than Ezekiel, but a new puzzle is simply put in place of the old." And he concludes that "the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis . . . makes unprecedented demands on its adherents, and creates difficulties in comparison with which those urged by Wellhausen are mere child's play." He very justly scoffs at the assumption mentioned above that regulations which appear not to have been observed must therefore never have been promulgated, and describes those who persist in it as likely in any other department of investigation to be regarded as "fit for an asylum." He shows once more that modern criticism, from its own point of view, cannot put the "Books of the Covenant" so early as it does, and proceeds to indicate

reasons which make it "impossible to place them so late as the principles of the critics, here so strangely at variance with their practice, require it to be placed." In a second and supplementary chapter he discusses isolated passages which he conceives make against the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis. He does not fail to notice, though he does not dwell on the subject, the grave moral considerations involved in the acceptance of that hypothesis, and he concludes with some wise cautions, which will have occurred to our too self-sufficient critics, in favour of a saner and soberer method of investigation. He thinks it possible that in the Pentateuch may be found "laws and enactments which necessarily point to a later time, and appear as further improvements of the original, and were therefore incorporated according to practical needs." There may have been, he thinks, a "codification of the laws in later times." The Priestly Code, he remarks, "nowhere claims to have been written by Moses," though it certainly represents him as having ordained the greater part of it. But all later additions, he contends, "would be confined to subordinate points." And, as he most wisely remarks, "it will never be possible to attain sure results" from such investigation. Those results, in other words, can never be more than hypothetical and tentative. They may be obtained in conformity with the rational criticism of ancient records, which is usual among the historians of other nations. The methods employed will not, like the methods of Wellhausen and his followers, be invented *pro re natâ*, and be followed up by a wholesale proscription of all investigators who are unable to accept either methods or conclusions. And they will touch only the fringe of the history instead of destroying its general credibility.

The appearance of this volume will unquestionably hasten the disappearance of such methods and theories as those which have been described. Herr Möller's book, though its style is by no means clear, is able and well reasoned, and is, moreover, in size and price within the reach of many clergymen in whose case more elaborate and expensive publications are quite out of reach. But though by no means bulky, it is quite sufficient for its purpose. I may venture personally to express my high satisfaction with it, because it follows the same line of argument as I have done in the articles which for some years I contributed to the CHURCHMAN. If, as I may claim to have shown, the theories of the Graf-Wellhausen school introduce into the Book of Genesis difficulties tenfold greater than those it professes to find there, *a fortiori* the same fact will manifest itself if the same method be applied to the whole Pentateuch. This Herr

Möller has proved, and until he is answered—the attempt, we may be sure, will never be made—the believer in Holy Writ may "thank God and take courage." It must become ultimately impossible to maintain modern theories by the cuckoo cry, "All scholars are agreed." They must ultimately rest on the basis of strict demonstration, and full answers to all objectors. When time has been given for a full investigation all round of the opinions on Hebrew history so unaccountably and hastily embraced among ourselves by men of character, ability, and learning, their full absurdity and inconsistency will at last be perceived, and men will wonder how they could possibly have achieved even a temporary triumph.

J. J. LIAS.

ART. IV.—THE CHURCH AND THE SOCIAL PROBLEM.

IS there a "social problem" or a "social question"? Or are these terms employed because they conveniently, if somewhat vaguely, cover a multitude of "problems" and "questions" supposed to be more or less closely connected with each other?

Are the various difficulties to which the words refer independent? Or are they simply different factors in one and the same problem? I might adduce the convenient analogy of a man "thoroughly out of health." Such a one often exhibits the traces of more than one disease in his system. The case is said to be "a complicated one," and the doctor declares that there are "many unfavourable symptoms."

Let us consider a few of the factors in what is termed the social problem. We cannot take up a daily paper, a weekly journal, or a monthly review, but we find, at least, something bearing upon one or more of the following questions or problems: That of the relations of capital and labour; that of the unemployed; of the housing of the poor; of temperance and the licensing system; of the administration of the Poor Law, and the uses and abuses of "charity"; of education and school attendance; of social purity and rescue work; of the increase of betting and gambling; etc. That there are very evil conditions and very grave difficulties, of whose existence and growth these various problems are the result, no one doubts. With regard to this further assertion—viz., that all these are not merely connected factors in, but actually different symptoms of, one great underlying problem—I think most social workers of experience are now agreed. If this is so,

then surely the first step towards the solution of these problems must be an effort to gain all the knowledge possible of the underlying conditions which are the primal causes of these various evils.

I. The Conditions.

As all the problems I have mentioned refer more or less closely, if not exclusively, to the "industrial" classes, I wish, in dealing with the social question, to confine my attention to them. The term "industrial classes" is sufficiently wide. I need not stay to define it. I may just remark that I am not dealing simply with the so-called "very poor," or with the "submerged," or the dwellers in the slums, but with the industrial classes "in their many grades" as a whole.

What are the "conditions"—I use the plural advisedly—of the industrial classes to-day? Those who wish to discover these otherwise than by the method of personal investigation will find abundant literature on the subject. Books, pamphlets, and papers are available, which contain not only theories and ideas, but the most carefully collected and arranged statistics—often the results of years of personal investigation.

From such tables and statistics we may learn much, and every earnest social worker is glad of the opportunity of perusing them. From them we may learn about the financial conditions under which the industrial classes live, the trades or occupations they follow, the condition of their homes, how they spend their money and their leisure time; we can discover to some extent the amount of intemperance, and the number of "charges" at the local police-courts. By comparison of different series of statistics we can form some conception of the "average" conditions.

But we have other means of information. Within recent years a considerable number of books containing "impressions" and "conclusions"—drawn from a long experience of work among the industrial classes—have been published. I should like to draw particular attention to one such book for several reasons: (1) The writer seems to have had unusual opportunities for forming his judgments; (2) he writes with peculiar plainness and force, yet withal with much sympathy; (3) his judgments on the whole coincide, not only with my own (drawn from long experience among the same classes), but with those of a number of men—belonging to the industrial classes and working among those classes—to whom I have submitted them.

In "The Gospel and Social Questions" the Rev. A. Shepherd, who is now minister of one of the largest congregations in

Glasgow, tells us how in early life he worked for years in a Lancashire cotton-mill. "My experience," he says, "was gained, and grimly gained, as a 'common factory worker' in one of the large industrial towns coterminous with the city of Manchester." Mr. Shepherd's view is briefly this: That the key to the conditions of the industrial classes to-day *lies not in any evil economic conditions to which these classes are subject, but in the character* (speaking generally) *of these classes.* And the saddest part of his testimony consists in the conviction that this character is actually *deteriorating.*

The following judgments may seem stern, but from my own experience of five-and-twenty years' work among the wage-earners of Yorkshire, Lancashire, and the Midlands, I believe that the witness here given is true:

1. "There is nothing I find it harder to keep and cultivate than the charity which hopeth all things, when I see, as I am obliged to see, on every side how ready, and even eager, our democracy are to accept any social and economic conditions so that they have drink and sport and animal indulgence in more or less abundance" (p. 17).

2. "The huge breakdown to-day . . . is the failure of the masses to rise to their opportunities—a failure for which, not Churches, not economics, but they themselves, are responsible. Surely we have a right to look for some evidence of character, some assertion of will, some display of self-respect! They are men, and not children."

3. "When I think of what the industrial classes might be by the help of God and themselves as compared with what they are, I know what St. Paul meant when he said of his brethren and kinsmen: 'I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart.' . . . Thoughtlessness and indifference far surpass economic wrongs in the production of bad social conditions. . . . I believe that the working classes are fatally neglecting opportunities they never had before, and may not soon have again. The drug of a little temporary prosperity has been administered to them, and while they sleep the tares of reaction are being sown to an extent they little realize" (pp. 45, 46).

