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

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

ELLIOT STOCK'S NEW BOOKS.

AN INTERESTING REPRINT FROM DR. JOHNSON.

In crown 8vo., appropriately bound, price 5s. net.

PRAYERS AND MEDITATIONS OF DR. SAMUEL JOHNSON.

New Edition, with Notes, and an Introduction by the Rev. HINCHCLIFFE HIGGINS, and a Preface by AUGUSTINE BIRRELL, K.C., Author of "Obiter Dicta."

Also some opinions of DR. JOHNSON on THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

"A vividly interesting book."—*Glasgow Herald.*
LORD ROSEBERY writes: "I think it is a charming book."

In crown 8vo., cloth, gilt lettered, price 5s.

A SOUL'S EMANCIPATION.

By F. F. GRANDJON,

Pastor of the Reformed Church at Puys S. Martin, Author of a Treatise on "The Marriage of Priests in the Western Church." Translated into English by R. C. FAITHFULL.

"This is a very remarkable work, and one which we hope will be widely read in this country."—*Record.*

In crown 8vo., cloth, gilt lettered, price 4s. 6d. net.

SOME DIFFICULTIES IN THE LIFE OF OUR LORD.

By the REV. GEORGE S. COCKIN, M.A.,
Assistant Curate of S. John's, Altrincham.

"The volume is a very instructive one, carefully written, and the result of honest study. It ought to be of great use to thoughtful readers of the New Testament."—*Church Family News.*

In crown 8vo., cloth, price 5s.

CHURCH PRINCIPLES;

Or, The Scriptural Teaching of the British Churches.

By JOHN COMPER,

Late Rector of S. Margaret's, Aberdeen, and for Fifty-one Years Priest of the Scottish Church. With a Preface by RICHARD MEUX BENSON, M.A., S.S.J.E., Student of Christ Church, Oxford. And a Memoir by JAMES WISEMAN, M.A., Rector of Bucksburn, and Synod Clerk of the Diocese of Aberdeen and Orkney.

"A powerful statement of the Scriptural argument for the Church's teaching, written in a popular and persuasive form."—*Church Bells.*

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

ELLIOT STOCK'S NEW BOOKS.

The Life of a Great Missionary.

In crown 8vo., cloth, illustrated, price 5s. net.

MEMOIR OF THE REV. JOHN THOMAS, C.M.S. Missionary at Mengnanapuram Tinnevelly, South India, 1836-1870. By the Rev. A. H. GREY-EDWARDS, M.A., C.M.S. Organizing Secretary for South Wales and Mon. With a Preface by the Right Rev. Bishop ROYSTON, D.D. And 27 full-page Illustrations and Map.

In crown 8vo., bound in cloth, price 2s. 6d. net.

CHRISTIAN LIFE, SUGGESTIONS FOR THOUGHT. By GEOFFREY EGERTON-WARBURTON, Rector of Warburton.

This book follows more or less the order of the Christian year in its choice of subjects, and mainly keeps in view the practical bearing of Christianity upon everyday life. Its aim is rather to suggest than to elaborate ideas.

In demy 8vo., paper cover, price 1s. 6d. net.

RELATIONS BETWEEN ENGLAND AND ZURICH DURING THE REFORMATION. By TH. VATTER. Dedicated to the XXIII. Anglican Church Conference of Northern and Central Europe, Zurich, June 1st and 2nd, 1904.

In demy 8vo., cloth, fully illustrated, price 5s. net.

HISTORY AND ANTIQUITIES OF THE COLLEGIATE CHURCH OF ST. SAVIOUR (St. Marie Overie), SOUTHWARK. By the Rev. Canon THOMPSON, D.D. (Rector and Chancellor).

LORD LLANGATTOCK writes: "I must send a line to say how delighted and interested I am in your beautiful book. You have got together a wonderful amount of information, and the illustrations are charming."

In foolscap 8vo., bound in cloth, price 3s. 6d. net.

DAILY THOUGHTS FROM DANTE ALIGHIERI. Selected and arranged for each day in the year. By J. B.

In crown 8vo., price 1s. 6d.

WHAT IS TRUTH? By E. A. RAWLENCE. A book for Seekers after Truth, showing the doctrines of Christianity as taught in Scripture and during the first three centuries of our era.

In paper cover, price 1d.

A MESSAGE! A MESSAGE FROM HEAVEN! A MESSAGE FOR YOU! FOR YOU TO RECIEVE! FOR YOU TO DELIVER! By the Rev. N. DIMOCK.

"A New Year's message, simple, forcible, direct, and pleading—the very 'message' for wide parochial circulation."—*Record.*

NEW VOLUME OF VERSE.

In crown 8vo., bound in cloth, price 3s. 6d.

MARIA CREATRIX, and other Poems. By H. PASSMORE, M.A., author of "Leisurable Studies," "The Things Beyond the Tomb," "The Sacred Vestments," "The Signs of Spring," etc.

NEW VOLUMES OF ESSAYS.

In crown 8vo., appropriately bound, price 5s.

A FIT OF HAPPINESS, and other Essays. From the *Spectator.* By CECIL GRAY.

In crown 8vo., appropriately bound, with an Allegorical Frontispiece, price 3s. 6d.

INTROSPECTIVE ESSAYS. By GRACE A. MURRAY.

"The book deserves praise because it is the product of a genuinely reflective mind. The authoress's outlook is broad and unbiassed, and her work shows wide reading well assimilated."—*Oxford Chronicle.*

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

The Friends of Armenia.

President: THE LADY FREDERICK CAVENDISH.
Vice-Presidents: Hon. Mrs. FRASER and Mrs. ALFRED BOOTH.
Chairman of Committee: E. WRIGHT BROOKS, Esq.
Treasurer: HECTOR MUNRO FERGUSON, Esq.
Secretary: Miss E. CANTLOW.

FUNDS URGENTLY NEEDED.

AN ORPHAN RESCUED, FED, CLOTHED, AND EDUCATED FOR
Per **£5** *Annum*
BY THE MISSION HOMES IN ARMENIA.

FUNDS URGENTLY NEEDED.

DONATIONS IN AID OF WIDOWS & ORPHANS gratefully received by the Hon. Treasurer as above.
CHEQUES SHOULD BE CROSSED "LONDON AND WESTMINSTER BANK."

47, Victoria Street, Westminster, S.W.

SOCIETY FOR RELIEF OF PERSECUTED JEWS

(SYRIAN COLONIZATION FUND).

President: LORD AMHERST OF HACKNEY.

TORTURE AND MASSACRE OF JEWS has continued this year, and in September there were many bad outbreaks. Jews, therefore, leave Russia, where there is no safety for their wives or children. Very few can be received here. **THIS SOCIETY ENDEAVOURS TO RELIEVE,** by food and work, the misery of some of the thousands who have found refuge at Jerusalem. Owing to the long and serious illness of the Secretary, the work at Abraham's Vineyard (where seventy Jews are employed) has lately been suspended. **1,500** Families of aged, sick, and blind are on our registry for relief.

WE ASK FOR FUNDS, as the coming winter must add to the chronic distress of these poor in their miserable homes. Work, food, and fuel are urgently needed.

DONATIONS THANKFULLY RECEIVED by

F. A. BEVAN, *Hon. Treasurer*, 54, LOMBARD STREET, E.C.
and by the *Secretary*,
E. A. FINN, 41, PARLIAMENT STREET, S.W.

"LIBERATOR" RELIEF FUND.

Patron: H.R.H. PRINCE CHRISTIAN.

£10,000 required to Relieve New and Urgent Cases.

HUNDREDS of aged and afflicted victims, so cruelly robbed of their life-savings by the great Liberator Fraud, just as they were hoping to enjoy the fruit of their industry and thrift. Many of them are members of the Church of England. Cheques and P.O.'s should be sent to the Secretary, Rev. J. STOCKWELL WATTS, 16, Farringdon Street, E.C.

THE MISSIONS TO SEAMEN.

Patron: HIS MAJESTY THE KING.

Vice-Patrons:
H.R.H. THE PRINCE OF WALES, K.G.
THE FOUR ARCHBISHOPS, THE BISHOPS, etc.

Labours afloat and ashore, at home and abroad, among seamen of all classes and nations, fishermen, bargemen, and emigrants. Seventy-six harbours are occupied. Income in 1903, £49,701.

Increased Contributions and Offertories, urgently needed, should be forwarded to the Secretary, Commander W. DAWSON, R.N. 11, Buckingham St., Strand, London W.C.

OPERATIVE JEWISH CONVERTS' INSTITUTION

(In connection with the Church of England.)

President: J. K. D. WINGFIELD-DIGBY, Esq., M.P.

OBJECT.—To assist young Christian Jews in distress by enabling them to help themselves. They are received for three years, provided for entirely, and taught trades.

SUPPORT.—Orders for Printing and Bookbinding are very helpful, but subscriptions and donations are also needed, and will be most thankfully received by the Principal, the Rev. H. O. ALLBROOK, Palestine House, Bodney Road, Hackney, N.E.; or by the Hon. Treasurer, A. R. PITE, Esq., Effingham House, Ramsgate.

Bankers—Messrs. BARCLAY & COMPANY, Ltd., 54, Lombard Street, E.C.

Church of England Zenana Missionary Society.

For Evangelistic, Medical, and Educational Work among the Women of India and China.

PATRONESS:
H.R.H. THE DUCHESS OF CONNAUGHT.

CHAIRMAN:
SIR W. MACKWORTH YOUNG, K.C.S.I.

The Society has at present 65 Stations, and employs 206 Missionaries in Home Connection, 116 Assistants in Local Connection, and over 900 Bible-Women and Teachers.

It has 14 fully equipped Hospitals and numerous Dispensaries. Over 300,000 cases were treated last year.

The Magazines of the Society, "INDIA'S WOMEN AND CHINA'S DAUGHTERS," published monthly (price 1d.) "DAYBREAK," Quarterly (price 1d.); "HOMES OF THE EAST," Quarterly (price ½d.).

Donations and Subscriptions are Much Needed.

HON. TREASURER—**Col. ROBT. WILLIAMS, M.P.**
LAY SECRETARY—**Mr. H. L. HEBBERT.**
CLERICAL SECRETARY—**Rev. G. TONGE, M.A.**
CENTRAL ASSOCIATION SECRETARY—**Miss MULVANY.**

OFFICE—**27, Chancery Lane, LONDON, W.C**

ORPHAN
WORKING
SCHOOL
FOUNDED 1758
MAINTAINS
AND
EDUCATES
500
FATHERLESS
CHILDREN

New Year's Gifts

AND

NEW ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTIONS

Are much needed by the Orphan Working School.

Senior School: MAITLAND PARK, N.W.
Junior School (Alexandra Orphanage): HORNSEY RISE, N.
Convalescent Home: HAROLD ROAD, MARGATE.

Patrons:
HIS MAJESTY THE KING. HER MAJESTY QUEEN ALEXANDRA.
President: H.R.H. THE PRINCE OF WALES, K.G.
Treasurer: SIR HORACE B. MARSHALL, M.A., LL.D., J.P.

The Charity is not endowed, but depends upon Voluntary Contributions.

Please help this most necessary work. One Thousand new Annual Subscriptions are urgently needed. Two Votes at each Half-yearly Election for every Guinea subscribed.
Information will be gladly given by the Secretary, to whom Contributions should be sent.

ALEXANDER GRANT, Secretary.

Offices—73, Cheapside, E.C.
Bankers—The London Joint Stock Bank, Princes Street, E.C.

In crown 8vo., tastefully bound, price 5s.

THE LOVE LETTERS OF A LADY OF QUALITY OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

With Two Facsimile Portraits from Miniatures.

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

PAROCHIAL MISSIONS TO THE JEWS AT HOME AND ABROAD.

President—THE DEAN OF WORCESTER.
Hon. Secs.—CANON SIR JAMES E. PHILIPPS, Bart.
ARCHDEACON SUTTON.
Org. Sec.—REV. W. O. E. OESTERLEY.

Work in London, Liverpool, Manchester, Leeds, Bombay.

Applications for Grants have constantly to be refused owing to want of Funds.

Office: 39, VICTORIA STREET, LONDON, S.W.

THE

CHURCHMAN

JANUARY, 1905.

1904:

SPECTABILIS ANNUS.

THE year 1904 has been crowded with big events, both civil and ecclesiastical, which are pregnant with possibilities. Few of them have as yet reached their full accomplishment. Many of them, however, are filled with promise. All are of great interest and importance. It may, therefore, be profitable for us to review them, so that we may define our actual position, and as far as possible make a reasonable prevision of the future, remembering, nevertheless, that among all the changes and chances of this life, in which human waywardness and obstinacy are such disturbing elements, no forecasts are wholly reliable, and events have a provoking way of disappointing every promise and of deferring hope.

The chief event of the last year, which still dominates the politics of the whole world, has been the outbreak and continuance of the war between Japan and Russia. This had been long foreseen by all wise observers who knew the facts. On one side, "an old and haughty nation proud in arms," to use a Miltonic phrase, which had assimilated all that is best and most progressive in modern civilization, has been driven to fight for its continued liberty, its most cherished institutions, and even its national existence. On the other side, we find calculating aggression, immeasurable ambition, broken promises, intolerable methods of diplomacy, even more odious methods of administration, and, at the same time, an unpreparedness which would be inconceivable if it had not been exposed, and which is only explicable first by the known corruption of the Tsar's officials, and secondly by their insolent and blind contempt for the Japanese. The course of the war has been very much what the best judges have expected. We have no direct interest in its political results, except in

so far as they must affect ethical and religious problems. We are not prejudiced against the Russian people, nor are we reckless admirers of our allies. Whatever the final issue of the war, we hope it may cause the reformation or the ending of the Tsar's despotism, both in Church and State. Facts oblige us to hold that the Russian bureaucracy is nothing less than a crime against human nature and the rights of man. It is an outrage against everything which we value most as Englishmen, and which cost our ancestors so much to win. We are the friends of the Russian people when we hope they may conquer the same rights, and so may take that place which their nature and high gifts deserve in our European civilization. If these ends are to be compassed the Orthodox Church must be reformed as well as the Russian State. We have no desire for reunion with the corrupt and obscurantist Russian Church as it shows itself to-day: the opposer of education, the encourager of persecution and of ignorance, the patron of superstition, the instrument of tyranny at home and of conquest abroad. We should, however, welcome the restoration of such a purged and renewed Orthodox Greek Church as our Formularies have longed for since the sixteenth century, and with which we might probably be in communion, to our mutual advantage. Such is one aspect of the war, and of its possible consequences. Another is that the example of Japan, whether she win or lose, must affect and stir profoundly the whole East. We have no desire to see Asia a second-rate imitation of Europe, or even of Anglo-Saxondom. Japan is assuredly not that. We hope neither India nor China will become so. But we do hope that everything which is best in the Oriental nations may be developed to the full, along its natural lines of growth, influenced and helped, no doubt, by much that we have to give them, though not dominated and overwhelmed by it. At any rate, we hope that the splendid Liberalism of Japan, its generous toleration, its scientific mind and methods, its high example of efficiency, its superiority to sectarianism and prejudice, its subordination of party to patriotism; all of which are a lesson and warning to ourselves; may spread through Asia. In that case we may hope for a real and fruitful harvest in ethical and religious matters. If the East have something to learn from Europe in these spheres, our own religious world may find a great deal that it might copy from the methods and spirit of Japan, and something, also, that it may acquire to its great advantage from the depth and richness of Oriental thought, as well as from the reserve and dignity of Oriental manners.

Looking nearer home, our chief interest and sympathy must

go to France. We welcome that understanding which makes us more than the allies of our kinsmen and nearest neighbours, whose fortunes have been so closely intermingled with our own for longer than a thousand years. Between the eleventh century and the fifteenth it was often doubtful whether England were only a province under French rulers, or whether France were destined to be an appanage of English kings. Our languages, our institutions and laws, our governing classes, were inextricably mingled, to the greater benefit of England. For many centuries the French and English were not two peoples, but one, ruled by different branches of the same family. Since then, if there have been rivalry and wars, there have also been admiration and imitation on both sides, with much give and take of the best that either country was able to impart. We hope the two great free and progressive nations of the West, who are so necessary to complete the well-being and perfection of one another, may ever be more cordially and closely joined. We have followed carefully the significant and promising events which have occurred in France during the last five years. At the beginning of that period, the Nationalists and Clericals made a despairing, and we hope a last, attempt to undermine, and if possible to explode, the Republic. The Dreyfus scandal, which was one of their offensive weapons, turned ruinously against themselves. It exposed to the whole nation the aims and methods of the Vatican and the serious danger of the State. These disclosures were the cause of that awakening which has restored France to sanity and strength. The Religious Orders were dealt with first, as being the chief instrument of Rome, the propagators of disloyalty to the existing Constitution, the corruptors of youth by obscurantist and reactionary methods of education, a disturbing and treacherous influence upon the army and the civil services, the encouragers of superstition and disaffection among the populace. Their abominable press is an outrage to common decency, and is more damaging to religion than all the attacks of its professed enemies. The firm, just policy of the Government alarmed and irritated the Vatican, which was impelled by its real masters, the Generals of the Religious Orders, to provoke an open quarrel. The Papal claims, whenever they are pushed to their logical conclusion, are incompatible with the freedom and sovereignty of every Civil Power. The Concordat was only endurable so long as each side was anxious to avoid a rupture. It allowed the Vatican far more jurisdiction than had been admitted by the ancient kings. It had been consistently and astutely violated and encroached upon by the Papacy all through the Restoration, the Monarchy of July, and the Second Empire.