So far of the actual conditions of the present. Now with respect to the charge (suggested by the last words of the last quotation), viz., that these conditions are not only bad, but are actually growing worse. Here, again, Mr. Shepherd speaks very sorrowfully:

1. "Few things impress me more than the change which has come over the working classes during the last quarter of a century in their estimate of the chances and possibilities of their lives. With some notable exceptions, they appear to

have ceased to believe in these possibilities, or they are content to let them go by default" (p. 27).

2. "Individual responsibility has passed away, leaving behind it nothing which can inspire men to do and dare for the conditions which make life better worth living" (p. 29).

3. "The very serious consideration which the Churches, as trustees of the moral and religious life of the nation, have now to confront is the undeniable fact that a spirit of weariness with the present and of hopelessness about the future has taken hold of the masses as probably never before in the history of Christianity" (p. 87).

The following question may here very naturally be asked, Are there any signs which justify us for looking for a turn in this tide of evil, in hoping for better things in the future?

To answer this question, we naturally consider the attitude and spirit of the rising generation—I mean the young men of the industrial classes. What may we hope from them? Unfortunately, I fear, very little indeed. And here I may say Mr. Shepherd's view again coincides almost exactly with my own. His opinion is evidently that, in a picture generally dark, we have here the darkest part of all. If any worker of experience among the poor is inclined to doubt this, let him ask himself the question: "How many young men do I know who take a really *intelligent* interest in any of the great political, social, or religious questions of the day?" Or even, "How many do I know who are making any strenuous effort for their own betterment, or for that of the class to which they belong?"

Before quoting Mr. Shepherd's opinions, I would venture to assert that those of us who can look back, say, thirty years, must remember a time when mechanics' institutes and mutual improvement societies were much more popular than they are to-day. And it is not as if any other institutions had come into existence to supply their place. Few institutions within reach of an enormous artisan population have done more to offer at least the rudiments of a liberal education than the evening classes at Owens College, Manchester; but the numbers attending those classes to-day are little more than a third of what they were five-and-twenty years ago. "But what of technical classes and continuation schools," I shall be asked; "are not these numerously attended?" "Yes," I would reply; "but the majority of the pupils in these schools do not actually belong to the artisan classes; and of those who do attend the schools, more attend them for the sake of the pecuniary advantages which a knowledge of certain subjects, such as shorthand and book-keeping, gives, than from any desire to improve or enlarge their minds.

I would now quote some of Mr. Shepherd's opinions upon the young men of the industrial classes to-day:

"I am made angry, and I do well to be angry, with our young men, who should be the hope, and are become all but the despair, of our democratic aspirations and ideals. . . . It used to be held that the ideas which were striving in democracy—the ideas which constitute its highest justification—are the ideas which lie at the heart of religion: that God is no respecter of persons; that every man should have the opportunity to make the best of himself; that men should be honoured for what they are rather than for what they have; that we are our brother's keeper. What hold have these ideas upon our modern, and especially upon the young, democracy? If you reckon off a comparatively few exceptions, in what do you find the young artisan interest himself, beyond pursuits that have often the same relation to his moral health and economic advantage that fever germs have to his physical health? . . . Our hope should be in the younger men. But what shall we say of a democracy that has ceased to read? What shall we hope from young men who are as ignorant as babies about the political and social questions that so vitally affect the welfare of their order? . . . What shall we hope from young men with whom the drink club takes the place of the lecture-room, the bookmaker the place of the teacher, and the sporting newspaper the place of a useful book?"

If, then, such are the "conditions" of the industrial classes, as a whole, at the present time, we must surely ask, What power or what influence is available to improve these conditions? And if, as I firmly believe, the evils from which these classes are suffering are *moral* rather than economical—that is, are connected with character rather than with environment or circumstances—we naturally turn for help to the greatest of all powers for the improvement of character—viz., to religion, or, rather, to Christianity. What help, then, may be expected from organized Christian effort, as we see it active in the midst of the industrial classes to-day?

I would not yet ask this common question, viz., "What help may we expect from 'the Churches' in the solution of our present difficulties, or in the improvement of the conditions of the industrial classes?" because there are other questions which must first be asked and answered. I much dislike the term "the Churches," but the expression is convenient, and is now so common in the current literature of the day that I will use it as there generally employed—*i.e.*, to indicate the various religious bodies or organizations. Also, where

in this connection I speak of "the industrial classes," I refer to men and women rather than to children.

Now, the hope and the possibility of influencing men and women depend very largely on their readiness to be influenced —in other words, upon their attitude towards those who are trying to influence them.

Upon the present attitude of the industrial classes generally towards religion there can be little room for dispute. If we describe that attitude as one of *indifference* we shall most correctly explain it. Except here and there, among very limited sections, we find little hostility to religion.

The questions (1) as to how far this indifference is the fault of "the Churches," and (2) as to what steps they might take to overcome it, I would defer. At present I prefer to deal with things as they are, and accept the fact that the proportion of working men in the towns who regularly attend any place of worship is lamentably small, and that even the proportion of working women is far from what it should be.

And how does the Church of England compare with other Churches? "Not at all favourably," seems to be the only answer possible. Besides appealing to personal experience, I would call attention to the following available evidence: The recent investigations into the attendance at places of worship in the various London boroughs seem to reveal that the attendance of men (especially in the industrial districts) at Anglican services is far less in proportion to the attendance of women than among either Roman Catholics or Nonconformists. Another most unsatisfactory feature in these returns is the very small number of adults—and, again, especially of men—who attend Church of England "missions," which, we may presume, are intended primarily to reach the poor. From these returns one would certainly conclude that this mission work is a very weak factor in the organization of the English Church at the present time.

But the returns of the religious census in London are not the only recent figures available. In "Poverty: a Study of Town Life," Mr. Rowntree gives the results of a similar religious census in York, surely a place where we might expect the Church of England to be exceptionally strong. In York, for the sake of greater correctness, the census was taken on two consecutive Sundays. It was there found that, of the total attendances at all places of worship on both Sundays, 14 per cent. were made at Roman Catholic services; 43 per cent. at Church of England services; 38 per cent. at Nonconformist services; 5 per cent. at Salvation Army and mission services.

Mr. Rowntree also divided the men from the women, with the following percentage results:

	Men.	*Women.*
Roman Catholic - - -	41	59
Church of England - - -	35	65
Nonconformist - - - -	49	51
Salvation Army and missions - -	46	54

As far as the attendance of *men* is concerned, these figures must be pronounced as most unsatisfactory for the English Church.[1]

The following questions seem to be forced upon us:

1. Wherefore this indifference of the masses of the people to Christian influences?

2. Wherefore the failure of "the Churches," and of the Church of England in particular, to gain an influence over the masses, and especially over the working men?

The fault cannot lie in Christianity itself. In other words, it is not due to any essential weakness or want of adaptibility in Christianity, which during eighteen hundred years, where intelligently expounded and where honestly tried, has proved itself to be infinitely the greatest of all beneficent social powers.

"Where intelligently expounded." These words suggest the importance of a clear conception of what we may term the social principles of Christianity. These are the social principles of Christ, gathered from His teaching as recorded in the Gospels. A brief examination of these shall form the second division of my subject.

II. The Social Teaching of Christ.

Fortunately, here, again, there is no lack of useful help in the way of thoughtful books. I will content myself with drawing more particular attention to one—viz., "Jesus Christ and the Social Question," by Professor Peabody, of Harvard University.[2] The sub-title of this book, "An Examination of the Teaching of Jesus in Relation to some of the Problems of Modern Life," explains both its scope and its method. Then, the titles of the various chapters are not only a further indication of the contents, but they are most suggestive as to useful lines for personal study. Some of these are: "The Comprehensiveness of the Teaching of Jesus"; "The Social Principles of

[1] In the still more recent Church census at Lincoln, the percentage of men among the Methodists was 48, against 41 in the Church of England.

[2] From the many authorities cited in Professor Peabody's footnotes, a very complete bibliography—including foreign as well as English and American works—upon the subject may be constructed (*vide* pp. 69-71).

the Teaching of Jesus"; "The Teaching of Jesus concerning the Care of the Poor"; "The Teaching of Jesus concerning the Industrial Order."

Like so many others of the best modern teachers on the subject, Professor Peabody is not only convinced that the social question is at bottom an ethical question, but he believes that the growing acceptance of this conviction is "a sign of promise." "It is its ethical quality which gives to the social question of the present day its commanding interest for generous minds. . . . Through these channels of activity [those of social service] the moral life of the time finds its natural outlet. It is a great source of happiness to be associated with people who are trying, however imperfectly, to make a better world."

To turn to the definite subject of the book. Professor Peabody regards with much hopefulness the present tendency to turn towards "the task of interpreting and perpetuating the teaching of Jesus Christ. . . . The modern spirit inquires, What would Jesus say? . . . These principles [of following Christ, and of trying "to direct one's own soul and the life of the world" along paths which He commended] are not to the modern Christian incidental to the Christian life, but are the essence of it." He also points out that the social movement has reached a point of peculiar reverence for the person of Jesus.

The first special feature in our Lord's teaching to which he calls particular attention is its *adaptability*.

"This extraordinary capacity for new adaptations, this quality of comprehensiveness, in the teaching of Jesus, which so many evidences of the past illustrate, prepares us in our turn for its fresh applicability to the question which most concerns the present age. As it has happened a thousand times before, so it is likely to happen again, that the Gospel, examined afresh with a new problem in mind, will seem again to have been written in large part to meet the demands of the new age" (p. 73).

Passing then to an examination of the teaching itself, Professor Peabody shows how eminently our Lord "lived in a world of social intimacies, problems, and companionships"; how "He was familiar with the most various social types—fishermen and Pharisees, tax-gatherers and beggars, Jews and Romans, saints and sinners. Almost every social question known to His age was in some form brought before Him . . . *e.g.*, the integrity of the family, the relations of rich and poor, the responsibilities of the prosperous." At the same time Professor Peabody is careful to point out that our Lord did not come primarily as a "social reformer." The social teaching

of Jesus rather "came about as He fulfilled His mission," than was "the end towards which His mission was directed."

Here Professor Peabody insists upon a most necessary caution in interpreting the teaching of our Lord. "To interpret the teaching of Jesus, there is needed more than willingness of heart. The study of the Gospels calls for commonsense. . . . The very essence of the interpretation of the teaching lies in the discernment, through the medium of detached utterances, of the general habit of mind of the Teacher. Jesus Himself repeatedly intimated that He required this thoughtfulness in His disciples" (p. 81).

Professor Peabody then passes on to consider the difficult questions which surround the phrase "the kingdom of God," or "the kingdom of heaven," in which he believes that "the social ideal which presents itself continuously and vividly to the mind of Jesus is summed up." In the interpretation of this phrase he again lays stress on the necessity for careful study of the social conditions of the time. For the expression was evidently used as one with which the people as well as the disciples were familiar. I must not stay to examine Professor Peabody's own treatment of the subject; but of this conclusion—upon which he lays stress—we may feel sure, "that whatever the expression describes, it implies a condition in which character rules supreme."

I can hardly conceive a more useful exercise for those who wish to be helpful in social teaching than a careful study of the whole of this chapter—upon "The Social Principles of Jesus." Even an outline of its contents would take far more space than can be afforded me. A few of the conclusions, however, may be given:

"The social teaching of Jesus is this—that the social order is not a product of mechanism, but of personality, and that personality only fulfils itself in the social order . . . the individual is the point of departure; but he finds his own self-realization only in the service of the social world. . . . Shall we say that Jesus was an individualist, or shall we say that, in any sense of the word, He was a socialist? Was His mind directed towards personal education or towards social reform? His method admits of no such antagonism between spiritual life and the social good. The one is His means, the other His end. Love has its watchword, 'for their sakes'; and character has its command, 'sanctify thyself'; and the Christian social law is fulfilled in the whole saying of Jesus, 'for their sakes I sanctify Myself'" (pp. 102-104).

The whole chapter suggests a crying need at the present time: that those who are called to be witnesses for our Lord —whether as preachers, teachers, or workers among the poor

—should make a far more systematic, a far more careful and thorough, study both of the teaching of Jesus in itself and of the social conditions amid which He taught, than they usually do. Think what the following condition demands, "to receive the teaching of Jesus in the light of the special circumstances and suggestions which prompted it, and to deduce therefrom the general principles which this teaching represents" (p. 82).

We must remember that one characteristic feature of our Lord's teaching is its "occasionalism." Though our Lord's utterances or decisions often consist of general principles, yet these were called forth by the definite needs and conditions of definite individuals. If we wish to understand and to appreciate the wisdom of any philanthropist's judgments, we have no right to isolate those judgments from the circumstances under which they were delivered. It is this condition which makes a study of the social environment and social atmosphere in which our Lord taught of such supreme importance for a full appreciation of His teaching.

To take a parallel case from our own time. For good or for evil, the Poor Law is a factor in our social environment. The wise philanthropist knows its general effects, and in his dealing with the poor he does not ignore its existence. So we must, as far as possible, take account of the various forces at work in the social environment of our Lord. But how many of those who take upon themselves to expound His principles have paid any heed whatever to the conditions amid which those principles were enunciated?

One great lesson from our Lord's teaching, and a lesson of the widest possible application, we must never forget. He deals with *men* rather than with their circumstances. He prefers to try and influence *character* rather than to attempt to revolutionize the conditions of society. "Interior inspiration, the quickening of individuals, the force of personality, are the means He chooses to employ." How different is this from the methods most in favour to-day! As Professor Peabody says: "We are much more apt to trace the evils of society to unfavourable environment, to imperfect legislation, or to the competitions of industry. . . . No tendency in modern life is more destructive to social progress than the tendency to weaken the sense of personal responsibility for social imperfection, and to fix the blame on unpropitious circumstances. . . . The problem of charity will remain an ever-increasing problem of relief and alms, unless there is included within the problem of relief the stirring of individual capacity to do without relief, and to enlarge the range of initiative and self-respect. . . . To whatever phase of the social question we turn, we observe within the sphere of social arrangements

the interior problem of the redemption of character" (pp. 116, 117).

The stress which our Lord laid upon character, and the importance which He attached to it, is an example of His prophetic insight. For character, with the increase and greater complexity of the organization of society, as seen at the present time—like speech, with the invention of the printing-press and the telegraph—paradoxical as the statement may appear, has grown infinitely more powerful, and therefore the exercise of its power has grown infinitely more important and more responsible. The tendencies of all democracies are towards accepting dictatorships.

Yet these truths are little recognised to-day; and instead of laying stress upon the creation, the strengthening, the refinement of character, we are all too apt to expend our energies upon the creation or extension of machinery. We are sometimes tempted to think that committees, combinations, and organizations have left small place and small scope for individual treatment or individual responsibility. But, as Professor Peabody shows, "the fact is that the growth of organization, instead of displacing the principle of inspiration, only provides a larger opportunity for its effectiveness. . . . Personality finds in organization the multiplication of power; and organization, the more complex it grows, makes greater demands upon personality. . . . Modern politics, statesmanship, and administration have become more and more dependent upon competent men, who shall control and direct the mighty power which modern organization has devised. All things, said the Apostle, wait for the entrance into organization of the power of personality: 'The earnest expectation of the creation waiteth for the revealing of the sons of God'" (pp. 125, 126).

Having now considered the "conditions" of the present time and the "principles" of our Lord's social teaching, which, as Christians, we believe must be the principles which lie at the basis of social welfare, and which 1,800 years of experience — where they have been honestly tried — have proved them to be, I would pass on to consider the position of "the Churches"—and of the Church of England in particular—as the stewards and exponents of these principles—that is, as they stand now face to face with the social problem, which, we believe, waits for the application of these principles, and whose difficulties can only be solved by this application. I would, therefore, next consider those factors in the work of the Churches which may be described as their "opportunity" and their "equipment."