Under the Liberal Governments of Napoleon III. and of the existing Parliamentary Republic, France had become really democratic and educated. The ideals of modern civilization, of all that was best and most necessary in the Revolution of 1789, have been almost fully realized. The result has been a wider breach than ever between the French nation as it really is, at the head of modern civilization, and the so-called French Church, which still places its ideals in the past and its destinies in the hands of an Italian autocrat. Modern society and the present methods of the Vatican cannot be reconciled with one another. Pius IX. was right when he proclaimed this in his uncompromising Syllabus. The French Government are equally right, and are far wiser, when they draw the inevitable conclusion, and resolve that the Church and State must be divorced. A Bill for that purpose was introduced by the Prime Minister on November 10. This is an open declaration that the Church of France has been left behind by the State in its onward and liberalizing progress. The consequences may be, as we hope, to renew and purge religion; to diminish materially the income of the Vatican, and so to lessen its diplomatic and political importance; to reveal the true numbers and impotence of the Clerical party. These revelations must be advantageous, since it is always wholesome for the truth to be acknowledged as it really is. Meanwhile, there is a large and growing Liberal party among the French Romanists, both laity and clergy. Some of them have been stirred by the intellectual movements of our time, which have penetrated more surely into the strongholds of the Church than the Clerical Reaction had into the schools and armies of the State. Others of the clergy, again, are returning towards a revived Gallicanism or an ecclesiastical Nationalism, which is replacing the discarded and impossible Vaticanism of 1870. We must remember always that the Vatican Council is only adjourned, and was not dissolved, so that the decrees of 1870 are not necessarily its final word. There is no insuperable barrier to their revocation; and France, in the past, has several times revoked engagements which were more binding than the Vatican decrees. Without committing ourselves in any way to the private or theological opinions of French Liberals, we are bound to sympathize with them in their struggle against the Papacy, since they are striving for precisely those liberties which our forefathers extorted, and which we ourselves possess, either to abuse or use. Their abuse is no argument against their lawfulness; and no individuals avail themselves more largely of this freedom, both in print and practice, than some of our extreme High Churchmen, especially those who combine medievalism in ritual

with the wildest theories of the Higher Critics. The organs of these hybrid theologians, which are violently anti-Papal so far as Anglicanism is concerned, are no less violent and unfair in their condemnation of the French Government. No Englishman should be deluded by these fallacies, which are manufactured, not in the interests of religion or of liberty, but of the narrowest ecclesiasticism.

Italy has experienced the first year of a new Pope. Pius by nature as well as name, personally well meaning and attractive, his policy has, nevertheless, been more reactionary in some directions than that of Leo XIII. The social and democratic societies which Leo encouraged and hoped to manipulate have been condemned by his successor. An open war has been declared against the foremost champion of Liberalism among the French clergy. The Curia has either steered or drifted into a conflict with the Republic. The administration of Leo XIII. and Rampolla, which was at least professional and adroit, has been replaced by the bungling of novices, who are more at home in the sacristy than in diplomacy. Pius X. appears to be ruled by two fanatical Spaniards and a half-breed; viz., Father Martin, the General of the Jesuits, the Franciscan Cardinal Vives, and the amateur diplomatist Merry del Val. The combination is of evil omen, and may bring back the errors and violences of Pius IX. During the thirty-four years since the occupation of Rome, the Italian Government has become stronger and the Papacy weaker. Three generations of Italians have grown up thinking that the clergy, or at all events the Curia, are the natural enemies of their country. The Papacy dare not organize a Clerical party like the German Centre, lest its weakness and loss of influence in Italy should be too openly revealed to the Roman Catholic world. The Temporal Power is a lost cause, at any rate, among the Italians; and the rulers of the Vatican see this clearly, though they will not say it. Meanwhile, the recovery and progress of Italy have been wonderful, in spite of many political errors. She is almost alone at present, among her neighbours, in having satisfactory finances. The recent election is a victory for both stability and progress. Every year the margin of taxation grows more elastic through the increase of trade, of manufactures, of shipping. The good fortune and security of Italy will probably increase even more rapidly now it has come to a political and commercial agreement with France. We wish continued good fortune to the two great progressive Latin countries, who now are both our sincere friends, whose lands and peoples always have been the admiration and delight of all that is most civilized and best among us.

Of Spain we hear little, and most of us know less. The Church is a burden to the people. Its income is out of all proportion to the resources of the State and the numbers of practising Catholics. A just retrenchment of the Secular clergy and a reformation of the Regulars were impeded by Leo XIII. Spain is watching the ecclesiastical reformation in France, and her own policy is almost certain to be guided by the example and experiences of her neighbour.

Austria is, as usual, in a state of smouldering combustion and of approaching disintegration. The jealousies of the various nations which live under the Hapsburg monarchy are producing, among other disturbances, that movement called the *Los von Rom*, which is more political than theological, but which is drawing large numbers out of the Papal Church, and which we regard, therefore, with sympathy and hope. A monarchy in which Italians, Czechs, Slavs, Germans, and other races are all moved by incompatible desires and interests, and whose only common attribute is a distrust of one another, is assuredly condemned to trouble, if not to civil war. Anti-Semitic prejudice is unusually active in many parts of the Empire, and is a continual pretext for riot and sedition. The Roman Catholic Germans gravitate in sympathy towards the new Germanic Empire. The King of Prussia is half flattered by their advances and half afraid of them. He cannot welcome without misgiving the addition of more than 20,000,000 Roman Catholics, with their proportion of voters, to the forces of the Centre. That Clerical party already dominates the Reichstag, and possesses the Bavarian Lower Chamber. The present condition of Romanism among the German States is ably discussed in the *Edinburgh Review* for October, 1904, and we refer our readers to that illuminating article, as well as to another on the position and prospects of Catholicism in France. The Roman Catholic Centre holds the balance of power in German politics. Every Chancellor is forced to make terms with it, or the Imperial Government could not be carried on. The relations between Berlin and the Vatican are most ominous for the future of Germany and for the quiet of the world. We have no desire to be alarmist or bellicose, but it would be nothing less than criminal if we shut our eyes and mouths entirely to the armaments and policy of the Prussian Government, and still more to the violent utterances of the Pan-Germanic organs, which breathe out threatenings and slaughter against the British Empire. Prussian diplomacy has the worst record in Europe for treachery and want of scruple. It is all the more dangerous because individual Germans have inherited a tradition for honesty and candour. Voltaire says of Frederick II.: "It is his nature to do always

the opposite to what he says and writes, not entirely through dissimulation, but because he writes and speaks excitedly, and acts afterwards in quite a different temper." Such a Sovereign is a standing danger, both to his own people and to the world; and Voltaire's description is still applicable to the Hohenzollerns. It is fatuous not to be guided by the plain lessons of the past; and the experiences of Poland, Denmark, Austria and France, should be unmistakable warnings to ourselves.

Our chief bulwark against these dangers is to be found in the prosperity and strength of our kinsmen across the seas. We welcome with the utmost satisfaction the results of the Presidential Election. It is a set back to corrupt and reactionary influences in politics. It is a triumph of English ideals and institutions as against those of various foreign elements. It guarantees the fuller exercise of American diplomacy upon international affairs, and it will draw still more close the happy friendship between the United States and the British Empire. The visit of the Archbishop of Canterbury has made the past year memorable in the intercourse of the two kindred peoples. His office renders that visit historical, and his Grace's personality has made it fruitful. It has gone far to undo the ecclesiastical blunders and timidity of George III. and his advisers. We hope the time is not distant when their political blunders may be not only forgotten, but utterly abolished in their effects.

To the Australian Commonwealth we wish more population, more revenue, less taxation and expenditure, fewer politicians, and many propitious seasons. We hope that the feet of the South African colonies are set in the way of prosperity and peace.

At home we have experienced many political excursions and alarms, which have produced little more than noise. A threatened Government has not only lived, but worked. We owe it our thanks for the agreement with France, for a better understanding with many of our neighbours, and for behaving both firmly and moderately under severe provocation and on several critical occasions. Our thanks are due to our best and most influential diplomatist, His Majesty the King, whom God preserve, and to his able Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. Some results of the Education Act must modify the thoughtless jubilation with which too many Churchmen received it. That measure is charged with difficulties, which may yet lead to serious disasters for the Church. The fervid opposition to it is caused, as we think, by distrust for the extreme teaching of certain clergymen, and we share cordially in that distrust without committing ourselves to any approval of the methods chosen for expressing it. The most flagrant

evil in our national life has been dealt with by legislation. No Act of Parliament is or can be perfect. It is possible to discover flaws or to raise difficulties in any conceivable course of action. Wise men will meet and overcome difficulties as they occur; it is less wise to magnify them into an excuse for doing nothing. We have no sympathy, nor even common patience, with those temperance fanatics who assert perpetually that no bread is better than half a loaf, and who, by so talking, have not only obstructed all reform, but have added immeasurably to its cost and difficulty. We accept, therefore, what we have got, resolving to make the best of it, and also to use it as a secured position for getting more. We remember, however, both in temperance and religious education, that the first can only be promoted effectually by reforming the individual, and the second chiefly by being cared for and provided in the home. People cannot be made sober or godly by Act of Parliament or by Government officials. By these means they can only be restrained from opportunities of evil; they cannot be established in goodness or strengthened in character.

With regard to that important question which has rent, and is still agitating, the domain of politics, we have no party bias. We only record our grave warning against the misuse and deceit of words. We have not at present, and we never have had, Free Trade in any real meaning of the phrase; and the effects of our present methods in trade are certainly unfair. No one has proposed to re-establish Protection, and still less to restore the methods of the Corn Laws. We have only been asked to consider very seriously the conditions of our home and foreign trade, and our relations with various communities which are supposed to form parts of a United Empire. It has been suggested that the bonds of union should be made real instead of remaining theoretical, that they might be practical as well as sentimental. It does not follow that this process would turn them into a bondage, or that "the crimson thread of kinship" would be thereby hardened into a sordid and servile chain. It should be remembered that the Germanic States were united commercially long before they were federated politically, and that the only separate communities which have almost complete Home Rule and absolutely unfettered Free Trade among themselves, viz., the United States of North America and the Federated States of the Australian Commonwealth, have obtained these advantages solely through their political unification. Before federation there were frontiers and irritating fiscal barriers between every colony in Australia. Under federation there is complete Free Trade between all

the States. It should not be impossible for a race which prides itself upon its successes in politics and commerce to evolve a scheme which would give it all the advantages of complete Free Trade among its various possessions, and at the same time preserve it as a whole from the disadvantages and losses of its present unscientific methods and obsolete procedure. For good or evil, the peoples of the world are grouping themselves into large and more rigorously exclusive units; and these undeniable tendencies of political and economical gravitation must result in loss, or even ruin, to our whole Empire, unless we seize the fleeting opportunity of turning them to our advantage.

We hope earnestly that the opportunity may also be taken to place our Parliamentary representation upon a just numerical basis, so that numbers and local interests, if not intelligence, may have a more equitable weight and influence. It might be considered seriously, in these days of instantaneous publicity, of the press, of the referendum, whether party government as we have known it hitherto, and Parliamentary debate as it exists at present, are any longer necessary to our well-being, or are even compatible with efficiency and progress.

In ecclesiastical affairs, we have to record the assembling of a Ritual Commission, and we wait with both curiosity and expectation for their verdict and its consequences. There are some recent signs of promise, which give us better hopes of the result than we had at the beginning of the past year. We notice various signs, too, which make us believe that the ritualistic tide has reached its height, and that its excesses are already beginning to decline. We welcome with great thankfulness and hope the formation of a Central Church party, though we only use the word "party" under protest, and because there is no other. The appeal to all moderate Churchmen to unite upon a common basis of historical Catholicity, as it may be found and proved by the first six centuries of ecclesiastical history, provided that what is so found be approved and tested further by the standard of Holy Scripture, is no party movement. It is an appeal to the great body of our Church, both lay and clerical, as we feel convinced. It is a vindication of our historical and theological position as we have received it from our best reformers and divines; from Cranmer, Ridley, Jewell, Hooker, Andrewes, Barrow, Taylor, Bull, Waterland, Routh, to choose no other names. We have no desire to narrow the Church to either of its extremes. We hold, and we always have held, that there is no incompatibility of principle, but only of expression, between scholarly Evangelicals and the old school of High Churchmen.

There is not only room for both in the Church, but it is well for the Church that it should contain both. Their common standard of belief is Scripture. Their common foundation and rule of practice is the Primitive Church, as interpreted by Scripture, according to the declaration of all the Fathers, who, in Milton's phrase, disclaimed all independent authority for themselves and their own times. Both Evangelicals and High Churchmen gloried in the name of Protestant, and united in repudiating the usurped Papal authority and that corrupt medieval theology which was at once a cause and consequence of Popery.

We believe that history and scholarship are undermining the position upon which alone Ritualism can stand. They are showing us, more clearly than ever before, that the Primitive Church, and not the Medieval, is our true foundation and exemplar; that we cannot be firm in our historical and theological position unless we be faithful to that example, and follow lines of development which are logically compatible with it. There is no other way of being loyal to our Anglican traditions and formularies, and at the same time of developing lawfully both in our thought and practice, as every Church must if it is to bear living fruit. With regard to any appeal to the first six centuries, we must be clear as to what it is able to effect lawfully, or we may find ourselves cheated of our first principles, surrendering vital positions, and engendering worse misunderstandings than exist at present. Such an appeal, we are firmly persuaded, excludes the chief Roman and medieval doctrines, such as the Papal authority, and all developments of it since Gregory I. It excludes transubstantiation, the medieval theory and development of Orders, the medieval theory and the modern practice of enforced private confession and of sacerdotal absolution. It excludes the sacrifice of the Mass for the living and the dead, as well as all the current theories of Indulgences and Purgatory. It disallows current and extreme theories of Mariolatry, and many popular devotions to the saints. In all these matters the results of such an appeal would be positive and clear.

We must allow, however, that there are other and secondary matters in which its results would be, by themselves, negative and even dubious. Many practices which are non-Scriptural, if not anti-Scriptural, came into use long before the sixth century, and were prevalent in some Churches, if not throughout the Church. Among such practices were the use of lights, of incense, of lustral water, of oils and chrisms, of vestments and utensils, of prayers for the dead, of solemnities in honour of saints and martyrs. As to the existence of all these matters,

we get a wide consensus of testimony, though the words and opinions of the Fathers are various and even contradictory, and the practice of the Churches was by no means uniform. It is to these matters that our saving clauses apply. We require, first, before we admit any belief or practice, a clear proof of Catholic, that is of universal and authoritative custom; and we require, secondly, even though the first condition be fulfilled, that every accepted practice should be justifiable by Holy Scripture, by the canonical books of the New Testament; or, in other words, by the example of the only Apostolic Church of which we have any certain or sufficient knowledge.

We look forward, then, with good hope to the ecclesiastical future; and we include in our hopes many of our fellow-Christians whose organizations we prefer to describe as alongside the Church rather than outside it. Their present opposition is caused, as we feel convinced, chiefly by extremists among ourselves, to whom we also are opposed; who may be with us, but are not really of us; who misrepresent the true Church of the English people. As we look round and look forward, we cannot but see the healing and reuniting possibilities of sound scholarship and scientific history. And we must not forget that ecclesiastical differences, grave as they are in their causes and effects, are not the chief dangers that confront us. We may be warned and helped even by an opponent. About sixty years ago Cardinal Wiseman foretold to a class of theological students that in half a century "the professors of this place (Oscott) will be endeavouring to prove, not transubstantiation, but the existence of God." He meant that, not the details, but the foundations and substance of Christianity would be the most urgent subject of preoccupation and defence. These times have come upon us; upon Romanists and Protestants alike. Our opponents have realized the fact, and have not lost the opportunity. Most Christians and all the Churches have ignored the fact, and have not utilized the time of preparation. It is high time that the Churches composed their differences, and made ready to defend their common position against an enemy who will strike hard at their foundations.

In conclusion, we pray for an abundant blessing on our Church and Nation during the next year. We hope the peace of the world may be restored and be more firmly re-established, and that the various matters of good promise which we have tried to summarize and forecast may be directed to their highest and fullest accomplishment.

ARTHUR GALTON.

Art. II.—THE PRIMITIVE EXPECTATION OF THE MESSIAH.

I HAVE endeavoured in a former paper to establish a rendering of Gen. iv. 1, 26*b* differing from that ordinarily given. I have tried to prove that the one ordinarily given is compassed with an always-felt difficulty, partly in the first passage from the plain usage of the Hebrew language, which is violated, and in both places from the sense and context. I have shown how the rendering of Yahweh in its simple sense, and consequently its primitive senses, make the context harmonious and the meaning throughout clear.

Eve was not speaking of God, whom when she speaks of she calls Elohim. She exults that a man-child is born to her, "the very one who is to be," and who is, according to the Divine promise, to restore all things.

Disappointing experience made men cease to expect deliverance from mere weak and failing man (Enosh). They perceived that the promised seed must be more than man to redeem. And then they proceeded to give Divine honour to Him who was the coming One, "Yahweh." They began to anticipate the Incarnation. This hope was not, then, a national hope, but the hope of the race, and so was handed on. I proved that this interpretation fitted with the after-history of the Old Testament, and made it plainer and more forceful. If the view given of the interpretation of Gen. iv. is a true one, there was once a universal expectation of a Divine Redeemer, common to the race. If so, traces of it should still remain outside the history of the Hebrew nation, as well as traces of His name, "Yahweh." I proceed in the present article to show that such traces very manifestly exist, and are clearly to be found.

Turning, then, to the atmosphere of ancient thought and hope, made plain to us by many restored treasures of the distant past, but chiefly, it may be, by Assyriology, as nearest to the cradle of these hopes and thoughts, I find my argument is cumulative still. I have said the expectation of one Divine (Yahweh, He who will be) to do what humanity, forasmuch as it is weak by reason of its proved, experienced, inherent nature, is unable to do, was once part of the common heritage of the race. It were no wonder, consequently, if we find traces of the name Yahweh in other ancient nations. It were no wonder if we find in the legendary and mythologic lore of a race that was nearest to the cradle of this expectation a picture, bold, beautiful, and gracious, of such a Divine Redeemer mixed with baser elements. If these ancient

peoples have preserved the names of the ten first Fathers of the race before the Flood,[1] and the tradition of their long lives, which stand immediately after Gen. iv. 26*b*, "Then men began to worship Him who is to be," it ceases to cause any perplexity that they should preserve traces of this worship, profaned indeed, but still luminous. For this worship and this hope were far the bigger and more vital thing of the two.

There are traces of the worship of Yahweh in Balaam's country, in the names of Ammonitish, Phœnician, Philistine, and North Arabian kings, where borrowing from the Hebrews is impossible.[2] We find traces of it in the names of witnesses in the ancient Babylonian contract tablets[3] and elsewhere. The probability is that in many different forms it fills the most ancient past the round world over. But it finds its finest and most attractive delineation in the picture of the Babylonish idea of the Messiah, with which some of those who have raised it from the past desire to mythologize the Christ that really came—so entirely different, and yet in some respects so like.

"Schelling," we are told, "taught that man inspired by God and endowed with reason lived in the earliest time. In no other way can we account for the beginning and spread of religion and culture. That culture may die and disappear in certain nations is a fact of which history makes us sure; that it may, as it were, *ab ovo et de novo*, develop itself out of the conditions of animal existence, this we do not know. The first estate of man was one of culture, founded on religion. That was the alpha of humanity, and a return of that golden age will be the omega. Schelling held that a tendency towards a true belief had more or less been present amid the errors of heathenism."[4] If this be historically interpreted, and the word "culture" applied to extremely simple things, it seems an opinion strictly true to the facts.

"There," I quote again, "in the Gentile world a poetical mythology was to a large extent corrupt in its ethical import,

---

[1] In a relation of "good Hebrew to Babylonish which is still perplexing," Delitzsch, "Wo Lag das Paradies?" p. 149; Zimmern, in Schrader's "Keilinschriften," pp. 530 and 539 *et seq.* It may be some confirmation of the view proposed in this essay that this tradition of the ten Urväter is closely related with a curious mythological conception in several forms of a son of God, Adapa, "the wise one," of "a Divine proclaimer of revelation who before the Flood arose among them" (Zimmern, pp. 378, 520, and 538.

[2] Delitzsch, *ibid.*, p. 162.

[3] Hommel, "Ancient Hebrew Tradition," pp. 100-102 *et seq.*

[4] Gostwick's thoughtful "German Culture and Christianity," pp. 405 and 410.

the sense of man's sinfulness was mostly superficial, and the idea of union and reconciliation with God was therefore shallow. For want of depth, there was want of height. Ideas of mediation—mostly imaginative rather than religious—did, however, exist in heathenism, and indirectly foreshadowed the coming of Christ."[1] The bound Prometheus, a profound but unchastened picture of human nature, "was," as Schelling said, "not a thought that ever a man invented. It is much more one of those primitive, primeval thoughts which came into existence by their own intrinsic force."[2] All this is true in a special degree of the Babylonian picture of the Messiah, only, if what has been said of Gen. iv. 1 and 26*b* be true, it plainly distorts, as it embodies, an historical idea, which was one time a treasured tradition of the race, but only entirely true and fruitful in those who were faithful to it.

In Palmer's "Babylonian Influence on the Bible," which in its very title at once begs the question, we have a copy of a bas-relief in the British Museum delineating this ancient idea—Merodach, with strong, benevolent countenance, apparently winged and armed with the lightning, contending with the dragon. The idea may well have connection with the creative victory over chaos, for creation and re-creation have ever been seen to be nearly related ideas; but it certainly did not stay in this region of thought. Nor did it originate in it. "The Babylonians themselves," says Mr. Palmer, "seem to have considered their Merodach and the Hebrew Ya—Jah = Jehovah—to be one and the same, as we may infer from the names they gave their children, such as Bel-Yahu." "Bel is Yahweh," identical with Bealyah, the name of one of David's warriors, and Shamshi-Ya: "My sun is Yahweh."

It seems the extreme of historical perversity to trace the origin of a pure, simple idea to a representation of the same idea coloured with baser elements and become complex; and this in the name of evolution and against plain historic probability. But perhaps those who are not inclined to be historically perverse will grant that my argument is cumulative. It remains to trace the main features of this Babylonian idea of the Messiah.

There are certain features of deep distinction between the Babylonish phantasies and the Hebrew Messianic expectation. They are clear and numerous, and insistent to the understanding, which has an eye for large and patent things as well as for small and comparatively insignificant things.

1. Apparently the Babylonish expectation, as we have it,

[1] Gostwick, *ibid.*, p. 411.
[2] Martensen's "Christian Ethics," i. 63.

is a probably mixed copy of a copy. How far Sumerian influences have impressed themselves on the Semitic in Babylonian ideas is at present uncertain.[1] A comparison of the results derived by different Assyriologists, a reflection how relatively small an amount of the Babylonian libraries has been really investigated, and how much of the real Babylonish history must rest upon happy hypothesis in the absence of anything like a connected historical record—thought along these lines inclines to the belief that while much that is strictly trustworthy has been attained, much also that is strictly uncertain and tentative underlies what is sometimes stated without condition. Much still depends upon the point of view and the capacity for correct and extensive generalization possessed by the investigator. Intellectual arrogance is out of place, and humility and the fear of God is in place, in this matter.

2. It is clear that the Babylonish ideas have been complicated, lowered, and sterilized. They are ideas mixed sometimes with a good deal of earth. They stop at the point reached, and only, so to say, revolve round it. They admit of no progressive expansion, and contain no good news for the whole world. They rightly perished with the people that held them and strictly localized them. But they retain enough to throw light upon the conception, increased by years of reflection, of "Him who is to be," which it is the object of what is here written to suggest was once the only hope of the race. The conception does not touch the fact of sin, or but little.[2] "For want of depth, there is want of height."

---

[1] Zimmern (p. 349) says: "It is, however, up to the present little possible to decide in individual cases with certainty how far ancient, time-worn Sumerian conceptions have to do with the Babylonian religion, or how far properly Semitic religious ideas are in discussion, though, indeed, as has been said, the probability is in favour of by far the greater part of the Babylonian religious thoughts belonging already to the Sumerians."

Maspero ("Ancient History," p. 138) says: "The Semites adopted the old pantheon *en bloc*. Some of the principal deities were identified one with the other." It is, however, clear that something essentially uncertain still underlies both these statements. Delitzsch, in his "Assyrian Grammar" (pp. 61, 71), ends a discussion on the origin of wedge-writing, in which he declares himself on the side of Halévy and his school, with these remarkable words: "The Semitic Babylonians will be found entirely justified when they ascribed the invention of the art of writing to their god Nebo; and that, besides the Cossæans, they never anywhere mention a third, a Sumero-Accadian, people will in the long-run be explained by the fact that such a people was never in existence."

[2] Yet it does touch it. Marduk is called, as below, "the reconciling priest," "the restorer of their benefit" to the fallen. Of a good King—a

I will try, then, to point out very briefly some of the main features of the Babylonish picture of the Messiah. It is a picture rather than in any sense a prophecy. It leads to nothing. There are only points of interesting contact. But it has destroyed the idea of anticipation altogether, and has made the future which the Hebrews looked for essentially impossible.

Now, the Babylonish picture of the Messiah is scattered through many interesting and possibly correlated fancies; but it is in many ways gathered up into the portraiture of Marduk, the local god of Babylon. To this I ask attention.

(*a*) The first great cleft between the primitive Old Testament conception and Marduk appears in his origin. The difference seems of first importance. The idea of an Incarnation is pointed to by the human form of Marduk, as of many other gods, and is associated with the idea of "Babylonian-Assyrian kings, even in the oldest regal inscriptions, as children of goddess mothers,"[1] and specially of Assurbanipal, the child of Istar. But Marduk was not "a child to be born to us" in the future. The earliest thought of him, probably, was as the "son of the sun," the probable meaning of the name. He is the god of the early sun, as well the morning sun in the day dispersing the gloom as the spring sun in the year calling all nature from death to new life. These are Messianic analogies implanted in nature, which have struck all men. But as early as 3000 B.C. his genealogy was settled.[2] He was the first-born son of Ea, "the wise god," "lord of wisdom," and of his consort Damkina, "queen of heaven and earth." Now, Ea's ancient seat was Eridu, "the holy or salvation-bringing city," and here stood his sanctuary, with a holy tree. His chief epithet, surely derived from the situation of Eridu, was "king of the water-deep"—*i.e.*, king of the life-giving influences of the ever-flowing streams of the Euphrates and the Tigris, which play a great part in the earliest (Sumerian derived?) incantation ceremonies. Marduk was called "son of Eridu,"[3] which Delitzsch makes his name mean. This Ea is identified with Sin, the god of Ur, the moon-god, by the manifest parallelism of the text in the Ishtar legend: "Then went forth Samas (*i.e.*, the sun-god), before Sin his father wept he, before Ea the king, came his

---

type of Yahweh—it is said, "Whom his sins had given up to death, him my lord the king has endowed with life" (Zimmern, pp. 373, 381; Palmer, p. 101).

[1] Zimmern, p. 379.

[2] So Zimmern, from whom the account is chiefly taken.

[3] Delitzsch, "Wo Lag das Paradies," pp. 227, 228.

tears,"[1] and nearly as clearly is the identification of the sun-god with Marduk hinted at. The sun, as a god localized in Southern Larsa and Northern Sippar, is thought of as scattering by his light life and health, and as the judge who brings all to light, who helps the good to live in grace and chastises the bad. His wife is "the bride," and his children are "righteousness" and "equity." Marduk became identified with Bel of Nippur, and became viewed as father of Nebo of Borsippa. But Marduk was identified with Jupiter[2] as an astral god, and as this planet had the name Bel, Kaukebil, so Marduk was called Bel. Marduk is so set side by side with Zeus and Jove. He was regarded as the leader of the imaginary beings of the Zodiac. He is called by Nebuchadnezzar in his "standard inscription" "the sublime master of the gods."[3] In another later inscription he is absolutely localized to Babylon.[4] But again Marduk was identified with Yah, a shortened form of Yahweh. "Mr. Pinches has proved that the element Äi must be read as equivalent to the Hebraic Yah, originally a word in general use among the Western Semites, but especially among the Arabs. Thus we find Abu-äi, Nindar-äi, Ashur-äi, Nirgal-äi, *Samas-äi, Marduk-äi, Bel-äi,* as well as Sharru-Ai ('Yah is king')."[5] And, further, Marduk, it may be esoterically, was identified with the other gods, not, apparently, the principal gods. The epithets belonging to them were simply transferred to him.[6] Further, many Babylonian hymns show a monotheistic ground-tone. They are addressed to the "Father, who in heaven and upon earth alone is great, the Father Nannar" ("giver of light," Zimmern). The word "ilu," "i," "ili," El (God), is never localized, but "in the earliest as in the latest Babylonish texts 'ilu' stands at the head of the Babylonish-Semitic pantheon." "Ilu or *Yahu,* the oldest principal god of the Semitic Babylonians, was gradually displaced by other gods."[7]

"Certain schools, that of Eridu amongst others, proclaimed the absolute unity of the Deity, and addressed their prayers to one God," says Maspero. Sir Henry Rawlinson held the opinion that Eridu was once the seat of monotheism. "The

[1] Hommel, "Ancient Hebrew Tradition," p. 65.
[2] Lenormant, "Ancient History," i., p. 454.
[3] *Ibid.*, i., p. 481.
[4] Maspero, "History," p. 584.
[5] Hommel, "Ancient Hebrew Tradition," p. 144.
[6] Zimmern, p. 609.
[7] Delitzsch, "Wo Lag das Paradies," p. 164. In the interesting and important discussion here referred to, Delitzsch, in the interest of proving the priority of the shortened forms of the tetragrammaton, raises difficulties as to its popular shortening, some of which he himself allows little weight to, and the rest of which disappear, if there is evidence of the fact.

doctrines of these schools did not prevail, and soon disappeared," says again Maspero.[1] Now, Eridu was the place whence came originally the idea of "the son"—Marduk, "son of Eridu," or "son of the sun."

Now, I submit, in the result, that under all these floating, inconsistent phantasies there lies one idea. It is the idea of the Father of the lights, whose creature the sun manifests His glory, bringing life and health and truth of vision into the world, and the idea of the Son sent by Him as the beams of light sent from the sun (an old Christian analogy of the Fathers for the eternal Son). Kings and deliverers were regarded as partial incarnations and representations of this idea, as in Ps. ii. That Yahweh, "He who is to be," was necessarily the Divine Son of God is the next inference upon His Divinity from Gen. iv. 26*b*. But the idea of Marduk gives up the thought of the actual birth of Yahweh as "the Son of man" also to come. It mythologizes His birth in heaven and in the past. It has no expectation more, for Marduk's mediatorial office is now and present. It is an ancient heresy of the once universal hope of Yahweh.

It is very interesting and more than conceivable that what remained of the better hope brought the magi from the East to Bethlehem. Osiris, who personifies the sun, presides over the last judgment, and is a type of the King, is the Egyptian counterpart of Marduk.