(*To be continued.*)

ART. V.—NOTES ON THE INTERMEDIATE STATE AS AFFECTING THE DOCTRINE OF THE RESURRECTION.

THERE are many Christian people who are not only anxious to obtain reliable information as to the intermediate state, but who are willing to accept, as the sole source of it, whatever may be proved from Holy Scripture about it.

What, then, is the actual condition of the soul in the interval between death and resurrection?

Most of the writers on this subject have had no hesitation in accepting the popular opinion, and notwithstanding the obscurity which belongs to a truth partially revealed, seem to entertain no doubt whatever of the soundness of their conclusions; but when the grounds on which their conclusions rest are carefully examined, it would seem that they are by no means adequate to sustain such large inferences as follow from them, or justify such decided conclusions.

The generally accepted opinion is that, in the intermediate state, those who have departed this life in the faith of Christ enjoy a partial blessedness, and exercise in varying degrees a useful activity, in the presence of Christ, to be perfected at the general Resurrection, when the body, raised from the grave, is to be made like unto the glorious body of Christ, invested with glory, honour, and immortality. Varieties of opinion on minor points exist among those who, in the main, would accept this definition of their hope. But the chief point of agreement between them all is the belief in the conscious and active condition of the disembodied soul during that period which, by some writers, is called the "Hades life," including, in the case of many, the consoling hope that imperfect Christians may during that time be purged of imperfection and prepared for the Beatific Vision of God in heaven itself; and some of the more venturesome maintain that those who leave this world unsaved have another and more favourable chance in Hades.

It must be at once allowed that there is much in favour of this view. The sadly defective religious condition in which so many estimable persons die, though perhaps their lives may have been morally blameless, leads us naturally to hope that what is lacking may be supplied in the intermediate state, though we know they have never in this life accepted the offers of mercy through the Blood of a Divine Redeemer. It is comforting to think that such persons may be graciously prepared, after this life, by some merciful but unrevealed pro-

cess, during the long years of the "Hades life," to sing the new song of all the saved, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain," for He was slain for us.

There is, moreover, a deeper reason why this opinion finds many advocates. It is the instinctive action of the human mind itself. There is an almost insuperable difficulty, which all more or less experience, in conceiving the idea of continued existence apart from the conditions of time and space under which alone we know it here. This seems imperatively to demand a "Hades life" more or less like that we live on earth. Minds unused to abstract thought inevitably slip into the language of materialized conditions when thinking or speaking of the disembodied state. "The words Sheol" in the Old Testament and "Hades" in the New, meaning simply the "unseen," or "concealed," are probably used in Scripture to hide what we could not understand had it been revealed. They mark the limits of revelation, and touch the line beyond which our present faculties cannot carry us.

The question is how far the popular opinion is supported by Holy Scripture. At once the advocate for it will quote St. Paul—"absent from the body, present with the Lord" (2 Cor. v. 8). But when the passage in which these words occur is examined, it is found that, so far from supporting the popular opinion, the Apostle here distinctly disclaims any desire for the intermediate state. "Our light affliction, which is for the moment, worketh for us more and more exceedingly an eternal weight of glory; while we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal. For we know that if the earthly house of our tabernacle be dissolved, we have a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. For in this we groan, longing to be clothed upon with our habitation which is from heaven: if so be that being clothed we shall not be found naked. For indeed we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened; not for that we would be unclothed [or being burdened, in that we would not be unclothed], but that we would be clothed upon, that what is mortal may be swallowed up of life" (R.V.). Thus the only comfort St. Paul presents to us in tribulation is to be found in the Resurrection, as the exclusive object of the Christian's hope. The eternal house in the heavens not made with hands cannot refer to disembodied existence.

The only reference in this text to that existence is to disclaim any desire for it, and neither in this passage nor in any other, is that state presented to us as an object of desire, or a source of consolation. But if the notion of partial blessedness

before the Resurrection were true, how could St. Paul have declared he did not wish for it? and how impossible it would be to explain his silence as to such blessedness had it been revealed to him. In the words "absent from the body, present with the Lord," or, as R.V., "at home with the Lord," St. Paul speaks of two contrasted states of embodied existence—*i.e.*, "this body of flesh and blood in which we groan, being burdened," and that state for which a spiritual body is to be given to us at the Resurrection (Cor. xv. 38), liberated from infirmities and sins, but retaining that identity which belongs to each one of us as our recognisable personality.[1] But the intermediate state being a disembodied state, is passed over unnoticed, or noticed only to be disclaimed as an object of desire. The Apostle steps across the gap between the two conditions of which he treats as if the transition from this body to that were instantaneous. Had there been any preresurrection consolation, or any hope of supplying in that interval the defects of this life, this was the place to say so; but so far from referring to any hope in that interval, this passage is found, when closely examined, to tell against it.

The parallel passage (Phil. i. 23), "having a desire to depart and to be with Christ, which is far better," falls under the same category. To "depart" is to be "absent from the body," to be with Christ is to be raised with Him; and if, as we have seen, the Apostle in the former place disclaims the intermediate condition, we must understand that disclaimer here, as no contradiction can be supposed between these two parallel statements. To St. Paul his departure would be instantaneous glory with no conscious interval. Here, as everywhere else, his mind passes across the interval unnoticed, and he speaks to the Philippians in the language of his waking consciousness, with no reference to his sleeping in the disembodied state, which would probably have been unintelligible to them.

---

[1] The ancient Egyptians, who thought much and profoundly on the future state, as their constant use of the scarabæus testifies, divided man into four parts—body, soul, intelligence, and *ka*. The *ka* seems to have been the personal identity or bodily appearance of the man, and the oath used by Joseph, "By the life of Pharaoh," should probably be "By the *ka* of Pharaoh," the most sacred thing in Egypt. This *ka* was represented by a model of the man, made with minute exactness in durable materials, and placed in his secret tomb, to be ready for his resurrection. Such a *ka* is the green diorite image of Cephren, builder of the second pyramid, quite a miracle of workmanship, and now placed, by what some think sacrilegious hands, in the Gizeh Museum. The Sheyk el Beled is another instance, in wood, in a lower rank of life, of the *ka* of a sturdy agriculturist.

We observe the same reticence as to the intermediate state in that passage in which our Lord establishes from the Old Testament the doctrine of the Resurrection—St. Luke xx. 37, 38: "that the dead are raised, even Moses showed in the place concerning the bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. Now He is not the God of the dead, but of the living, for all live unto Him." Continuous life of some sort is implied here; but, without noticing that period during which there is no bodily life, the Lord proves the resurrection—*i.e.*, the fully restored life of "body, soul, and spirit"—by the use of the present tense. He says God is the God of the living, which they are and must become, or He would not be their God. In order to this they must rise; therefore, there must be a resurrection. "Master, thou hast well said," was the comment of the Scribes, who accepted the argument as conclusive.

Thus in 1 John iii. 2, "Beloved now are we the sons of God, and it is not yet made manifest what we shall be. We know that when He shall be manifested, we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him even as He is; and every one that hath this hope set on Him purifieth himself, even as He is pure." We look in vain for any reference, however oblique, to the intermediate state in this passage, where, if the common view is correct, we should certainly expect to find it. Assimilation to the likeness of the Lord is presented to us as the result of personal intercourse with Him; but there was to be no realization of this till the time when He should "appear the second time, without sin unto salvation," at the Resurrection. St. John evidently did not expect to see Him in the intermediate state, or at any time before his own resurrection. And it was this hope, and not the hope of any intercourse in the period of "partial blessedness," that purifies.

So in 1 Thess. iv. 13-18, where the object of the Apostle is to console the bereaved, we find St. Paul pointing believers on beyond the intermediate state, to which he makes no reference whatever, where, if true, his object would have demanded it. "I would not have you ignorant," he says, "concerning them that fall asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as the rest, which have no hope; for if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also that are fallen asleep in Jesus will God bring with Him. For this we say unto you by the Word of the Lord, that we which are alive, that are left unto the coming of the Lord, shall in nowise precede them that are fallen asleep. For the Lord Himself shall descend from heaven, with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we that are alive, that are left, shall together with

them be caught up in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore comfort one another with these words." Can we reasonably suppose that had there been a conscious partial blessedness in the intermediate state (full, as is represented, of recognitions and preparations for the more blessed future) that St. Paul could in such a place as this have passed it over absolutely unnoticed? For I suppose no one would contend that this passage has any reference whatever to the "Hades life"; but where, if not here, could we look for it? Surely such unvarying silence is significant, and should give pause to those who think there is no doubt about the truth of the prevailing opinion.

Job xix. 26 stands thus in the Revised Version: "After my skin hath been thus destroyed, yet from my flesh shall I see God, whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another." The alternative reading of the margin, "without my flesh," seems excluded by the reference to his bodily eyes; so that by the text of the R.V. the writer of this most ancient book expects to see God in the body after his painful flesh in which he then lay had been destroyed—excluding, therefore, the disembodied state. And why excluded? Because the entire man—body, soul, and spirit—is necessary to all conscious action of thought, speech, or vision; and a man cannot be said to be alive, in the fullest sense, unless he be possessed of all the component parts of his nature, though we learn that his spirit may "sleep in Jesus" when apart from his soul and body; for "the dust returns to the earth as it was, and the spirit returns to God who gave it" (Eccles. xii. 7).

When we come to the *locus classicus* on the subject of the resurrection—*i.e.*, 1 Cor. xv.—we find that a future state of conscious blessedness was undoubtingly believed by those to whom he wrote; but it would seem they erred, as many do now, in looking for it before the resurrection. "If the dead rise not," he says, then "those fallen asleep in Christ have perished" (verse 18). So there was for them no "partial felicity," and no felicity at all except in and by resurrection, when their felicity would be complete. Thus in the order of the future events given in verses 23, 24 it is "Christ the first-fruits, then" (with no noticeable intermission) "they that are Christ's at His coming." Then cometh "the end." All the Apostle's hope of recompense for his toils and trials and temporal sufferings was solely at the resurrection. This is indisputable, whatever reasons we may suppose for the fact. The "Hades life" is absolutely ignored all through this crucial passage, and the same must be said of Rom. viii.

19-25, where our future hope is so fully described. Present suffering is placed in direct contrast with future glory, with no hint of a middle condition of any kind; and what we, with a groaning creation, are said to wait for, is not a disembodied blessedness, but the final act of redemptive power — the restoration of bodily existence by the gift of a new spiritual body at the instantaneous change (1 Cor. xv. 52), by which, without loss of identity, we shall be made like Him whom we have loved. How St. Paul could have overlooked the partial blessedness and perfecting process of the "Hades life," had such an important stage or step to glory existed, is inexplicable.

Take as another instance 2 Tim. iv. 6-8. I am aware that some great German scholars think St. Paul was mistaken; but whether he was or not, it is abundantly clear that he looked for nothing till the Lord's coming, when he was to receive the crown of righteousness, "which," he says, "the Lord, the Righteous Judge, shall give me in that day, and not to me only, but to all them that have loved His appearing." All mention of the disembodied state is studiously excluded from his anticipations, which is unaccountable if he knew that he would retain his consciousness and be actively employed during that long period, and in the enjoyment of his Master's presence in that section of Hades (as is imagined) prepared for saints and called "Abraham's bosom."

So the Psalmist teaches us to look from this life directly on to the resurrection (Ps. xvii. 15): "I will behold Thy face in righteousness: I shall be satisfied," he says, "when I awake in Thy likeness." He looks forward to the sleep of death, and on beyond it, not to any disembodied waking, but to perfect satisfaction when he wakes from that sleep in the likeness of his Saviour. All the mystery of a life preserved in Hades, though not in full possession of living powers, is invariably all through the Bible hidden under that term "sleep," and what is healthy sleep but life maintained unconsciously? Dreamless sleep is absolutely unconscious. Can we, therefore, rationally crowd into that expression all the imaginary activities of purgatorial preparation for judgment, together with all the half-happy, half-regretful intercourse with each other and the Lord, which has been enlarged upon, poetically and unpoetically, by those who have turned the "sleep in Jesus," which is promised us, into a period of unsatisfied longing and eager anxiety in the "Hades life"? Had these fancies any solid ground in Scripture, the Psalmist must have said, "I shall be satisfied when I fall asleep in Jesus," for he would then have been consciously present with the Lord, which is the source of all satisfaction.

The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews seems to have

been of the same opinion with St. John and St. Paul in this matter. He says (xi. 39, 40): "These all, having had witness borne to them (R.V.) through their faith, received not the promise" (that is, the full accomplishment of the purpose of God in gathering in the last of the elect before all were glorified); "they were tortured, not accepting deliverance that they might obtain a better resurrection"; so that it is evident they had no hope of any comparative bliss before that event. For if Christian souls at death at once enter on partial bliss in the presence of their Redeemer, what place is there, in their case, either for a resurrection to life or for a day of judgment at all, either that of the *βῆμα* (2 Cor. v. 10) for reward of service, or of the Great White Throne (Rev. xx. 11) for the rest of men? But in 2 Tim. iv. 1 we read of "the day when the Lord Jesus shall judge the quick and the dead, at His appearing in His Kingdom." If each person is judged at death, and then at once ushered either into a half-happy life with Lazarus, or the torments of Dives, what can be understood by this Judgment Day?

Abraham is said to have "looked" on from his tent life, "for a city that hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." Only by resurrection can he realize this promise, which has never yet received its fulfilment! The statement may be safely hazarded that never, in any case, is Death represented as the time of Judgment, but a future day, when all accounts shall be wound up; and the intermediate state is significantly left out of consideration as a time when men are "out of the body." Ps. vi. 5: "For in death there is no remembrance of Thee: in Sheol who shall give Thee thanks?" implies that there should be no active worship in Sheol or Hades, or till the final deliverance at the resurrection. So in Ps. xxx. 9: "What profit is there in my blood when I go down to the pit [grave]? Shall the dust praise Thee? shall it declare Thy truth?" And in Ps. lxxxviii. 10: "Wilt Thou show wonders to the dead? shall the dead arise and praise Thee? Shall Thy loving-kindness be declared in the grave, or Thy faithfulness in destruction? (Abaddon, Job vi. 6). Shall Thy wonders be known in the dark, and thy righteousness in the land of forgetfulness?" If those in Sheol are consciously and actively present with the Lord, this language could not be applied to them by any stretch of accommodation. The description of the intermediate state here given, as "the dark," "the land of forgetfulness," and "destruction," is very different from, and, I venture to say, quite incompatible with, the popular notion. So in Ps. civ. 33, "I will sing unto the Lord as long as I live: I will sing praises to my God while I have my being," implies that

he would cease to do so as soon as he was dead, during the intermediate period. All his hopes of doing so were, as the following verses prove, connected, not with a disembodied state, but with resurrection. Then Ps. cxv. 18: "The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence," could hardly state the case more clearly. "Silence" agrees with all other inspired representations of that condition. So of man he says (Ps. cxlvi. 4): "His breath goeth forth, he returned to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." I have never met with any attempt to square these distinct denials of intermediate consciousness with the usual opinion on the subject, to which they seem to be in direct opposition, as is also the statement of Eccles. ix. 5: "The dead know not anything"; or, verse 10: "There is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither thou goest"; and with Ps. civ. 29: "Thou takest away their breath, they die and return to their dust. Thou sendest forth Thy Spirit, they are created; Thou renewest the face of the earth"—referring, we may suppose, to the resurrection, which in one sense is a physical re-creation. In Isa. xxxviii. 18, 19: "The grave cannot praise Thee, Death cannot celebrate Thee: they that go down into the pit cannot hope for Thy truth. The living, the living, he shall praise Thee as I do this day." Passages like this cannot be ignored, or treated by the reverent student of God's word as mere poetical hyperbole; nor, on the other hand, should they be pressed beyond their intention.