(*b*) It is clear, from what has been stated, that Marduk, and all the correlated fancies which he dominates and gathers to himself, reflect as in a distorting glass the primitive expectation of the incarnation of Yahweh, as it meets us in Gen. iv. We have, then, in the office and work of Marduk, light poured on the ancient anticipation of what Yahweh was to be, only complicated and lowered from its highest Hebrew plane. He was emphatically the healer of all sicknesses and the looser of all curses, the rescuer in trouble, "the reconciling priest among the gods," the supremely "compassionate one, who loves to give life to the dead," "the lord of life," "the king of heaven and of earth," "the king of gods and lord of lords," "the creator of the world." He was *sent* by his father on a journey of bringing help and loosing curses with these remarkable words; "My son, what thou knowest not, what can I say more to thee? What I know, that knowest also thou."[2] A series of tablets concern his wanderings to do his mission, in which he refers to his father in any difficulty.[3] He contends in fierce

[1] Maspero, *ibid.*, p. 139.
[2] Zimmern, pp. 373 *et seq.*
[3] Smith, "Chaldæan Genesis," p. 112.

battle with the hostile powers of evil. This gives him the aspect of strenuous suffering. He is "he who maketh whole," "the only begotten one," "the creator of the law of the universe," "life," "restorer of their benefit" (to the fallen), "the shepherd-king." As good kings bring joy and prosperity to a nation, so he to the world[1] (Zimmern, p. 380). "The Son of Ea is the mediator between his divine father and suffering humanity. It is by him that Ea makes known his decrees, and reveals the great mysterious name that puts to flight the demons." "All the angel hosts of heaven and earth regard thee [Marduk], and give ear." "He is the great overseer of the spirits of heaven," "the king of angels," "the director of the spirits of heaven."[2] In fact, he stands in the same relation as Yahweh in human shape many times stands in the Book of Genesis to the hosts of God's messengers or angels, separate and supreme. But here again the same cleft comes in between the Old Testament and the Babylonish myth, that it is a pathetic, moving picture, only painted, as it were, on the sky and wandering in the earth, regularly dying down in the winter as much as reviving in the spring. The Babylonish Messiah never wrought any real deliverance, nor was he expected to work one. It is a heretical Messiah, the work of reason only, not of fact. And if, with Zimmern and many another, we conceive that Marduk created Yahweh, as he stands among the Hebrews in his actual mediatorial office, and not that the ancient thoughts and longings, once common to the race and centred in the promised Yahweh, created Marduk, we are bound back into the really hopeless paganism of "fallen" Babylon. The cleft that divides the Babylonish Marduk from our Jesus (the name means "Yahweh is salvation"), progressive in the Hebrew prophets and actual in the Gospel story, is exceedingly deep, for all the other analogies, some of them but slight and superficial, pointed out by Zimmern. They are all interesting, but do not lead to his conclusion. We Christians are not worshippers of Marduk redivivus, or followers of the authority of wisely-thought-out myths, when we have believed the power and the coming of Jesus Christ. There were chosen eye-witnesses of His majesty. There were chosen witnesses present even when He received honour and glory from God the Father, when there was brought to Him from the majestic glory such a

[1] Marduk is said to have searched out a good king, and proclaimed by his declaration "This is the shepherd, who gathers together the scattered" (Zimmern, p. 382). *Cf.* the remarkable allusion to Marduk's calling Cyrus by his name, p. 381.

[2] For these translations from Babylonian texts see Zimmern, and Palmer as above (pp. 101, 102), and Maspero (p. 136).

voice: "This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." There were those who heard the voice come from heaven, from the living God, when they were with Jesus in the Holy Mount.

We might ask, When were the prophetic historians and inspired speakers for God who built up the Hebrew Messianic idea in so friendly an attitude to the Babylonish pantheon of false and sometimes foul divinities that they culled out of them the flower and bloom of this sterile but beautiful speculation to engraft it on a really growing stock?

One thing more. In the Babylonish Messianic idea there is no mystery. Strictly, men and women and their children, naturally born, are projected on the heavens and on the wonders of the earth, so to say, and return Divine. There is nothing mysterious about it. But in the Old Testament, Yahweh, He who is to be, and to fill the future, and to gather together the nations, is the name of the one true God. Yahweh sends as much as Yahweh comes. There is the mystery throughout of the oneness of the Father, Son, and Spirit, suggested from one end of the Old Testament to the other. It is only possible to expurgate it by holding the opinion that what was always true in heaven *could* not be communicated to the men of the ancient world at that stage of their ideas. Such a preconception employs its learning to root out what is clearly there, hitherto always perceived, and historically developing. The New Testament only explains what the Old had sown. "God was *in* Christ reconciling the world unto Himself." "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son (also the only begotten God; see the reading of the Sinaitic MS.), who *is* in the bosom of the Father, who was, when on earth, also in heaven: He hath explained Him." He was rejected because He came as a suffering man. It has been impossible in the scope of this essay to do more than suggest the outline of a theory which, I submit, accounts for the facts, which I hope are correctly stated. Mr. Leslie Stephen has said that a true theory is able to account for the prevalence of partial and even false systems by bringing to light and giving scope for the element of truth which each contains.

F. Ernest Spencer.

ART. III.—"THE YEAR THAT TARTAN CAME UNTO ASHDOD" (ISA. XX.).

IT is now more than half a century ago since that brilliant, penetrating genius the Rev. Edward Hincks, guided possibly by the identity of the second and third syllables, was able to pick out in the inscriptions of Sargon the three consecutive cuneiform characters which form the name *As-du-du*, Ashdod.[1] Despite the long interval that has since elapsed, and all that has been written on the subject, there is reason to think that the records of Sargon's campaign against Ashdod, thus early discovered, have not yet received all the attention they deserve. The correspondence in this passage of history between the Assyrian inscriptions and Holy Writ is so close that it calls for the fullest and most minute investigation. True it is that, from a literary standpoint, the inscriptions of Assyria are often exceedingly bald, thus presenting a strange contrast to the inspired writings. Nevertheless, the details they furnish and the very phrases employed throw a strong light on the Bible, both on prophecy and narrative, and so help to clear up some of the numerous difficulties which confront the thoughtful student. I propose, therefore, to lay before my readers the accounts which Sargon has left us of his Ashdod campaign, and then to examine their bearing on that remarkable and difficult passage, Isa. xx.

In the Nineveh Gallery of the British Museum, Table-case C, are the fragments of two cylinders containing the Annals of Sargon, King of Assyria, 722-705 B.C. One of these cylinders is unique, in that a portion of it, marked K. 4818, and bearing the library stamp, "Palace of Sargon, King of Assyria," is adorned with figures, so that we seem to have here an *édition de luxe* of the contemporary history of the day. But that which constitutes the chief interest of these shattered fragments in the eye of the archæologist and historian is that they furnish certain dates and details either not found in, or seemingly at variance with, the better-known Annals of Sargon, written on the palace walls at Khorsabad.[2] Let us, then, pick out from the débris in Table-case C one particularly precious morsel — the fragment Sm. 2022, marked No. 4, on the floor of the case. Sm. 2022 is one

[1] Hincks' communication to the Royal Irish Society was made in June, 1849, only two and a half years after the first Assyrian marbles sent to Europe had found a home in the Museum of the Louvre.

[2] See "Die Keilschrifttexte Sargons," by H. Winckler, vol. i., Introduction, pp. xi, xii.

of the larger of the small fragments, and has two inscribed faces. The longer face, with which we are concerned, is about 1½ inches in height, and has a dividing line drawn across it near the bottom. Immediately below this line, and somewhat to the left, there can be seen with the help of a magnifying-glass a group of nine cuneiform indentations, arranged in three parallel horizontal rows. Even the uninitiated will easily understand that we have here a representation of the number "9." It is this group, then, which gives to the fragment its special interest, for it tells us, as I am about to show, "the year that Tartan came unto Ashdod." Now, since this coming of the Tartan, or Assyrian commander-in-chief, to Ashdod was the beginning of the Ashdod troubles, it may be well for me to place before my readers a literal translation of this fragment, not omitting the portion above the dividing line, which, as we shall see, has an important bearing on what follows. The fragment Sm. 2022, then, may be thus translated:

"as a spoil . . . . . .
Matti, of the country of Atunâ,[1] who to [Mita of]
the country of Muska[2] trusted . . . . . .
the capture of Amris[3] and his spoiling . . .
saw, and his heart trembled. For [to pay]
tribute to the yoke of the god Ashur [they sent]
their envoy, who a message [of grace]
to the country of Sikris[4] in the country of Media
to my presence brought, and [kissed my feet.]"

"In my 9th year. . . . . .
. . . great . . . . . .
. . . . Ashdod . . . . . ."

The above fragment presents two difficulties. In the first place, the portion above the dividing line, which must, of course, refer to Sargon's eighth year, records the capture of Amris and the sending of tribute by Matti and others to the King of Assyria in Media as taking place in that same eighth year; whereas in the better-known Annals from Khorsabad

---

[1] Atunâ, or Tunna, possibly the Dana of Xenophon's "Anabasis," lib. i., cap. ii., 20, on the northern slope of the Taurus, from which a pass, called the Cilician Gates, led over into Cilicia.

[2] Muskâ, or Muski, the Meshech of Gen. x. 2 and Ezek. xxxviii. 2.

[3] Amris, or Ambaris, King of Tabal, was Sargon's son-in-law. He had received from Sargon the neighbouring province of Cilicia as a dowry along with his daughter. His subsequent rebellion called forth the bitter reproaches of the Assyrian king. Tabal—the Tubal of Gen. x. 2—lay to the north of Cilicia, and was bordered on the north-east by Muskâ.

[4] Sikris was one of six Median provinces conquered by Sargon in his sixth year, and which revolted from him in the following year. See Winckler's version of the annals, lines 73 and 84.

the capture and carrying off of Amris are set down under Sargon's ninth year, in which year also, as in our fragment, the Great King is represented as carrying on a campaign in Media and the Far East. Now, as the annals in this portion reach us in *two* versions—viz., from Halls II. and V. of the palace at Khorsabad—there can be no mistake as to the correctness of the date given.[1] Are we, then, to suppose the number "9" on fragment Sm. 2022 to be a mere slip of the pen? This also is out of the question. To form the number "9" the scribe had to make nine indentations. To form the number "10," which would make our fragment tally with the Khorsabad Annals, only one, or at the most two, indentations would be required.[2] Equally unlikely is it that the scribe who wrote Sm. 2022 should have been in ignorance of the exact date of the recent events he was recording. But the best proof that the "9" is neither a slip of the pen nor an error of ignorance is afforded by another small fragment, Sm. 2021, also to be found in Table-case C, and which Winckler justly regards as belonging to the same cylinder as Sm. 2022. The fragment Sm. 2021, which is also marked with a dividing line, reads as follows:

". . . . . together with their dwellings
a heavy spoil I carried off . . . . . ."

"In my 5th year, which in . . . . . .
Assurli, king of the country of Karalla . . ."

Here we notice a difference in the number of the year exactly similar to that in Sm. 2022, seeing that the revolt of Assurli of Karalla, here set down under Sargon's fifth year, is in the Annals assigned to the sixth year, no mention being there made of that king and his country under the fifth year.[3] The conclusion is thus inevitable, first, that the fragments Sm. 2021 and Sm. 2022 are portions of one and the same cylinder, and, second, that the reckoning of time on this cylinder, supposing the year to begin with the same month Nisan, is one year later than the reckoning adopted in the Annals. In other words, the Annals make Sargon's reign to commence in the year B.C. 722, his accession year; whereas our cylinder, which, after Winckler, we will call Cylinder B,

[1] The carrying off of Amris in Sargon's ninth year is vouched for by the inscriptions on two slabs given by Winckler in "Die Keilschrifttexte Sargons." See vol. ii., p. 7, plate 14, lines 6 and 9; also p. 18, plate 38, lines 12 and 14.

[2] If a three-cornered stylus were used, it could be done with a twist of the instrument in one stroke, or at any rate without taking the stylus off the clay.

[3] See Winckler's version of the Annals, lines 58-64.

regards 721 B.C. as the commencement of the reign.[1] From this conclusion we obtain the following remarkable result: The capture of Samaria is assigned by the Annals to the accession year of Sargon, and recorded as the very first event in his reign. But according to this new reckoning of time on Cylinder B, that event would not be included in the reign of Sargon at all, but would be looked upon as falling in the reign of his predecessor, Shalmaneser IV. When, then, it is objected that our sacred records in 2 Kings xvii. 3-6 assign the capture of Samaria to Shalmaneser, we can answer that they are no more at fault than Cylinder B, which from its ornate decoration may well have been intended for one of Sargon's palace halls.[2]

The second difficulty in Sm. 2022 is connected with the mention of Ashdod in the part below the dividing line. According to the reckoning of time adopted on this fragment, something must have happened at Ashdod at the beginning of Sargon's ninth year—*i.e.*, at the beginning of the tenth year, according to the better-known reckoning of the Annals, the year 712 B.C. Now, when we turn to the Annals and examine the record of this tenth year, we find no mention whatever of Ashdod. Not till we come to the second and closing portion of the record for the eleventh year do we meet with the account of the famous campaign against that city.[3] What, then, is the solution of this second difficulty? Simply this: that the mention of Ashdod on the fragment Sm. 2022 does not refer to the siege of that town, which, as just stated, forms the second and closing event in the record for the following year, but in all probability does refer to the first of those political events which led up to the siege—viz., the coming of the Tartan to Ashdod. To make this plain, I will now give the different accounts of the Ashdod imbroglio found in the inscriptions of Sargon, beginning with the one

---

[1] I can give no explanation of this. The reckoning cannot be from Sargon's eponym year, which was 709 B.C. See Schrader's "Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament," vol. ii., p. 184.

[2] The fragment K. 4818, mentioned above as being adorned with figures, is regarded by Winckler as belonging to Cylinder B—*i.e.*, to the same cylinder as Sm. 2022. For another and excellent explanation of the difficulty in 2 Kings xvii. 3-6, see Sayce's "Higher Criticism," pp. 419, 420.

[3] For the capture of Ashdod as happening in Sargon's eleventh year, see the inscription on the slab which figures as plate 27 on p. 13 of vol. ii. of Winckler's work. The rebellion of Azuri is mentioned in line 6 of the inscription; then, a little further on, in line 13, we read, "In my *twelfth* year." Compare also p. 14, plate 30, line 2, "In my twelfth year," and note the verbal accordance between plate 30, lines 1, 2, and plate 27, lines 12 and 13.

in the Annals (lines 215-228) already referred to, which runs thus:

215 ". . . . . Azuri, King of Ashdod, not to bring
tribute his heart was set, and to the kings in his neighbourhood
proposals of rebellion against Assyria he sent. Because of the evil he did, over the men
of his land I changed his lordship. Akhimiti, his own brother, to sovereignty
over them I appointed. The Khatte,[1] plotting rebellion, hated his lordship; and
220 Yatna, who had no title to the throne, who like themselves
the reverence due to my lordship did not acknowledge, they set up over them.
In the wrath of my heart, riding in my war chariot,[2] with my cavalry,
who do not retreat from the place whither I turn my hands, to Ashdod,
his royal city, I marched in haste. Ashdod, Gimtu,
225 Asdudimmu, I besieged and captured. The gods dwelling therein, himself,
together with the people of his land, gold, silver, [the treasures] of his palace, I counted for a spoil.
Those towns I built anew. People of the countries conquered by my hands I settled therein, my officers as governors over them I set,
and with the people of Assyria I numbered them, and
228 they bore my yoke. In my twelfth year Marduk-apal-iddina,"[3] etc.

The above extract forms, as already stated, the second and closing portion of the record given in the Annals under Sargon's eleventh year, 711 B.C., the earlier portion of the record for this year being occupied with the account of the expedition against Muttallu of Gamgum.[4] Very similar to this account of the siege of Ashdod is the one given in the Great Inscription of Khorsabad, lines 90-112. As, however, this latter contains some additional particulars, and especially one remarkable variation, the usurper Yatna being here styled Yamani, I subjoin the closing portion of it (lines 97-112), which reads thus:

97 "In the rage of my heart the main body of my army
I did not muster, I did not collect my munition of war.
With my warriors, who the place whither I turn
100 my hands do not retreat from, to Ashdod
I marched. Now he, Yamani, the advance of my expedition
heard of from afar, and to the frontier of Egypt[5]
on the border of the country of Melukhkha he fled.
His whereabouts was not seen. Ashdod, Gimtu, Asdudimmu,

---

[1] *I.e.*, Hittites, men of the land of Heth. See Pinches' "Old Testament," p. 322.

[2] Lit., "The chariot of my feet."

[3] The Merodach-baladan of Scripture.

[4] The same order is observed in the Great Inscription of Khorsabad, the campaign against Gamgum immediately preceding that against Ashdod.

[5] *Mutsuri* = Heb. מצור, Isa. xix. 6 and xxxvii. 25.

105 I besieged, I captured. His gods, his wife, his sons, his daughters,
the goods, treasures, and valuables of his palace, with the people of
his land,
I counted for a spoil. Those towns anew . . . . . .
I built. People of the countries conquered by my hands,
who within . . . of the rising sun, I settled therein, and my
officers over them I appointed, with the men of Assyria I
numbered them, and they bore my yoke. The king of Melukhkha
110 who, within . . . . . an inaccessible region, a path . . . .
. . . who from ancient days, the *ádu* of Nannar, his fathers
to the kings my fathers
their messengers did not send to inquire after their welfare, the
might of Ashur Nebo and Merodach[1] [he heard of] from afar, and
the dread of my royal splendour overwhelmed him, and fear
overpowered him.
112 Into strong fetters, iron bonds, he cast him; to Assyria the road [he
caused him to take, and] brought him to my presence."

With the close of the above extract, compare the following brief notice in the Inscription from Hall XIV. of the palace at Khorsabad:

"Yamani of Ashdod feared my arms; his wife, his sons, his daughters,
he left, and to the frontier of Egypt on the border of Melukhkha he
fled, and sat him down like a *sharaku*.[2] Over the whole of his
wide land and scattered people my officers
as governors I appointed, and I increased the realm of Ashur, the king
of the gods.
. . . [the king] of Melukhkha, the brightness of Ashur my lord
overwhelmed him, he put iron bonds on his hands and feet, and
caused him to be brought to Assyria to my presence."

Other short notices of the campaign against Ashdod are as follows: First, in the Inscriptions on the Pavement of the Doors, No. IV., Sargon is described as the hero,

"who took Samaria and the whole land of Beth-Omri, who carried
captive Ashdod";

in which passage the association of Samaria with Ashdod has no historical or chronological signification, but is purely geographical. Again, in the Bull Inscription, lines 17-21, we read of Sargon as

17 "Carrying captive the princes of Carchemish, Hamath,
Kummukh, and Ashdod, the wicked Khatte, who do not
fear the name of the gods and plot rebellions: who over
the whole of their land appointed his officers as prefects, and
numbered them with the people of Assyria."

There now only remains the most interesting, but sadly obliterated, account of the Ashdod campaign, found by the

[1] Sargon's three favourite divinities, regarded by him as the bestowers of sovereign power, Assur being the national god of Assyria, Nebo and Merodach the gods of the mother-city of Babylon.

[2] I am unable to explain this expression.

late Mr. George Smith of the British Museum on the broken cylinder which Winckler calls Cylinder A. This cylinder is marked "No. 1" on the floor of Table-case C, and entered as K. 1668+D.T. 6 in the Museum Guide. Mr. Smith very naturally looked on the fragments Sm. 2022 and K. 1668 as well-nigh contiguous parts of the same cylinder. He therefore joined them together, and filling in the lacunæ with that skill in which he stands unrivalled, furnished us with the translation given in Chapter xv. of his "Assyrian Discoveries." Experts, however, have since decided that Sm. 2022 and K. 1668 belong to different cylinders; and, even if their judgment in this instance should be at fault, it would still be impossible to join on Sm. 2022 to K. 1668. For, as we have already seen, the lower part of Sm. 2022 refers to the ninth year of Sargon—*i.e.*, to the tenth year according to the reckoning adopted in the Annals—whilst the siege of Ashdod, recorded on K. 1668, belongs to the eleventh year according to the annalistic reckoning. The great interest which attaches to the account given on K. 1668 warrants me in presenting it to my readers in its entirety.[1] The record reads thus:

"from . . . . . .
Akhimiti . . . . . .
his own brother, over [them] . . . . . .
tribute and gift . . . . . .
as of kings [former] . . . . . .
on him I placed . . . . . .
The wicked people . . . . . .
not to bring tribute . . . . . .
[they planned, and] . . . . . .
their prince, revolt . . . . . .
. . . . . .
they expelled him . . . . . .
Yamani, a soldier . . . . . .
to sovereignty over them [on the throne] . .
of his lordship they set [him, and] . . . . .
their city . . . . . .
of battle . . . . . .
. . . . . ,
. . . . . .
. . . . together . . . . . .
. . . its environs, a moat . . . . . .
. . . cubits in depth . . . . . .
they reached the underground waters.[2] In order to . . . [The people]
of Philistia, Judah, E[dom],

[1] For the fragment K. 1668 in the cuneiform, see "Die Keilschrifttexte Sargons," vol. ii., plate 44.

[2] This was the plan adopted by Merodach-baladan when fortifying Dur-Yakin. See the Great Inscription of Khorsabad, line 128. Jerusalem could have no such defences; nevertheless, "There the LORD will be with us in majesty," says Isaiah (xxxiii. 21), "*a place of broad rivers and*

Moab, dwelling beside the sea,[1] bringing the tribute [and]
gift of Ashur, my lord, ...
speaking seditions, acting with base wickedness,
who, in order to stir up rebellion against me, to Pharaoh
King of Egypt, a prince who did not save them,[2]
brought their offerings of peace, and requested of him
an alliance. I, Sargon, the lawful prince,[3]
reverencing the oath of Nebo and Merodach, guarding
the name of Ashur, the Tigris and Euphrates,
when the surging flood was at its height, the flower of my army
as on dry land I caused to march through. Now he, Yamani,
their king, who to his [own strength]
trusted, and did not submit to my lordship,
the advance of my expedition from afar he heard of, and
the brightness of Ashur, my lord, overwhelmed him, and
. . . . . of the bank of the river
. . . . . waters
. . . . . .
. . . . . distant
. . . . . he fled
. . . . . Ashdod."

The reader is now in possession of the different historical texts bearing on the campaign against Ashdod, and he will see that they furnish us with a fairly circumstantial account of the sequence of political events which led up to and ended in the siege and capture of that town. In the first place, Azuri, King of Ashdod, deliberately refused to pay the wonted tribute to Assyria, and attempted to stir up rebellion amongst the neighbouring States. This led Sargon to depose Azuri, and set his brother Akhimiti on the throne. In order to effect this, he must have despatched an armed force to Ashdod. It is in all probability the despatch of such a force, and the successful achievement of the end in view, which were recorded on the fragment Sm. 2022 below the dividing line. As the prophet Isaiah informs us, this first expedition to Ashdod was led by the Tartan. Possibly this may be the reason why it was not thought worthy to be recorded in the Annals under Sargon's tenth year, 712 B.C. But when we come to the eleventh year, 711 B.C., and the annalist very properly and suitably records the whole series of events leading up to the siege, two things at once strike us: first, that all these events could not possibly have happened in the single year 711 B.C.; and secondly, as stated above, that a force must have previously

---

streams, wherein shall go no galley with oars, neither shall gallant ship pass thereby."

[1] *Matu Piliste, matu Yaüdi, matu U*[*dumu*], *matu Mâbi asibût tamtim.*

[2] *Pir'u, sar matu Mutsri, malku la musezibusunu.* Compare Isa. xxx. 5, 7.

[3] In allusion to the meaning of the name Sargon.

been despatched at the beginning of the troubles to accomplish the deposition of Azuri and the placing of Akhimiti on the throne. On the retirement of this force sedition must again have broken out in Ashdod, for it appears that the anti-Assyrian party were able, after a longer or shorter interval, once more to get the upper hand, to expel Akhimiti, and to set up in his stead a Greek adventurer, Yatna-Yamani. The town was then strongly fortified and surrounded by a moat. This could easily be done, owing to the abundance of water from the hills of Judah, which finds its way to the sea underneath the plains of Philistia, a little below the surface of the ground. These are "the underground waters" of which Sargon speaks. Meanwhile, the news of what was going on at Ashdod appears to have reached the Great King at the beginning of his eleventh year, according to the reckoning of the annalist—viz., in the spring of 711 B.C., at a time when, through the melting of the snows in Armenia, the Tigris and Euphrates were at their height. So enraged was Sargon that, without waiting to collect a large force, he started off at once with a picked body of cavalry, crossed those rivers in flood, and marched with all speed to the disaffected province. Such, at least, is his own account, but I shall presently adduce reasons which lead me to think that he did not reach Ashdod so soon as we might expect from the description of his march, but stopped on his way to put down a revolt in the country of Gamgum. In hastening to the West, Sargon tells us that he was urged on not merely by wrath, but by the intelligence that the whole of Southern Syria, including Judah, Edom, and Moab, as well as Philistia, was ripe for revolt, relying on ample promises of support from Pharoah, King of Egypt. His object, therefore, was to prevent a very dangerous rebellion, and in this, as he assures us, he was completely successful. For at the mere report of the advance of the Assyrian force, and whilst his foes were still at a distance, the adventurer Yamani fled to Melukhkha, a country on the Egyptian frontier, leaving Ashdod and her daughter towns apparently an easy prey to the invader. If anything were wanting to complete this success, it was supplied by the action of the King of Melukhkha. Through the special grace of Ashur, Nebo, and Merodach, this monarch, whose ancestors from the remotest ages had never paid homage to Assyria, was so affected by the splendour of Sargon's arms that he threw the fugitive into chains and handed him over to the Great King.

CHARLES BOUTFLOWER.

ART. IV.—THE VIRGIN BIRTH OF CHRIST.

WHY IS IT AFFIRMED IN SCRIPTURE? AND IS IT "A TEST CASE" OF THE TRUTH OF CHRISTIANITY?

THE subject of the Virgin Birth of Christ has recently become, to an unusual degree, a matter of public controversy. It seems, therefore, well to raise the question, Why and in what character is the subject stated in Scripture?

In the *Nineteenth Century and After* for September, 1904, Mr. Mallock, in controversy with the Bishop of Worcester and Dr. Sanday, states that "there are four great miracles" which the Bishop declares to be essential and refuses to abandon—viz., Christ's Virgin Birth, His Godhead, His Resurrection, and His Ascension. From these four he selects one, the Virgin Birth, and says: "The reality of this miracle we may take as a test case."

But in attempting to make this the special test of the truth of the Christian religion is he not making a very serious blunder? Is the subject set before us in Scripture in that character? and is it reasonable to regard such an event as if it were, or could be, suited to be "a test case," and be sustainable by evidence acceptable to an opponent or a doubter of the Christian religion?

An essential element in the religion of the Gospel it may be without being therefore adapted to be "a test case" of the truth of that religion. And Christians who accept the Virgin Birth as a historical fact and as an essential because it is affirmed in the Gospels (whether or not it seems to them to be an essential on grounds of speculative theology) may reasonably deny that it can be argued as "a test case," without implying thereby any doubt on their part of the historical accuracy of the Gospel statements.

The point at issue in this paper is simply the suitability or otherwise of this particular miracle to be argued between believers and unbelievers as "a test-case" of the truth of Christianity. And, further, if it be not offered in Scripture as an evidence of Christianity, nor suited to be discussed as "a test case" of its truth, why is it affirmed in Scripture?

Mr. Mallock would doubtless not object to be classed among unbelievers. Yet as such he has no proper status in the consideration of this subject.

Not once in the whole New Testament is the subject urged upon unbelievers to convince them of the truth of Christianity, or as one of the bases of the religion.

The Resurrection of Christ was so urged continually. The Apostles were distinctively "witnesses of His Resurrection."

They had repeatedly seen the risen Christ. On that matter they were willing to face the world at all hazards. But on the subject of the Virgin Birth they maintained, so far as we know, a reverent silence in controversy with unbelief.

Why, then, and in what character, is the subject stated in Scripture?

As a partial *explanation* of God's method in providing a sinless Saviour for a sinful race—*an explanation granted to faith*, not a subject offered to unbelief as a "test" of the truth of the religion.

As it was in the early days of Christianity so it is still. The wondrous personality of the Lord Jesus claims reverence, His words of holiness and mercy to sinners touch consciences and win love. Then the question may arise in the hearts and on the lips of His true disciples as of old: "What manner of man is this?"

That winds and waves should obey Him was a light thing in comparison with this, that He spoke, and though now unseen, still speaks to the consciences and hearts of all kinds of people, and they "obey Him," confessing their sins and loving Him as their Saviour. And yet this Preacher of repentance, with unique power over the consciences of others, stands Himself apart from others, with a calm conscience, knowing no repentance and claiming to be free from sin walking upon the waves of this troublesome world! A wondrous Man truly! so tender in His sympathy even with the vilest, and yet "separate from sinners"; not in outward show like the Pharisees, but evidently separate in character and life, as both friends and foes could see—ay, and can see still. But more: He not only stirs the conscience to repentance; He also says: "Thy sins be forgiven thee." And while objectors ask, "Who is this that forgiveth sins also?" to humble penitents in some mysterious way His word comes as a word of power, calming the troubled conscience; and the gentle, sympathetic Jesus becomes, as it were, transfigured, until He who is more truly than any other "the Son of Man" is seen to be also "the Son of God."

To some of those who have received Him on evidence and by experience as the sinless Saviour, God incarnate, the revelation of His Virgin Birth is not an isolated wonder, not the figment of a credulous imagination, not a legend of the past; but it is a part, and perhaps comparatively a small part, in the great revelation of God's infinite love to man—a detail in a vast plan of superhuman wisdom and grace, yet a detail that is far more suggestive to reverent faith than would have been an entirely new creation of a Man (or, rather, a manlike Being) *not* of our flesh and blood to be our Saviour—if, indeed, such

a Being could have been our Saviour according to the Divine method and purpose, which seem to require *a Redeemer with a right to redeem His brethren.*

And, further, this detail of His Incarnation is not an isolated miracle, because it is wonderfully in harmony with very much else past and present in God's dealings with humanity from the days of Eden until now. For from the Divine purpose recorded in Gen. i. 26-28 to the end of the Bible, and onward to the present time, God's dealings with man have been one consistent whole of gracious love, transcending human thought, including forbearance with sinners, tender mercy to the penitent, however vile, the use of man's moral evil for man's probation and education, the use of manhood to effect salvation, and of forgiven sinners to preach the Gospel of salvation; the agency of His Holy Spirit in the heart of sinners to lead them to repentance and to sanctify them, making them fit to be His instruments of blessing to others, and culminating in "those good things that pass man's understanding that God has prepared for them that love Him."

And, turning to science, we may see that, as there is nothing too great in the universe for the infinitely great God who rules over all, so there is nothing too small for Him, and microscopic cells are as truly part of His universe as are gigantic suns illuminating space; and, moreover, microscopic cells may be the embryos of the most wonderful of His living creatures upon earth.

Thus, the Incarnation, although probably the greatest manifestation of Divine condescension and love, is not out of harmony with the universe of Nature, but is rather a crown of glory for Nature, and especially for man, preparing for that manifestation of the liberty of the glory of the children of God for which creation waits (see Rom. viii.), when glorified humanity shall inherit the fulness of the Spirit, and Christ shall be all and in all.

The Virgin Birth of Christ is one of the inner truths of Christianity. As such it rightly stands in the creeds of believers; but it is not a matter to be discussed with unbelievers as if it were, or in its nature could be, a "test" of the truth of the religion. Indeed, it seems strange and unreasonable that on such a point Christians should even for a moment consent to discuss the evidences with unbelievers.

If a believer were to offer to discuss the Virgin Birth with an unbeliever, he would do a foolish thing, *as he has not evidence to offer of a kind acceptable to an unbeliever.* Similarly, if an unbeliever proposes to make it "a test case" of the truth of Christianity, he is acting unfairly, for he

must surely be aware that he is unready to receive any evidence that can now be offered.

But this is a totally different thing from being able to disprove the reality of the event. There are many facts and realities, *even in our own experience,* of which we cannot offer demonstrative evidence to anyone, nor even probable evidence to an objector who is predisposed to doubt that particular in our own personal experience. Yet the fact remains a fact.

The case for the Resurrection of Christ is greatly different from that for the Virgin Birth. The Resurrection of Christ is definitely and emphatically set before us in Scripture, and was affirmed in Jerusalem shortly after the event, as a case in which the evidence of "witnesses" was offered, and that not hesitatingly, but vigorously and triumphantly. It is quite evident that the Apostles and their companions, when their own preliminary doubts were dispelled by overwhelming evidence, bore their own testimony to the fact, without the slightest fear that their testimony could be overthrown. The evidence is cumulative, and very much stronger than that required by the English courts of law to hang a man for murder.

The modern reasons for slighting that evidence and denying the fact are chiefly founded (directly or indirectly) on difficulties of thought in reference to body, soul, spirit, and "spiritual body," which are not for the present explicable by the theories or resources of science. But as we have been taught recently in the name of science, accepted hypotheses are not sufficient reasons for refusing evidence that is inconsistent with them. The evidence should be considered upon its own merits without prejudice.

Let the subject of the Resurrection of Christ be discussed in all its bearings fully and fairly without prejudice. It is the true "test case." But the Virgin Birth is not in Scripture "a test case," and it surely ought not to be so regarded now.

If the Resurrection of Christ be not true and real, the Virgin Birth needs no consideration. But if St. Paul's evidence and logic are correct, Christ is risen from the dead, the Gospel of Christ is true and, we may add, therefore the positive statements in Scripture of the Virgin Birth of Christ are believable, and throw some light on the profound mystery of the Incarnation of "the Word of God," by which He became a Member of our sinful race, "yet without sin."