But when we come to consider those Scriptures which are alleged in favour of intermediate consciousness, we find the weakness of the case when such an acted parable of glory as the Transfiguration is forced into the service; as if the actors in that "vision" were disembodied souls! The plain purpose of the "vision" was to prefigure the day of restitution, when such bodies as appeared to the three witnesses would be given to Moses and Elias—if, indeed, they were not then temporarily given them for that special appearance. No one doubts that Moses and Elias were there embodied, whether temporarily or only in appearance; they were shown as what they shall be "in glory" (which absolutely excludes the silent darkness of the intermediate state). Our Lord Himself was "metamorphosed" so as to represent Him in the form He will assume when He "comes in His kingdom," or when "the Kingdom of God comes with power," as St. Mark phrases it. That kingdom is to be established, as we all agree, when He returns to earth and calls up His people to meet Him, to return with Him. Mistake here is impossible. For if Moses and Elias were embodied, what has their appearance (whether real or only visionary) to do with the condition

of disembodied souls? They no doubt represented the two classes of which St. Paul speaks—those that are to be raised, and those that are alive and are left till the coming of the Lord.

I suppose no text is more frequently used to prove the popular notion than the words of our Lord on the cross to the penitent malefactor. A great deal of ingenuity has been expended in attempts to show that paradise meant the intermediate state.[1] But it can hardly be disputed that paradise was a figurative phrase uniformly but perhaps, vaguely, used by Jews for future happiness and glory, as Sheol and Hades were for the silence of the unseen condition—a condition, be it remembered, from which even our Lord desired deliverance: "My flesh shall rest in hope *for* Thou wilt not leave my soul in Hades," which to our Lord was more a state for aversion than for hope or happiness. It is hardly conceivable that the Lord would have turned away the mind of the poor sufferer from the glories of the kingdom in which he prayed that he might be remembered, to expect relief amid the gloomy shades of Sheol! If good people would but consider what was the prayer to which our Lord's words were the gracious reply, mistake would be less easy. "Lord, remember me when Thou comest in (or into) Thy kingdom"—*i.e.*, when "He shall come in the glory of His Father and the holy angels." The "Hades life," of which so much is made, was wholly omitted, both in the petition and in the reply which granted it. Had that petition been to be remembered in Hades, his reference to "the kingdom" would have been irrelevant. The robber asked for a place in that glorious kingdom, which will not be set up till the resurrection, which clearly he anticipated, and his prayer was granted in terms which convinced that dying man that, to his consciousness, his entrance on it would be not far off, but immediate—"To-day," etc. If the man had heard any of the prevalent Jewish fancies about the "Hades life," he utterly ignores them in his pathetic prayer; and the Lord, in replying to him and granting that prayer, does the same, using, as ever, not abstract language, but that of the man's apprehension. To anyone whose mind is not warped by such Jewish fancies our Lord's reply is a clear indication that between the cross of shame and the crown of glory there was no conscious interval whatever.

Of the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus it is enough to say it is a parable; and, as Trench insists, parables must

[1] In 2 Cor. xii. 4 St. Paul understood paradise to be, not Hades, but "the third heaven." The word "paradise" only occurs three times, and the two other occasions are clearly irrelevant, one being the parable of Dives and Lazarus and the other the highly metaphorical prophecy in Rev. ii. 7.

not be used for other than their proper purposes. To suppose that these two characters were real men is to abuse the parabolic method of conveying instruction. But it would be easy to point to the tongue of Dives to prove he was in the body, and therefore not disembodied, and therefore not in the condition inferred. He is said to be "in torment"; but the idea of a separate division in Hades for such as he, is, of course, unauthorized assumption. The parable draws a striking contrast between a future state in torment and a future state in peace, Hades answering to the one and "Abraham's bosom" to the other, when hereafter the earthly conditions of the two characters are reversed. No more than this can be got out of it, as it is not intended to teach anything more than this.

The confessedly figurative language of Rev. vi. 9, 10, which some advocates have tried to press into the question, is open to the same objection. "I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the Word of God," etc. This confessedly refers to events yet future, and throws no light upon the present or past condition of disembodied souls; and the highly figurative language of the whole passage is such that no careful expositor would attempt to prove from it such an important and questionable doctrine as that of intermediate consciousness.

Heb. xii. 22-24 is a beautiful description of what is also confessedly future: "Ye are come unto Mount Zion and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to innumerable hosts of angels, to the general assembly and Church of the first-born, who are enrolled in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the mediator of a new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling that speaketh better than that of Abel." All, of course, future, but as the purpose of God is as sure as if it were fulfilled, they are here spoken of as if they had already obtained the inheritance reserved for them, as, *e.g.*, in Isa. liii., the past tense is used for far future events. But what possible help is here for the notion of intermediate consciousness? This is a grand resurrection scene; and the "just men made perfect" are justified men whose perfection is "made" by oneness with the only Perfect One, and not arrived at by the slow strivings of sin-laden souls in the "Hades life," though, indeed, by such a process it could never be arrived at at all. Relative perfection is all we can ever attain. Of course, absolute perfection belongs only to God.

We come now to the passages 1 Pet. iii. 18-19 and iv. 6, which have by some been considered to prove the conscious activity of the intermediate state—*i.e.*, the supposed visit of our Lord to spirits in prison during that period, and His offer

to them of those terms of salvation which they had refused in life. From among the several interpretations of these passages which have been suggested, the simplest and most obvious is that to which fewest objections can be made, and which can claim the support of such names as Bishops Hall and Pearson, and Archbishops Secker and Whately. By these and other authorities the preaching was not addressed to dead, but to living, souls—namely, those on whom Noah, in the spirit of Christ, urged in vain repentance and faith, and whose "disobedience"—*i.e.*, unbelief—was the cause of their death and incarceration. They are now dead, and their spirits in prison, but were alive when the pre-incarnate Christ, through Noah, preached to them all the time the Ark was preparing. So in iv. 6 the dead are those now dead, but who were living when preached to.

It may be asked, What, then, became of the Spirit of the Lord Jesus during the interval between His Death and Resurrection? He has Himself supplied the answer: "Father, into Thy hands I commend My Spirit." Beyond this we cannot go. But to suppose that during those thirty-six or forty hours He set up in Hades what is substantially a duplicate economy of grace (continuing from Noah's time on to the end), which is to effect the salvation of men who failed in their earthly probation—and all this vast hypothesis based chiefly upon a single disputed passage—is an astounding assumption, probably without a parallel in the history of theological speculation. There is no proof whatever that spirits when in Hades were the subjects of this preaching; but, on the contrary, insuperable difficulties belong to the theory, on which, nevertheless, this towering fabric of perilous inference has been built up. But the passages are confessedly obscure, and have been for centuries disputed. Dr. Salmond, in the fourth edition of his "Immortality," Dr. Wright, in his "Biblical Essays," Dr. Morris and others, have carefully examined the evidence, and arrived at the conclusion briefly here given as presenting fewer difficulties than any other.

Dealing solely with the disembodied state, I need not go at length into the curious case of Samuel, raised, at least in vision, by the Witch of Endor; or into the mysterious glimpse of the saints who arose immediately after Christ's resurrection; or into other instances of persons who were raised, and their bodies revivified by the power of Christ, or those who acted in His name. For not one of these cases supports intermediate consciousness, but the reverse. If Lazarus, for instance, had been actively conscious during those four days in Hades, some reliable hint of what was done there would have crept through to us. But if he was, as the Lord said he was,

"asleep," of course he would know nothing and could tell nothing; and so of the others.