The Creeds are not apologies for Christianity, but expressions of faith, and so they contain some statements not suited for discussion as "tests" of the truth of Christianity. *E.g.*, an unbeliever has no status for discussion of "the forgiveness of sins" as "a test case"; but to him who can honestly say,

"I believe in the forgiveness of sins," those words express a precious truth to be enjoyed, but not to be discussed with those who do not appreciate sin and forgiveness.

There are other "tests" on which Christians and unbelievers may discuss fairly, upon data acceptable by both sides, which is the essential of fair discussion. And Christians make a great mistake in undertaking a timid defence instead of a vigorous attack, after the example of the Apostles.

May God grant us more Apostolic Bishops!

Though the Virgin Birth of Christ is not a "test" to be discussed with unbelievers, believers may produce arguments to strengthen weak faith and to repel the attacks of unbelief.

Objection is raised on physiological grounds, and it is affirmed that Virgin Birth would not secure its supposed purpose, because heredity proves that a child derives its "imperfections" from the mother, as well as from the father.

This argument on the part of those who assert the impossibility of such a birth seems to be unsound, for the very assertion in the name of science of the impossibility of Virgin Birth establishes the great importance of the fact that they deny and yet seek to minimize. Neither physiology nor psychology are as yet competent to decide on some of the questions involved. But at present the unbelievers seem to agree that such a birth, if it took place, would be a miracle; and in this they are in agreement with both St. Mary and the angel.

But if God chooses to intervene by a miracle, can human science decide exactly what and how much will be the effect of the miracle?

According to the Scripture revelation, the result of the Incarnation, of which the Virgin Birth was a detail, was a real and complete Man, truly of Adam's race, inheriting human weaknesses, "touched with the feeling of our infirmities . . . in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin" (Heb. iv. 15). And while He was really and truly one of our race, He was also "the second man," "the last Adam," by the power of the life-giving Spirit of God.

E. SEELEY.

ART. V.—STUDIES ON ISAIAH: THE ASSYRIAN INVASION.

CHAP. VII. 17-25; X. 5-38.

THE arrangement of the matter in this passage is a task of extreme difficulty. Whether the sequence of the prophecies was dislocated at an early period, or whether their alternation is to be accounted for on the principle of the swing of the pendulum[1]—that is, the habit of the Hebrew prophets, and of Isaiah especially, to interwine passages of hope and promise with their warnings and threatenings—is by no means certain. Chap. vii. 17-25 (with which we may connect chap. viii. 5-8) seems to fit in with chap. x. 5-11. Then comes a passage (chap. x. 12-19) in which God's judgment is pronounced on Assyria for its pride. This appears closely linked with what precedes. Then follows the prophecy that, amid all the afflictions of Judah, she shall not utterly lose her national existence, as the other nations have done (chap. x. 20 - 27). This, again, seems in close connection with what precedes. Then (chap. x. 28-32) a sudden change of subject takes place. The invasion of the Assyrian from the north is vividly pictured. The change is so abrupt that one is almost compelled to infer a dislocation of the text here, though the modern critic elects to follow Professor Robertson Smith in suggesting a conjectural emendation of a confessedly difficult text. But conjectural emendations are always hazardous, and rarely scientific. It is easy to denounce, as one critic does, "the meaningless clause in the English version."[2] But the difficulty here, as every scholar may see who takes pains, is as old as the LXX., which gives us quite as "meaningless" a "clause" (reading *shichmaychem*, your shoulders, for *shemen*, oil). Then, again, there is another sudden reversion to the former prophecy of the destruction of the Assyrian power. And with this the chapter concludes. It is impossible under the circumstances to do other in our exposition of chap. x. 5-34 than follow the passage as it stands.

1. *The Judgment upon Jerusalem* (chap. vii. 17-25).—We have already reviewed the political situation—the three parties which existed at Jerusalem: one for submission to Rezin and Pekah, and for the establishment of a new dynasty; one for seeking the protection of the great and increasing power of Assyria; and one, headed by Isaiah, for placing one's confidence in the Divine protection alone. This last, the party

[1] See CHURCHMAN for December, p. 125.

[2] The Revised Version is involved in this condemnation.

of faith in God, has always been, and is still, in the minority at a crisis. Accordingly, the prophet now threatens Judah with the judgments which must follow on her unbelief and disobedience. A worse calamity (ver. 17) has not befallen her since the secession of the Ten Tribes under Jeroboam. Egypt, as well as Assyria, shall fall upon her—a prophecy fulfilled, be it observed, in the invasion of Sennacherib, and in the subsequent overthrow and death of Josiah at the hands of Pharaoh-Necho (1 Kings xxiii. 29, 30; 2 Chron. xxxv. 20-24). It should be noted that this last event did not occur till more than one hundred years after the time of Isaiah, and that there was little in the condition of Egypt in his time to enable him to foresee it by ordinary means. We need have no hesitation in saying that criticism of the contents of the prophetical Scriptures, however minute, if it only be rational and impartial, must entirely dissipate the idea that prophecy is impossible except in the sense of intelligent anticipation of what is likely to happen.[1] Ver. 20 implies the *thoroughness* of Judah's humiliation and the indignities offered to her sons, as implied by the shaving of their bodies—a gross insult in the eyes of an Oriental (2 Sam. x. 4). The eating of butter and honey (ver. 22; *cf.* 15) signifies the destruction of all the crops of "corn, wine, and oil," and the necessity of subsisting on the natural products of the land, as well as on the milk and butter with which their scanty flocks could supply them. The vines (vers. 23-25) shall be destroyed. The terraces for vine and olive, carefully dug over and hoed in prosperous times, shall be—as, indeed, they are now in the hill-country of Judæa—waste and desolate, covered with briars and thorns, or trampled down by cattle.[2] In chap. viii. 5-8 the punishment is definitely stated to be in consequence of the treachery to Jahveh involved in the proposition to overthrow the Davidic dynasty, and to substitute submisssion to apostate Israel and its ally. We cannot but be struck with the close similarity between the allusions here to the Assyrian invasion and the more detailed vision of it in chap. x. 28-32.

2. *The Pride of the Assyrian* (chap. x. 5-11).—The *reason* of the permission given to the Assyrian monarch to lay waste Judæa and to threaten Jerusalem is here once more repeated. The insolence of the conqueror, and his claim to regard Jahveh, God of Israel, as merely a tribal deity, like the gods of the other nations, is next dwelt upon. This passage is, I

[1] See preliminary observations.

[2] The difficulty in ver. 25 is best removed by adopting the translation in the margin of R.V., though even that requires some particle not found in the present text. The LXX. evades the difficulty by altogether leaving out the word translated "fear," and substituting a paraphrase.

believe, on all hands admitted to be a prophecy, though not a prophecy which was beyond the power of the unassisted intellect of man. Yet, at least, we ought not to pass it by without observing its complete and literal fulfilment (chap. xxxvi. 16-20). The prophet takes care to assure Judah that the Assyrian is but the minister of Jahveh's vengeance on a corrupt and unbelieving people. The invader himself does not think so. He imagines that he is all wisdom and power and superiority. His officers are on a level with the kings of the people whose territories he invades. He proudly enumerates all the conquests he has made (*cf.* chap. xxxvi. 19). From the invader's point of view this was not a vainglorious boast. Carchemish, though not yet, apparently, finally annexed, had frequently been taken, and was at this time under Assyrian influence. Calno, if properly identified by the critics, was taken shortly after Arpad (chap. xxxvi. 21). Arpad itself was captured about 738 B.C., in the victorious advance of Tiglath-Pileser. Hamath, in the mouth of the great valley between Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon, was reduced about the same time. Damascus fell in or about 732, not long after Isaiah's prophecy about the two "smoking stumps," Rezin and Pekah. The fall of Samaria was delayed till 721, it having endured a three years' siege. Thus, humanly speaking, his self-glorification was not without reason. And so he dares to confound Israel's God with the gods of the surrounding nations. A terrible judgment is therefore prophesied for him, a prophecy which was strikingly fulfilled. Yet, on the modern critical view, where was his mistake? Jahveh, we have repeatedly been told, *was* nothing but a tribal deity after all, and therefore not to be distinguished from the gods of the surrounding nations. It is, at least, *some* difficulty in the way of this theory that the supposed "tribal deity" of an obscure hill-folk in Palestine, whose resources and riches were far below that of other nations whom Sennacherib and his predecessors had subdued (ver. 10), is stated, in documents which have not yet been proved unhistorical, to have been revealed to Abraham and Moses. He is worshipped still by countless millions, on the strength of those and subsequent revelations. In spite of the invasion of Judæa in full strength by the mightiest monarch of the world at that time; in spite of the cowering of even good King Hezekiah before him; in spite of the captivity at Babylon, the return to Jerusalem of a weak and despised remnant, and their ultimate dispersion after the destruction of their city by the Roman power;—in spite of all this, the walls of millions of temples throughout the world echo to the cry in regard to this "tribal deity": "Jahveh,

He is the God! Jahveh, He is the God!" Is there nothing in this beyond the reach of human sagacity and foresight—nothing which conflicts with the "undisputed conclusions" of modern criticism and modern enlightenment?[1] This passage is a rehearsal beforehand of the actual language of Sennacherib recorded in chap. xxxvii. 12, 13.

3. *God's Sentence on the Assyrian* (vers. 12-19).—When the Assyrian has performed the task assigned him by the Lord of the whole earth, he, too, as well as Israel, shall suffer the punishment due to his pride and cruelty. For his pride, see above and ver. 12; for his cruelty, see vers. 13, 14, 28-32. The same fate befell the other great Powers of the ancient world—Egypt, Babylon, Media, Persia, Greece, Rome—though it is remarkable that the last and greatest of these, Rome, did not disappear swiftly, like the others, but slowly and imperceptibly melted into a modern Christian society during the space of some 1,400 years. And this because, even in the Gentile world, there was moral growth and development, infinitely slow though it was. Assyrian and Babylonian power was possibly a declension from the earlier and worthier rule and religion of Egypt. But Persia, under Cyrus, was an advance upon Mesopotamia under Tiglath-Pileser and his successors, Assyrian and Babylonian. Greece surpassed Persia intellectually and even morally. And Rome was remarkable for her enthronement—albeit incomplete—of *law* in the place of force, and for this reason the break-up of her empire was slow, and it left permanent traces behind it.

It has already been said that the pride of the Assyrian conqueror was, humanly speaking, not altogether unreasonable. Not only had he subdued cities without number, but he inhabited the cradle of the human race—the territory where the Old Testament, which on this point has received no slight confirmation from modern scientific research, represents man as having been at first placed, because it was as a garden of God. We are told how it was watered by four noble rivers (Gen. ii. 10-14), which spread fertility and prosperity far around. The Egyptian power, since the days of Rameses II., had been crushed. The Hittite Empire had disappeared. Semitic Syria, though near the sea and watered by noble rivers, such as the Orontes, had not recovered sufficiently from the sway of her Turanian masters to consolidate herself into a world-power. The insignificant tribes

[1] If we are to regard ver. 9 as an allusion to a past event, and not a forecast of a future one, this prophecy is fixed for a far later date than that of chaps. vii. and viii., and, together with chaps. xi. and xii., it becomes a repetition of the prophecies in chaps. vii. to ix. But, if critically distinct, they are homiletically homogeneous.

of Palestine lay helpless and divided before the attack of a powerful and united nation. Their numbers were small, their resources—with the exception of those of Tyre and Sidon—contemptible. Tyre and Sidon themselves, civilized and wealthy though they were, were cities, and no more. They possessed no territory, and their resources were due to their foreign and sea-borne trade. They were the early prototypes of the great free cities of the Middle Ages, in Italy and the Low Countries especially.

All these failed eventually to maintain their freedom and separate existence against the consolidated and corporate life of great monarchies. Then, again, Israel—in spite of her admirable constitution, religious and civil, which seemed likely at one time to give her the sovereignty of the world—was no larger than Wales. Moab and Edom, mere strips of territory, were inhabited by mere uncivilized hordes. Philistia was little better. The hill country of Palestine, arid and bare, fed by mountain torrents which run dry in summer and rush rapidly to the ocean in winter, afforded comparatively little pasture for cattle, and cultivation was only carried on with great difficulty. The rolling hills of Moab—the *Mishor*, as they were called—were more fitted for cattle, but they could not, in this respect, compare with the plains of Esdraelon and Sharon, or the land of the Philistines, still less with the magnificent valley known to the Greeks as Cœle Syria, to the Hebrews as the Bik'ah, less still with Syria proper, and not at all with the land of Mesopotamia itself. If Mesopotamia is a desert now, it is by reason of misgovernment, or, rather, the absence of any government whatever. But in the infancy of civilization and of the human race it possessed resources with which it was as yet impossible for other lands to cope. There was reason, then, humanly speaking, for the haughtiness of one who possessed these resources, and possessed beside the power to organize and develop them—to weld them into the machinery of a world-power. Making allowance for the changed circumstances of the time, we find the Czar of All the Russias even now deluding himself into a similar misconception of his importance—making war with a light heart, and expecting all nations to be no more than the foils of his self-consequence. But Israel had long been taught (see Deuteronomy *passim*, which I must continue to regard, whoever may have been the author, to have been a production of the Mosaic age) that faithfulness to Jahveh, the Lord of the whole earth, was the sole condition of success and empire. And Judah was to have a remarkable confirmation in the catastrophe which happened to Sennacherib of the warning in Deut. viii. 17-

ix. 6. The human and natural element was not, of course, altogether wanting. The spirit of manliness fostered by conflict with natural difficulties, together with the inaccessibility of mountain fastnesses, have often compensated for a contracted territory and scanty resources. The history of Switzerland, Wales, and the Highlands are instances of this. And the visible and the human bulks larger in the minds of men than the invisible and the supernatural. Yet, however much we may be inclined to forget it, there is but one real and permanent source of prosperity—dependence upon God, and obedience to His holy will. Yet "the axe" is ever ready to "boast itself against him that heweth therewith." "The saw" is only too much inclined to "magnify itself against him that shaketh it."

But though "the kings of the earth may set themselves up, and the rulers take counsel together, against Jahveh and His Anointed, yet He that sitteth in the heavens will laugh them to scorn, and Jahveh shall have them in derision." So it has been, and so it shall be, with ourselves as with other nations. We all remember the stirring passage:

> "Come the three corners of the world in arms,
> And we shall shock them. Nought shall make us rue,
> If England to itself doth rest but true."
>
> "King John," Act V., Sc. vii.

But England can only be true to herself by being true to her God.

4. *The Prophecy of the Remnant* (vers. 20-27).—This, again, is clearly an instance of a prophecy which exceeds the bounds of ordinary intelligence. It was, doubtless, *suggested* by the captivity of Israel, and the imminent danger of Judah. But the only possible fulfilment of it was the return from the Babylonian captivity. No such event as the prophesied "return" of the "remnant" had ever been known. Yet this prophecy of the remnant was a portion of Isaiah's special mission to his countrymen. His son (chap. vii. 3) was named "The remnant shall return" (Shear-jashub), and those words are found *twice* in this prophecy (vers. 21, 22).[1] The prophecy

[1] The word *shear* (remnant) is described by Gesenius as "a word of the later Hebrew." It only occurs in Isaiah and in the confessedly post-exilic books. But, strange to say, it is found in the undisputed chapters of Isaiah (vii. 3, 20-22, xvii. 3, xxviii. 5), and in xi. 11, 16, xiv. 22, and xxi. 17. The two last prophecies are said ("Cambridge Bible for Schools," pp. lxviii, lxix) to have been written "near the end of the exile." Strange to say, the word *never appears at all* in what is described as the "second Isaiah," though it, too, is declared to have been written "near the end of the exile." Surely criticism has hardly said its last word on so complicated a problem as the analysis of style. Here is a word

of the remnant is found repeatedly in the prophets, though different Hebrew words are used to designate it. Thus in Jer. xxiii. 3 the "remnant" is referred to in connection with Jeremiah's prophecy of the "branch," just as Isaiah's is in close proximity to a similar prophecy. In Jer. xl. 11 the remnant is distinctly that which was left in Judah by the King of Babylon. So Ezek. vi. 8, xi. 13; see also Ezra iii. 8, ix. 8, 14; Neh. i. 3. Nor does there appear to be any period beside the captivity in Babylon to which the prophecy could apply. It is obvious that one single instance in which definite prophecy can be proved or reasonably inferred to have taken place is destructive of the assumptions on which the analytic criticism rests. Nothing could have been antecedently more improbable than the return of the Jewish captives to their homes. Nothing is more clear than that it was steadily predicted by many of the prophets that this antecedently improbable event should take place.

A future captivity, then, of the Jewish nation is here predicted, and their return from it promised. To whatever author Isa. xxxix. 5-7 is assigned, there is a distinct prediction, attributed to Isaiah, that Babylon should be the place with which this captivity and return should be connected. A "consumption," or rather *destruction*, is decreed for the land. But it will be only an instance of God's righteousness (ver. 22; *cf.* xxviii. 22). Judah has sinned, and she must therefore suffer. But God's covenant with her shall not be broken. It will but receive a higher and more spiritual fulfilment. Therefore, again the trembling inhabitant of Judæa is admonished not to faint or be dismayed at the approach of the Assyrian (ver. 24). His oppression shall be harsh and cruel, as was that which Israel had endured in Egypt (*ibid.*). But God has decreed (ver. 26) a similar deliverance (note the allusion to Moses lifting up his rod over the Red Sea).[1] The burden of the oppressor shall be removed, and his yoke broken off *before the presence of the oil.* This is the literal translation of the latter part of ver. 27. There seems, on the whole, no need (see above, p. 199) to resort to a conjectural emendation of the text. The "oil" here referred to is most

---

constantly in use in the post-exilic period. It is not found in Jeremiah nor Ezekiel, nor, in fact, in any other prophet but Malachi. It is not found in Isa. xl.-lxvi. (In Isa. xlvi. 3 the word is the more usual *shearith.*) But it *is* found in the writings admitted to have been Isaiah's.

[1] The passage in Exodus to which the undisputed Isaiah makes reference is assigned by modern critics to *an exilic* or *post-exilic writer*. In fact, in Exod. xiv. 21 the verse is broken into *three parts*, of which that which refers to the stretching out of Moses' hand over the sea is *specially assigned* to the later writer, who is here quoted some 300 years before he wrote!

probably that with which David was anointed king (unless it signifies prosperity, of which oil is not infrequently a figure in the Old Testament), and the promise of consecration then given to his descendants and the people over whom they ruled (see Old Testament *passim*, and especially Ps. lxxxix. 19-37). Whatever calamities should fall on them, God would fulfil His promise. As we know, it has been gloriously fulfilled in Jesus the Anointed. And Judah is only excluded from its blessings because he stumbles at the inclusion of all mankind in God's covenanted mercies. When his heart shall "turn to" his covenant God, then he also shall be "graffed in" (2 Cor. iii. 16; Rom. xi. 15-36).[1]

5. *The Assyrian's Advance and its Sudden Check* (vers. 28-33).—A full consideration of the phenomena presented in these verses suggests rather, on the whole, the swing of the pendulum than the disarrangement of the text. For here, again, after a vivid picturing of the Assyrian's advance, and the terror struck into the people by it, we are once more (vers. 33, 34), as in the preceding section, met by words of comfort. A power, not of earth, but of heaven, shall arrest the invader's course when he is within a very short distance from Jerusalem. The haughty shall be humbled, and he who had exalted himself as high as Lebanon shall have a fall proportioned to the height of his pride and presumption.

It would seem as if this prophecy were written immediately after the fall of Samaria, 721 B.C. The terror which the near approach of the Assyrian caused gave the idea to the prophet of an immediate march against Judah. Hezekiah, we know, had been preparing for such a catastrophe. He had fortified Jerusalem, and looked after its water-supply. And relying upon Isaiah, at once his political and spiritual adviser, he had refused, in spite of the appalling superiority of his opponent's resources, to pay the tribute his father had engaged to pay. Sargon, in whose reign, as we are now aware from the monuments, Samaria was taken, did not venture at that time to chastise his vassal for his contumacy, but marched into Philistia and defeated the Egyptian, or rather Ethiopian, army. He then turned his attention to Southern Mesopotamia, where he drove out Merodach-Baladan from Babylon. Hezekiah, therefore, had a period of respite from his imminent peril. The actual invasion did not take place until after the accession of Sennacherib. And it took place, not from the north, as the passage we are now considering represents it as having taken place, but from the west or south-west

[1] "The Cambridge Bible for Schools" says that the words *El Gibbōr* in ver. 21 mean "Mighty God," but not in chap. ix. 6. Why?

(chap. xxxvi. 2; 2 Kings xviii. 17). Consequently, we have here a purely ideal picture of an advance of the victorious army of 721 B.C., flushed with the spoils of Samaria, toward Jerusalem through the passes of Ebal and Gerizim, Ai and Michmash. The march is thus in the opposite direction to that of Joshua's campaign, which proceeded from Jericho in the south-east, thence through the defiles of Michmash (1 Sam. xiv. 4) to Ai, and thence to Gibeon. The Assyrian invader is supposed to leave his baggage at the entrance of the narrow defile at Michmash, and to proceed with rapid steps to Jerusalem. His warriors rest for the night at Geba. But their approach spreads terror all around. Gibeah of Saul is deserted by its inhabitants. The panic spreads to Ramah and Anathoth. At last the conqueror halts at Nob, in the immediate vicinity of Jerusalem, where he prepares for the assault. But suddenly there is a check. Some entirely unexpected occurrence removes the peril. And the fall of the mighty conqueror (ver. 34) is as sudden and terrible as his pride had been.

On this one or two remarks are needed. First, we are told by the modern critic that the Hebrew prophet "had no magical means for foretelling the future, but simply his own spiritual convictions, and his observation of history."[1] Now, Isaiah on *four several occasions* repeats this prophecy: here; in chap. xxix. 1-8, 14 (where the deliverance is predicted as taking place "at an instant, suddenly"); xxx. 30-35; and xxxi. 6-9. There is not, in these passages, "a vision of the future in actual detail," for the details do not correspond in particulars with the event. But there is a *distinct prediction* of some marvellous exercise of Divine power, which no "spiritual convictions" or "observation of history" could enable a man to foresee, and the exact character of which remained unknown until the moment of fulfilment. Just now it is the mode to explain all the phenomena of Holy Scripture on principles of pure naturalism. But a higher authority than the modern critic tells us that "no prophecy is the particular interpretation of the individual" of the facts which come before him. "It was not brought into existence by the will of man, but holy men of old spake as men who were borne along by the Spirit" of the Eternal God (see 2 Pet. i. 20, 21, in the Greek). We may rely upon it that this, the earliest, will also be the ultimate verdict of the Christian conscience on the question of Hebrew prophecy.

The next point which calls for remark is the terror inspired by the Assyrian invasion. Ruthless indeed were Assyrian

[1] See CHURCHMAN, January, 1904, pp. 210-212; April, 1904, p. 363.

methods of campaigning. The king has delineated it himself for future ages in the monuments his pride has left us. He tells us how on one occasion he impaled the corpses of rebels against his authority on stakes around the city he had captured. He boasts how he took 200,150 persons, small and great, as spoil. Large numbers of them were torn from their homes to live as captives and slaves in strange lands. Wives and virgins were offered in service to the licentious worship of the Babylonian Venus. To understand this we need the pencil of Erckmann-Chatrian, who has described the miseries consequent on Napoleon's Russian campaign, and the great *débâcle* after the Battle of Leipzig. Longfellow, in his "Evangeline," has painted for us the cruelty of removing a people from the hearths and homes of their childhood—a fate, however, more terrible in post-Christian times than could have been the case in the harder and sterner days of the heathen world, though even then keenly felt, as the Greek dramatists make clear to us in their pictures of Hecuba and other Trojan captives. We have also the touching lament of the captives of Judah by the waters of Babylon, and the allusion to the tears which never ceased to flow when they were called upon to "sing the Lord's song in a strange land." And the daughters of Judah, who had been taught to value female purity as no other ancient race would seem to have valued it,[1] must have writhed with grief and shame at being degraded to the level of a priestess of Mylitta. (See Lam. i. 4, 15; ii. 10, 13; v. 11.)

What lesson may we draw for ourselves from all this? If we cannot apply the prophecies of Isaiah to our own day, they remain as a sealed book to us. But there are lessons on the face of this history which we ought to be able to read as plainly as could the Jews of Isaiah's day. *Human policy must never for a moment conflict with our duty to God.* That is a principle which it is easy to state, but difficult to carry out in practice. Men do not easily raise themselves from the level of present hopes and fears to the height of spiritual facts. And so one man is an opportunist, and staves off inconvenient questions by unsatisfactory compromises. Another boldly casts principle to the winds, and declares that all we need do is to look after our own interests. Such modes of dealing with national affairs, Isaiah tells us, are suicidal. If we wish for prosperity and peace, we must do the will of God. But what *is* His will? Important questions await solution in the century upon which we have now entered. In what spirit are we to meet them? Not, I venture to think, in the way in which many earnest and sincere men among us would bid us

[1] See Professor König, "Bibel und Babel," p. 49.

meet them—by exaggerating our past crimes, mistakes, and refusing to thank God for the blessings with which He has endowed us, and which we have not altogether neglected to use aright. Such conduct involves gross ingratitude to Him. Prosperity (Deut. xxviii. 1-12; *cf.* Ps. cxlvii. 11-20) is a sign of God's favour, and is never vouchsafed to any nation which systematically disobeys Him. If, therefore, He has given us prosperity and pre-eminence among the nations of the earth, it is because we, as a nation, have not forgotten Him altogether, but have endeavoured to "defend the poor and fatherless," and to "see that such as are in necessity have right." Only one offensive war can be laid to our charge during the century which is now past,[1] and that was due to our belief, sound or unsound, that Russia had shamelessly broken faith with Turkey and Europe in general. British rule has established permanent peace among 400,000,000 of our fellow-creatures for years past. Even Bishop Butler's seemingly extravagant vision of a Power so generous and so just that men seek to come under its beneficent rule,[2] has from time to time been fulfilled in India. We have doubtless sinned much in the past, and continue to sin. But we have, nevertheless, no right to forget the "good hand of our God upon us." We ought not to disparage British rule, which, on the whole, has stood for peace, liberty, and fair play to all. Love, beginning in the home, should extend thenceforth to the family, to the parish, the district, the nation, and the Empire, thence to our Christian brethren in other lands, and ultimately to the world at large. Had the policy of Isaiah been followed, Judah must have become supreme over all the nations of the earth. If we hold the high position we do, it must be because on the whole our rulers have followed such a policy. Instead of denying this obvious truth, let us act upon it. Let us strive to make our imperfect obedience as a nation to God's will ever more thorough and complete, and we shall more and more realize the glorious prospect which, in chaps. xi. and xii., we shall next be called upon to contemplate, and which is surely, if slowly, coming into actual existence.

J. J. Lias.

---

[1] Some will mention the "opium war" of 1842, but that is a question on which we are bound to admit that men of character and principle have taken opposite sides.

[2] "Analogy," Part I., chap. iii., 5.

ART. VI.—"CHARITABLE RELIEF."[1]—I.

IN a series of "Handbooks for the Clergy" it was well that a place should be found for one upon "Charitable Relief"; and the manual before us may be pronounced a very useful guide to that most difficult subject. The principles which it enunciates are generally correct; and though we may disagree with the author on certain points of detail, we feel sure that his views in the main are thoroughly sound.

Mr. Rogers writes with a considerable knowledge of his subject, gained from practical experience, as well as from a study of many authorities. In an appendix he has given a list of books "which will be found useful for those who are engaged in the practical administration of relief." This list might with advantage have been made longer. To it should certainly be added: "The Strength of the People," by Mrs. Bosanquet; "Methods of Social Advance," edited by Mr. Loch; "The Heart of the Empire"; and the recent "Report of the Committee upon Physical Deterioration."

In the preface the author states that his book has been written "to do something to enable the clergy to realize the extreme difficulty of the work of charity, and the necessity for study and training for success in any of its branches. . . . The day will come, I hope, when the clergy will realize the necessity of an education in social work as the result of a more scientific treatment of pastoral theology." This is a necessity to which we have frequently called attention. But an education surely implies teachers capable and willing to give it. No doubt in the recently-formed School of Sociology in London most excellent instruction could be obtained. But might it not also with advantage be found in our theological colleges? A study of this handbook should prove the absolute necessity for such instruction; it should also encourage men to qualify themselves to give it. And this qualification should not be regarded as necessary only for those who *instruct* the future clergy. It should be deemed necessary for every parish priest, for he is ultimately responsible, that those who work under his direction do their work *intelligently*. He must convince them that they are not dealing simply with individuals: they are dealing with individuals living in a very complex state of society. Hence it is essential that they should know something of the laws and principles which govern the welfare of society. The parish priest must

[1] "Charitable Relief," by the Rev. Clement F. Rogers, M.A. ("Handbooks for the Clergy"). London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1904.

encourage his workers to work in obedience to true and ascertained law. But how can he explain these laws unless he has himself made a careful study of them?

By no means the least of the merits of this book lies in its constant insistence upon this matter. The clergy should be able to teach principles. "Set free from the actual administration of relief and all the detailed work that it involves, they would be able to pursue their special work, first as learners and then as teachers. . . . If this was done, the Church would be sending out a constant stream, not only of workers in the cause of charity and relief of distress, but of men trained to do their duty in all the many parts of civic life" (pp. 174, 175).

The book is divided into eight chapters, the first being upon "The Christian Conception of Charity." In this chapter we have a very careful study of our Lord's principles and actions as a Reliever of suffering; and it is clearly proved that if the worker of to-day would follow His example "the moral factor, the part played by character and principle," must be his chief concern.

Christ's action is considered under seven heads: (1) "He worked with full knowledge." He possessed the requisite knowledge. Therefore it is our duty to obtain as much knowledge as possible. (2) "He worked for a cure." Jairus' daughter was not only raised: food was ordered for her—"the first step in an after-life of duty." The Samaritan did not bestow an alms and pass on; he gave immediate personal service; he co-operated with others; he made also provision for possible future contingencies. (3) Our Lord "always considered the effect of His action on others." This is most important, and it is often forgotten by the thoughtless distributors of charity. The man blind from his birth was cured "that the works of God should be made manifest in him." Our Lord was chary in performing miraculous cures; He knew how often the bystanders were content with a mere surface impression. (4) He "never disregarded the structure of the society in which He lived." "He recognised the several functions of the law. . . . He would not arbitrate in the quarrel over the inheritance, nor did He rescue the robbers on the cross from the penalty due to their deeds." (5) "His charity was always personal." There is an interesting comment on the feeding of the five thousand: "Only when the numbers were too great had He recourse to organization, by which alone can then the personal element in well-doing be retained." (6) "Christ taught that the cure for the ills of life was a moral one." The spiritual help given was greater than the material aid. (7) "He realized the intimate con-

nection of religion and relief." "But He also realized the fatal effect of confusing these."

In the next section we have some excellent thoughts suggested by St. Paul's great chapter on "Charity" (1 Cor. xiii.). Three characteristics are noted: its providence, its unselfishness, its moral strength. To the lack of these three qualities the mass of distress is due. "Improvidence is due to a narrow outlook in time." When work is plentiful there is freedom in spending. Few parents can resist the temptation of sending their children out as early as possible, and to earn the maximum wage at once. Apprenticeship, with small wages, means looking ahead. "Selfishness is due to a narrow outlook in area." Attention is drawn to the way in which the money kept by the husband for "personal spending" is usually wasted. Very rarely is any of it saved against a "rainy day." "Moral failure" is the cause of much distress. Under this head we must place drunkenness, prostitution, bad management, and the weak indulgence of children.

Chapter II. deals with the "Nature of Distress," which is briefly described as a disease (of the social body), and which, like disease in the physical sphere, is often, though not always, due to *moral* causes. Thus, the causes of the disease, whatever they may be, must be discovered, and as far as possible removed. Even their discovery is often difficult, and means a great expenditure of time and thought. But unless we are prepared to expend these, we had far better leave the work alone.

Mr. Rogers might here have drawn attention to what is doubtless one of the greatest of all the obstacles to the cure of this social disease—viz., the inefficiency of those who are officially chosen to deal with it. Among the great number of men and women elected to fill the office of "Guardian of the Poor" there are many experts—many who by study and personal investigation have qualified themselves to fill that most responsible office; but these are, we fear, but a small proportion, and so long as Guardians are chosen by present methods they will continue to be so. The great majority of Guardians have a similar effect to what we might imagine a body of entirely unskilled doctors would have. They are dealing with a disease which they have not studied scientifically—which they do not understand. The result of their action is too often to spread and intensify, rather than to remove, the disease. We are glad to notice that in Chapter V. our author speaks strongly upon recent evil developments in Poor Law administration, and asserts that, simply through the ignorance of many Guardians, we are in danger of returning to the disastrous conditions which existed in the

early part of last century. When men are granted medical diplomas by popular suffrage, and because they promise a liberal distribution of drugs free of charge—the analogy with the present system of outdoor relief is not a far-fetched one—we shall then see the rates of death and disease rise, as the rates of pauperism are rising at the present time.