With collateral speculations, metaphysical or philosophical, the main issue is only indirectly concerned. The question is, Does the Bible, fairly interpreted, sanction intermediate consciousness? and the only answer to that question I have been able to find there is that it does not. I have no quarrel with those who think there is sufficient evidence for it, in some of those passages to which I have referred. But taking the whole scope of revelation, and weighing the plain statements which categorically deny it, against the obscure passages which have been supposed to imply it, I cannot come to any other conclusion; and I have delivered my soul by laying before the Christian Church the result of many years of thought and investigation. I do not suppose that warm-hearted Christians, who have been all their lives taught otherwise, and have long been accustomed to think of their departed relatives as consciously waiting for them in Hades, and perhaps interceding for them, will readily yield this sacred feeling to the cold arguments of the understanding. This would, perhaps, be more than we have right to demand. Still, truth does ultimately prevail, and there will always be some who have learnt to keep their imagination in subordination to their reason, and to regard with suspicion a cause which is supported less by Scriptural exegesis than by sensational stories and rhetorical appeals. Nothing of value is gained by calling sleep "torpor," or by refusing to attempt to grasp that condition of which sleep is the divinely inspired emblem. And those of us who cannot accept the modern theory of "salvation after death," and "pre-resurrection," are not, therefore, hard and unfeeling. We believe "the Judge of all the earth will do right," and we doubt not will save all who can possibly be saved, including not only myriads of infants, but probably myriads of heathen and quasi-heathen, who have had no real opportunity of accepting salvation in this life, acting on the principle revealed in Rom. ii. 12.

The main reason why it is vitally important to get clear of prevailing mistakes, if they are mistakes, on this subject, is the bearing of it on the central truth of Christianity. If conscious activity exists in the intermediate state, irrespective of the resurrection, the linchpin of our faith is knocked out, and the enemies of Christianity will have little difficulty in proving that there is no necessity for a still future resurrection. But if the Scriptures not only exclude the idea of partial happiness till the resurrection, but inculcate the contrary, then indeed the enemy will not prevail against it. If at death the destiny of each soul is adjudged, and reward

and penalty awarded, then the day of judgment is so far forth anticipated by the decisions of what is, by a *petitio principii*, styled the "Hades life."

I am well aware of the difficulty which many minds feel in grasping the thought of unconscious existence. On this difficulty the whole of the perilous theories of the "Hades life" and its possibilities are built up. But the full significance of the Scriptural expression "sleep," once accepted in its simple and obvious meaning, all difficulty vanishes. That word occurs about twenty times as the inspired description of the state of the soul between death and resurrection; and when the serious and inevitable errors which follow the acceptance of the popular opinion that sleep is not sleep as we know it, are considered, and the danger to the resurrection by the pre-resurrection hope is realized, some much stronger proof is required than can be found in the disputed interpretation of an obscure allusion by St. Peter, set against a long series of passages, directly or indirectly opposed to it.

If the passages supposed to imply the activity of the soul in the intermediate state are capable of a scholarly and reasonable interpretation in an opposite sense, surely ordinary caution would hesitate to adopt a questionable exegesis as the foundation for doctrines which undermine the necessity for believing the Gospel in this life; which put off the great work of salvation into the concealed future, and which teach the virtual resurrection of the soul before the appointed day of the Lord. For these errors, and nothing less than these, are the consequences of the modern theory of the "Hades life," as any study of the popular advocates of consciousness in that life will show.

The peril of this teaching is obvious, remembering the multitudes who desire to put off decision. If a man may hope for an opportunity of seeking salvation in the intermediate state, why should he listen to all the exhortations of prophets and apostles who have declared that this is the time to seek the Lord?—*e.g.*, Isaiah: "Seek ye the Lord while He may be found, call upon Him while He is near: let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts," etc. If a second probation is to be afforded, the foolish virgins need not be alarmed if the door is shut now, for it will open again in Hades. If there is to be a long period hereafter when men may turn to God with that repentance and faith which they have refused here, then our Lord must have exaggerated the danger of final exclusion by saying: "When once the Master of the house has risen up," etc.; and, "Agree with thine adversary quickly," etc. St. Paul must have been quite mistaken in declaring with so much

emphasis, "Now is the accepted time, now is the day of salvation," begging his readers to consider how impossible would be escape if they neglected so great salvation.

Then, too, our Lord's words in John v. 28—"The hour is coming when all that are in their graves shall hear His voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done ill, unto the resurrection of judgment"—would be emptied of meaning. The invention of the theory of disembodied consciousness in the fifteenth century[1] has introduced the serious errors to which I have referred, but which receive their death-blow as soon as the view is realized, for which Archbishop Whately argued so forcibly, but which some have so much difficulty in apprehending—*i.e.*, the instantaneousness of the passage from death to resurrection. But "it is appointed" ("laid up," R.V.) "to man once to die, and after that" (with no conscious interval) "the judgment" (Heb. ix. 27); and in all Scripture the judgment follows or accompanies the resurrection, never precedes it.

The illustration of the resurrection used by our Lord (John xii. 24), and expanded by St. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 36), is the germination of the corn of wheat. As far as I know, neither Greeks nor Egyptians used any other than entomological illustrations of it. The Greeks portrayed the butterfly on tombs to declare thereby their assurance of a bright hereafter, and the Egyptians the beetle. The Lord draws His illustration only from the vegetable world, possibly because pagan thinkers had mingled much error with their analogies. Recent botanical research has informed us how wonderful the germination of the wheat-corn is, and how instructive is this illustration. For the corn of wheat does die in a very real sense on beginning to germinate in the ground, though the germ of life (or embryo) lives through that death of all other contents of the grain. Sir George King refers me to Anton von Marilaun (edited and translated by F. Oliver Quain, Professor of Botany, London), who gives useful illustrations (vol. ii., pp. 439 and 607 *et al.*) of the marvellous process through which each grain passes in the death of the original corn and the resurrection of the new plant from the undying germ, feeding, till it reaches the soil, on the carefully reserved store of food enclosed in the silicious husk, which will be found empty by the time the new shoot is able to find food in earth and air for its own support. Just as the undying

[1] As far as I can learn, this theory was first made an article of faith by the Council of Florence in 1478. Whately's essay was published in 1832.

germ of life in each soul is kept alive, though dormant, by the power of Him who gave it life and keeps it ("sleeping in Jesus" is the Apostle's term) till the appointed time arrives to restore it to the full life of consciousness. The corn must "die," and the chemical change which it passes through helps to preserve the dormant germ till the right moment, when, like the soul, it awakes to new life. May we not fairly infer that as the germ of the corn-grain lies in a dormant state, through these transformations, so the germ of human life does the same? We must be careful not to press too far the analogy between the animate and the inanimate. At any rate, a dormant life is implied, and though the grain as a whole dies, something which eludes the most powerful lenses of our microscopes lives. Out of this the new life rises; or on it is superinduced. Regarded as the dissolution of body, soul, and spirit, death occurs to us. Regarded as the divinely sustained germ, life remains. Where? The only reply to that question must be this: "In Him who is the life of all that lives."

F. GELL.

SAN REMO,
March 1, 1903.

ART. VI.—THE MONTH.

THE practical working of the Education Act is a matter of increasing difficulty and importance, and during the past month the discussion respecting it has been brought to a somewhat critical point. The so-called "Passive Resistance" to the payment of the Education Rate has spread in various parts of the country, and the distraints which have followed upon the goods of the recusants have presented scenes which are at least very unpleasant. The practical problem which arises in these circumstances is a difficult one. It is obviously impossible for the authorities to make terms with open resistance to the law; while on the other hand, if the resistance continues, the law will be brought into discredit. It is necessary to say that, as a principle, this passive resistance is perfectly intolerable. It is a flagrant example of a spirit which is tending to undermine all constitutional action. It is another example of the spirit which animates, for instance, the Romanizing clergy in the Church. They have been for some time openly saying that if certain interpretations were put upon the Law of the Church they would refuse to obey, and would take the consequences. They have their consciences, like the Nonconformists, and act, in fact, as Nonconformists within the Church. All legislation, or at least all administration, may be brought to a standstill if the rights of conscience are pressed to this extent. Resistance to an autocratic power is quite a different matter. The very basis of constitutional government is obedience to the law as long as it exists, the remedy for any alleged injustice being found in agitation for alteration of the law. But if the practice be recognised of anyone resisting a law which he may think offends his conscience, the old question recurs, "How is the King's government to be carried on?" As Sir William Anson observed in the House of Commons, the objectors avow their intention of endeavouring to alter the law as soon as they have an opportunity, and they thus recognise that a remedy is open to them, provided they can command the sympathy of their countrymen. If so, why can they not, as good citizens, wait for the opportunity of applying this remedy?