Mr. Rogers deals severely, but not too severely, with the *misuse* of charity; with the "overlapping," due to ignorance of what other workers are doing, and especially with the evils of the "voting" system, by which applicants for any particular charity are successful, not because their case is the most needy or most deserving, but because they have obtained the greatest number of votes.

He passes on to speak of the carelessness with which letters of recommendation are given, even by the clergy. "In business circles a recommendation from a clergyman is (except in the case of boys) worse than useless; it is assumed that the bearer of it is someone who has lost his character, and to whom the writer desires to give another chance" (p. 27). He then shows how, when charity is given or recommended by the clergy to undeserving cases—that is, through want of knowledge, which means neglect of careful investigation—the harm done affects not only the donor or the recipient: it affects the reputation of the Church as a whole. "When lying or imposture are rewarded, discredit is brought upon the institution through whose representatives this has been effected."

The next subject treated by the author is a painful one, but we are glad that he does not hesitate to speak plainly. "It is difficult for people who have been brought up as those who undertake charitable work have been to realize the untruthfulness of the majority of uneducated people" (p. 32). We must remember that to accept statements, whether made by word of mouth or by begging letters, without investigation is actually to encourage untruthfulness; it is, therefore, to do an injury to the community, whose welfare consists in mutual truthfulness, the essential condition of mutual trust.

This untruthfulness does not consist always in deliberate lying; much more frequently it consists in a *suppressio veri*—*e.g.*, neither the whole income nor all the possible sources of help are confessed. People do not own that they have relatives who could and ought to help; they do not say what they are receiving from other charitable agencies. This is one chief reason for combination in charitable work. A great part of the poverty—indeed, of the low moral tone—of the "slums" is due to the great number of thoughtless and untrained "mission" workers, frequently belonging to

different "causes" or agencies, working independently of each other, and actually fostering both pauperism and deception by thoughtless and indiscriminate giving.

If it were once clearly recognised in any neighbourhood that perfect truthfulness and a complete revelation of all the facts connected with a case was an essential condition of the bestowal of charity, the effect upon the moral character of the neighbourhood would be enormous. People do not realize that in the community (the social body) the presence of one moral disease gives a liability, as in the physical body, to attacks of other diseases. Drink, and impurity, and idleness, and untruthfulness, and poverty, which abound in some neighbourhoods, are not unrelated. They form a *complication* arising from a low state of moral health. It is surely our duty to demand from people purity, sobriety, and truthfulness before we relieve their poverty.

In the last section of this chapter the *nature* of the inquiries to be made before relief is given is carefully considered. Too great stress can hardly be laid upon this part of the work, for if we are to do good, and not evil, we must act upon the fullest knowledge available; and, while we have no right to pry into another person's concerns, it must be clearly recognised that when once charity is asked, the right to withhold any information about themselves or their circumstances which may assist us in helping them in the best and wisest way, must be surrendered. Such information should, of course, be treated as confidentially as possible, and it should certainly not go beyond the knowledge of those who are responsible for coming to a decision in granting or refusing help; but it *must* be in their possession.

It is in the obtaining and sifting and weighing of evidence that the really expert worker is of such value upon "relief committees." It is by carelessness in these matters that so much harm is done; and this carelessness generally proceeds either from idleness or ignorance. Mr. Rogers gives many valuable hints upon how this work should be done, and at the end of his book he prints two specimen "case-sheets," showing how the particulars of every case should be entered. If these are properly used the information which a relief committee needs can be seen at a glance.

The next chapter is upon "The Cure of Distress," which, as Mr. Rogers wisely says, must be the *object* of our efforts; in other words, we must not be content to help people *in* their difficulties, we must try to help them *out of them.* The great instrument for cure is *character;* money may be likened to a useful temporary medicine, but the real cure in sickness arises from the doctor's advice and the strengthening of the patient's constitution. If only people would but remember

that the bestowal of charity is often like the giving of an opiate!

For a permanent cure what do those in distress really most often need? Suppose we can impart to them forethought and initiative, perseverance and temperance, shall we not have done them a far greater service than if we bestow upon them some material gift, which perishes rather than increases in the using? May not these moral powers, as Mr. Rogers suggests, be "the things which are within," of which we are "to give alms"? But we cannot impart what we do not possess. Hence, character—the sum of these moral qualities—is the primary qualification for the charitable worker.

Of course, the worker must learn to judge whether any particular case is one which admits of permanent cure by the aid of private charity. It is both foolish and cruel to "potter" with a case which ought at once to have been referred to the Poor Law. To do otherwise is only to raise false hopes, besides wasting time and money, both of which might have been usefully expended upon other cases.

Upon one point we venture to differ very strongly from Mr. Rogers. He thinks that when help is given it should always be given "in cash." "For the wife is the natural provider of the family, and knows best what is needed, and where to buy." Has Mr. Rogers read the recent report upon "Physical Deterioration," where it is shown that a large proportion, even of the deserving poor, seem to have little knowledge or judgment of how to lay out their money so as to procure, for a given sum, the greatest return in nourishing and sustaining food? No doubt there are cases in which money may be given, but we believe that in the majority of cases help in kind, if given with discretion and at regular and stated intervals, is likely to prove more useful.

Two other points in this chapter claim attention: (1) The way in which people, who might be "helpable" if left to a trained worker, are ruined by the interference of "kind ladies," who, by the thoughtless bestowal of doles, enable them to "muddle along," instead of compelling them to use initiative and self-help. (2) The absolute necessity for all the workers in any district having complete knowledge of each other's action. I well remember a certain slum in which, by the exercise of the greatest care, we were gradually raising people to a position of comparative respectability. Then there appeared signs of deterioration, and we discovered that certain ladies with large means, which they bestowed liberally, had begun to invade it. In a single winter the results of the efforts of years of strenuous work were practically destroyed.

W. Edward Chadwick.

Art. VII.—PAROCHIALIA; OR, HOW IT STRIKES AN OUTSIDER.

"WE will continue steadfastly in prayer and the ministry of the Word."

So said the Apostles as they shook from their shoulders the intolerable burden of the secular cares of the Early Church, and turned to give themselves afresh, with free hearts and minds, to the work of carrying out the Master's command: "Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all the nations." How they did it we know: "They that were scattered abroad went out preaching the word." Preaching was evidently *the* work to which they felt themselves called.

But that was 1,900 years ago, and times have changed, and Church systems have changed, and people look for something more from their clergy nowadays. The Apostles were itinerant missionaries, but our parish priests live among us; they must concern themselves with parochial matters, or the whole organization of the parish will fall to pieces.

This, which is often urged, is doubtless more or less true, yet as we make the admission a sense of something akin to despair creeps over us, since we cannot but feel that in the case of many an overworked and overworried parish priest it is the secular, not the spiritual, burden which is wearing him out, and that we of the laity who make such exorbitant demands on our clergy have much to answer for. For have we not gradually come to consider that all work of a charitable and philanthropic nature which is started in a parish must necessarily be part of the Rector's or curate's work, and is not likely to succeed unless the clergy have a share in it? I have lived in parishes where, monstrous as it may seem, those who managed the Band of Hope continually clamoured for the Rector's presence. The ladies who held missionary working-parties were not happy unless one or other of the clergy appeared to read the opening prayers. Boys' clubs, men's clubs, factory girls' classes, mothers' meetings, golf clubs, cricket clubs, choral unions, choir practices, besides innumerable committees, all felt themselves aggrieved if the clergy took no part in them. And the Rector and curates pursue the weary round uncomplainingly, with the poor consolation that they are spoken of as hard-working and indefatigable, though, as some never-to-be-satisfied people are spiteful enough to say: "They are but poor creatures in the pulpit." It would be a miracle if they were anything else. Those who thus force this burden of semi-secular work upon them should at least pay for the

mending of the clerical boots, and provide the clerical library with a sufficiency of printed sermons.

But it may be urged the remedy is in their own hands. Why do they fritter away their time dispensing coal-tickets and other charities, keeping club accounts for the parish, attending boards and committees and what not, and doing a hundred and one things which a layman or a laywoman could do as well or better? As well might a doctor carry round his bottles of medicine, or a merchant sweep out his office himself, as a clergyman thus take upon him other people's work, with the inevitable result that time fails him to do his own. We do not attempt to explain the mystery. We have heard it said that laymen are not willing, do not come forward to take the burdens from the clerical shoulders; but we have also heard the other side of the question, and the layman's complaint that his aid is not asked. There is something wrong here, and the consequence is a great decline in the power of preaching throughout the land, and, as was well said the other day, "It is not the want of faith, but the bad reading and poor preaching, which are emptying our churches."

Are we setting too high a value on the ordinance of preaching? Surely not, for however diligent a visitor a parish priest may be, it cannot be denied that he moves in a limited sphere, and that there are and must be numbers of his parishioners—employés in shops, domestic servants, workmen, governesses—who are unknown to him by sight, and with whom he never exchanges a word. Yet these he may meet through the medium of preaching, always supposing that his preaching is sufficiently good to bring them to church; and all unknown to himself he may bring them a message which will make crooked ways straight, dark places light before them, life more hopeful, and death less terrible.

That there is so little of this preaching, so few sermons which abide in the memory for years to come, or even linger with the listener throughout the week, may well be the cause why men weary of church-going, and many churches which were once well filled now show a depressing number of empty seats. We can think of many a church in London which forty years ago could not contain the congregations which thronged them, though in many cases galleries were built one above another. Now the galleries have gone or are empty, and London streets more crowded than ever; but the churches wait the preacher's voice to call their multitudes back. Musical services will not do it, grand ceremonials will not do it; but the earnest pleadings of Christ's ambassador, the thoughtful words of the man who has been much in the secret

place of the Most High, and is abiding under the shadow of the Almighty, will have a power and an influence that will draw men from far and near, away from the world, away from sin and self, to the rest and the peace and the safety to be found at the foot of the Cross.

Are we setting too high a value on the ordinance of preaching? Nay, that is impossible.

Notices of Books.

Monumental Facts and Higher Critical Fancies. By A. H. Sayce, LL.D., D.D., Professor of Assyriology in the University of Oxford, etc. London: The Religious Tract Society. Pp. 127. Price 2s.

Archæology has been called "the avenger on the track of rationalism." This is not an inapt description, considering the nature of the facts which the spade of the excavator has brought to light. One theory which it has effectually demolished is the old contention that the Israelites were unable to read or write, and that a mature literature, such as we find in the Old Testament, could not have come into existence at an early date. Professor Sayce has put together a concise account, which ought to be in everybody's hands, of the principal discoveries bearing on the age and authenticity of the Old Testament Scriptures. For the purpose of history, philology can only be of service accidentally, being concerned merely with the linguistic sense of the record, not with the historical circumstances it embodies; and the delusive character of the philological method relied upon by modern critics is clearly shown by Dr. Sayce in his first chapter. "Time after time," he observes, "the most positive assertions of a sceptical criticism have been disproved by archæological discovery; events and personages that were confidently pronounced to be mythical have been shown to be historical; and the older writers have turned out to be better acquainted with what they were describing than the modern critic who has flouted them." After explaining the use and value of archæology as a test, the author describes the revolution effected in our conceptions of the antiquity of literature by the Tel-el-Amarna tablets and other finds, proving that the age of Moses, and even the age of Abraham, was almost as literary an age as our own. One of the most valuable chapters in the book is devoted to an account of the confirmation of Gen. xiv. supplied by Babylonian monuments, from which we now learn that the political situation presupposed in the narrative corresponds exactly with the actual requirements of history, though only a few years ago it was declared to be an "impossibility." Even the names of several of the Kings mentioned there have been recovered. "The Laws of Amraphel and the Mosaic

Code" is the title of another important section to which attention may be directed, where it will be seen that the laws in question throw also no small light upon certain incidents in the life of Abraham. Dr. Sayce tells his story in perfectly simple language, and the clergy might do much good by bringing the volume under the notice of their parishioners. While we fully believe that the Bible carries with it its own credentials, not needing to be buttressed up by external supports, at the same time the evidence accumulated by archæological research seems to be almost a Providential answer to the cavils of unbelief.

The Golden Book of John Owen. Passages from the Writings of the Rev. JOHN OWEN, M.A., D.D., sometime Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford and Dean of Christ Church. Chosen and edited, with a study of his Life and Age, by JAMES MOFFATT, B.D., D.D. (St. Andrews). London: Hodder and Stoughton. Pp. xx+244. Price 6s.

Dr. Moffatt is entitled to cordial thanks for this selection from Owen's writings, to which he has prefixed a full and interesting introductory sketch. The works of the great Puritan divines appear to be better appreciated in Scotland than in England at the present day, and we are afraid that they are too much despised by English Churchmen, the majority of whom seem unaware of the depth of thought and spiritual insight that distinguish them. Many of these forgotten books were in their time "living forces, helping to form character, to regulate conduct, and to shape public action." Owen himself was a voluminous author, but was best known to a later generation through two or three practical treatises written after his retirement from active life. The son and grandson of Oxfordshire country Rectors, he had been driven into Nonconformity by the policy of the Laudian party, yet retained throughout his career such a tender regard for the Church of England as to draw from a partisan witness like Anthony Wood an acknowledgment of his fairness. The selections in the present volume are arranged in three divisions, under the heads of "Discussions and Meditations," "Passages of Exposition," and "Sentences and Aphorisms," illustrative parallels from contemporary or recent writers being occasionally appended in footnotes. Dr. Moffatt's task in the formation of this choice collection has evidently been a labour of love. We must leave our readers to make acquaintance with it for themselves, but room may be found here for one striking example of Owen's style, taken from his exposition of Ps. cxxx. On the subject of "Forgiveness" he wrote: "Reason's line is too short to fathom the depth of the Father's love, of the blood of the Son, and the promises of the Gospel built thereon, wherein forgiveness dwells. Men cannot by their rational considerations launch out into these deeps, nor draw water from these wells of salvation. Reason stands by amazed, and cries: 'How can these things be?' It can but gather cockle-shells, like him of old, at the shore of this ocean, a few criticisms upon the outward letter, and so bring an evil report upon the land, as did the spies. All it can do

is but to hinder faith from venturing into it, crying: 'Spare thyself; this attempt is vain, these things are impossible.' It is among the things that faith puts off and lays aside when it engageth the soul into this great work. This, then, that it may come to a discovery of forgiveness, causeth the soul to deny itself and all its own reasonings, and to give up itself to an infinite fulness of goodness and truth. Though it cannot go unto the bottom of these depths, yet it enters into them and finds rest in them. Nothing but faith is suited to rest, to satiate and content itself in mysterious, bottomless, unsearchable depths."

Forty Outline Lessons on the Prophets for Bible-Classes. By ALICE C. J. HORNE. With Prefatory Note by ROBERT SINKER, D.D., Librarian of Trinity College, Cambridge. London: The Church of England Sunday-School Institute. Pp. viii + 128. Price 1s.

These lessons, compiled by a lady who has had much practical experience in teaching, cover the whole sixteen prophetic books of the Old Testament. Dr. Sinker's recommendation is a sufficient guarantee of the soundness of the contents, and nowadays it has become more than ever necessary that caution should be exercised in the choice of books for religious instruction. The lessons seem to us to be drawn up with much care, especially the two series on Isaiah and Daniel, but more space should have been given to Zechariah. The thirteenth lesson, entitled, "Isaiah, the Evangelical Prophet," contains a useful summary of New Testament references.

Text Studies for a Year. By the Rev. A. R. BUCKLAND, M.A.; the Rev. F. BAYLIS, M.A.; the Rev. W. R. BLACKETT, M.A. London: Hodder and Stoughton. Pp. xxiv + 283. Price 6s.

The above volume provides sketches of two sermons for every Sunday in the year, as well as for Christmas Day, Good Friday, and Ascension Day. The outlines are chosen from those which have appeared during a considerable period in the *Record*, most of them being based on texts in the Gospel or Epistle for the week, or in the evening first lesson. A little more "unction" would be acceptable, and there is a distinct avoidance of anything like an appeal to the emotions; but we presume that this is to be supplied by the preacher who uses the notes. Many men find it a real difficulty to address the same congregation year after year, and in such cases a book like this will help to suggest new thoughts.