But meanwhile the spectacle of such resistance forces the

matter back upon our consideration, and the heads of the Church, even more than the heads of the State, have been endeavouring to appease the opposition. It seems doubtful whether they have been taking a wise course. Both the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London have been urging that, in point of fact, the contributions still incumbent on Churchmen for the maintenance of the fabric of their Elementary Schools more than cover, in practice, the cost of the religious instruction given in them, so that no real charge for denominational teaching is thrown upon the rates. But this, which may be true, does not touch the real grievance which is alleged. That grievance is not merely that a portion of the rate, more or less, goes to pay for Church teaching, but that it goes to support schools which are definitely and entirely Church schools, and which are, in fact, an integral part of the Church system. It is nothing more nor less than the old Church rate difficulty in another form. The Dissenters then refused to pay rates for purely Church purposes. The result was that the rate was abolished, and the expenses it defrayed had to be provided for by voluntary contributions. In this case, the new Act has substituted rates for voluntary contributions in respect of the greater part of the expenses of Church schools, and the contention of the Nonconformists is that, in such circumstances, the schools ought not to remain in the hands of the Church, but should be under the entire control of the public. The Kenyon-Slaney clause has, indeed, much restricted the power of the Church in respect to the actual religious teaching in such schools. But it cannot be denied that, by the predominance given to foundation managers, they remain substantially Church schools, and the gist of the grievance thus subsists. Churchmen may, indeed, well consider that the action of the Nonconformists is very ungenerous in view of the vast contributions which Churchmen have made in the past, and which they will have to make still, in the provision and maintenance of the Church schools. But generosity is not an element to be taken into account in political controversy, particularly where ecclesiastical interests are concerned. The Nonconformists will certainly assert their claim to the utmost under present circumstances; and that claim is, as it was in the case of the Church rates, that public money shall not be applied in the present day to distinctively Church purposes.

All this is intelligible and plausible until we ask what is the alternative which the Nonconformists would adopt. Is there to be any religious teaching in the schools; and if so, what? Is it to be the so-called undenominational teaching of the Board schools? But if that were the teaching

universally enforced by the law, Churchmen would be subjected, as they have been in the past, to precisely the same grievance of which Nonconformists are now complaining. They conscientiously object to undenominational teaching as much as Nonconformists do to Church teaching; and the grievance in their case would be peculiarly aggravated, as the schools in which such teaching would be enforced would have been mainly provided by their contributions in the past, and they would be the largest ratepayers in the present. In fact, if there is to be any religious education in the schools at all, it must be unsatisfactory to one class of ratepayers or another, and on the principles of passive resisters it must be unjust to some class or other. In this dilemma it is thought, in some quarters, that we are forced to the alternative of purely secular education in State-aided schools, leaving all religious instruction to the Church and the various denominations. But it would soon be found that this lands us inevitably in the same difficulty. A purely secular education is impossible. The mere exclusion of religion has its positive as well as its negative side. To bring children up in an atmosphere of thought from which religion is excluded is, in the view of many persons, to exert a disastrously irreligious influence upon their minds. Unless, moreover, teaching is rigidly restricted, which is now impossible, to reading, writing, and arithmetic, subjects like history must be introduced, in which religion must needs enter with full sails; and a Roman Catholic teacher of English history would be exerting mischievous political as well as religious influences. It may safely be said that, in the end, it is impossible to devise any form of instruction in elementary schools which will not offend the religious views or consciences of one class or other of ratepayers; and consequently, if the contention of the Nonconformists is to be admitted, there can never be any system of elementary education which may not justly be met by passive resistance.

These considerations seem to reduce the Nonconformist position, as an abstract principle, to an absurdity, and to show that, if we are ever to have a national system of education, people must be prepared to pay rates for some religious teaching or other which they would not themselves adopt or approve. The practical question, accordingly, must be how to render this unwelcome necessity as bearable as possible. It must, unhappily, be admitted that a considerable section of the clergy at the present time are doing what they can to make the existing arrangement as unbearable as possible. By assimilating their teaching and their ritual as nearly as possible to that of Rome, they are investing Church education

and Church schools with a character which rouses the natural suspicion and apprehension of the Protestant feeling in the country. Purely secular education or a narrow undenominational system would be similarly offensive in their turn. In these circumstances, a suggestion which has been made in a letter by the Archbishop of Canterbury seems to bring the matter to a practical test. He had been invited by a correspondent to adopt the plan of "trusting the people," and he replied that he has personally no objection to doing so, provided the trust be real and absolute—"provided, that is, that the local authorities be left at liberty to exercise unfettered discretion by appointing, as in Scotland, denominational teachers whose qualifications to give religious teaching may be inquired into or tested, and by supporting, as in Scotland, what are virtually denominational schools, where such schools are locally desired, the whole cost of such teachers and such schools, including the buildings, being in Scotland defrayed out of the rates and taxes." In other words, would it be possible to leave each body of managers perfectly free to give such religious teaching as they chose in the schools under their care? And if this were done, and the Church and the Nonconformists were left to decide their differences in each parish or district, would the minority consent to the maintenance by public rates of the system which might thus be determined? It would seem there would be much to be said for such a system, as it would enable each district to have the system of religious education which was most in conformity with the religious views predominant in it, and men might defer more readily to the decision of the majority if they had had a direct voice in its settlement. There is no sign that the Nonconformists will accept the suggestion. But it seems the only alternative to an arrangement under which the grievance now resented by the passive resisters must be borne by some one or other. Under any system that is conceivable, somebody must pay rates for teaching of which he disapproves. It is the turn of the Nonconformists to-day. If they had their way, it would be the turn of the Churchmen to-morrow. The only practical question is, What is the most reasonable or bearable form under which the hardship can be imposed?

When the matter is brought to this point, a consideration must be borne in mind which is, of course, kept out of view by Nonconformists, but which we think those who speak for the Church would be wiser to urge more boldly than at present. That consideration arises out of the position of the Church as established throughout the country, and out of the responsibility which that establishment involves. Every clergyman is solemnly charged at his ordination with the spiritual cure

of all the souls in his parish, and it is a responsibility which is recognised by the State as well as by the Church. But the children of his parish form a momentous part of his charge; and it is in pursuance of the obligation thus imposed that the clergy and Churchmen have been content to make such pecuniary sacrifices in the cause of the schools. Mr. Balfour pointed out, indeed, that it is a responsibility which is restricted by the admitted right of every parent to remove his children from the clergyman's care, just as parents in the wealthy classes place their children under the spiritual charge of the masters of the schools to which they are sent. But there remains, as it were, a permanent balance of responsibility on the part of the clergyman of the parish; and so long as establishment exists, the clergy may fairly expect that this balance will be taken into account in legislation. If, in other words, preference must, from the nature of the case, be given to some form of religious teaching in the parish schools—if that inequality cannot be avoided—it is surely reasonable that the teaching of that communion which, by virtue of establishment, has the main responsibility for the moral and spiritual welfare of the children, should be given the advantage. It is a mistake to argue as if, under present circumstances, Nonconformists could be given entire equality in the matter with the Church. The Church at present holds a position in every parish of prior authority and prior responsibility in regard to the religious welfare of the people; and consequently, if it is given an advantage in the schools, that is no more than it has in other respects, and no more than naturally attaches to its position. The truth is, there are indications that the Nonconformists know perfectly well that what they are really attacking, under cover of the Education Act, is the establishment of the Church. In a direct attack upon that system they are, of course, fully justified. But if, as Churchmen believe, that system is a good one, it has a right to some recognition in the parish schools as well as in the parish churches.