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

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

ELLIOT STOCK'S NEW BOOKS.

NEW AND HELPFUL MANUAL FOR THE HOLY COMMUNION.

In limp cloth, for the pocket, and uniform with the Prayer Book, 1s. net in cloth, and in leather binding at 2s. net; lambskin, 3s. net; and in Persian calf, 3s. 6d.

COMMUNION & OFFERING.

By the Rev. G. H. S. WALPOLE, D.D.,

Examining Chaplain to the Archbishop of York, Rector of Lambeth.

"The value of this excellent little book is very great. It is for busy people who want short and good prayers, and who welcome sound instruction if it can be briefly given. The whole forms a singularly complete and convenient manual, and we cannot doubt that it will be widely adopted."—*The Guardian.*

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

Third Edition.

In cloth limp, for the pocket, and uniform with the Prayer Book, price 2s. net; also for presentation, in leather binding, 3s. net; in lambskin, 3s. 6d. net, and in Persian calf, 4s. 6d. net.

THE PEOPLE'S PSALTER. A Plain Book for those who wish to use the Psalms in Church with intelligence and devotion.

"We think that this little book may be a useful help in suggesting ways by which different Psalms may be applied to present-day difficulties, and to the problems and anxieties with which the Church is always confronted."—*Guardian.*

Sixth Edition. In crown 8vo., cloth, gilt lettered, price 2s. 6d. net.

VITAL RELIGION; or, the Personal Knowledge of Christ.

"A work of real spiritual value. We heartily recommend it to all thoughtful readers."—*Guardian.*

In crown 8vo., cloth, price 6s. net.

NOT LEFT WITHOUT WITNESS; or, Divine Truth in the Light of Reason and Revelation. By the Rev. JOHN BLACKET.

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

SHADOW AND SUBSTANCE. A Handbook of Types and Antitypes for Church Teachers. By E. K. RYDE WATSON.

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.

"A successful effort has been made to adopt many of the passages to the Church's round of fasts and festivals. The work of selection from the poet is always a critical process. It is not always well done, but here the most fastidious critic will not be able to withhold his praise."—*Saint Andrew.*

NEW VOLUME OF VERSE.

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

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

"Mr. Passmore is not without a certain fancy, a measure of the poetic feeling; his ideas are often iridescent, if the violence of manner did not obscure their quality."—*Academy.*

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, 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.** CLERICAL SECRETARY—**Rev. G. TONGE, M.A.**
LAY SECRETARY—**Mr. H. L. HEBBERT.** CENTRAL ASSOCIATION SECRETARY—**Miss MULVANY.**

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

"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.

NOW READY. CHEAP AND NINTH EDITION.

In demy 12mo., tastefully printed and bound, 1s. 6d. post free.

NOTES FOR BOYS (and

their Fathers) on Morals, Mind, and Manners. By "AN OLD BOY."

"The advice is simply excellent. It is practical, minute, and although high-toned, not too stringent." —*Literary World.*

"The teaching is high-principled, liberal-minded, and drawn from practical experience."—*Christian World.*

"An admirable little volume, full of sound sense and wise suggestions, plenty of sympathy, with wholesome liberty."—*Daily News.*

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON.

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

MARCH, 1905.

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

THE reader will have observed that at the close of my last article I regarded the Egyptian and Ethiopian captives, who were to be led away within three years after the coming of the Tartan to Ashdod, as forming presumably part of the garrison of that town. I hope in this present article to be able to justify that view, but before I do so it will be necessary for me to dwell somewhat on the position occupied by Egypt in the year 711 B.C., a matter with which the subject of this paper is very closely concerned.

At the time when Isaiah uttered the prophecy contained in chapter xx. of his book Egypt was under an Ethiopian suzerainty. The Ethiopian rulers of Egypt were themselves Egyptians, but not of pure descent, their faces betraying an admixture of the negro type. Napata, the centre of their power, was situated in a bend of the Nile, where the river flows in a southerly direction, a little below the Fourth Cataract. The town stood in the plain at the foot of the modern Gebel Barkal, a sandstone cliff which rises perpendicularly to a height of 200 feet. This cliff, called the Sacred Mount, was supposed to be the dwelling of the god Amun, by whom the Kings of Ethiopia were appointed to their office, and as whose priests they acted.

The Ethiopian invasion of Egypt took place in the days of the Twenty-third (Tanite) Dynasty. The country was at that time in an unsettled, disorganized condition, under the rule of more than one legitimate Pharaoh. This state of things afforded an opportunity to Tafnekht, a man of obscure origin but of great energy and talent, of establishing his power, first at Sais and in the Western Delta, and then up the river as far as

Heracleopolis. The petty princes of the Said and the Delta, who still remained unconquered, alarmed at the rapid spread of Tafnekht's power, called in the aid of the Ethiopian King, Piônkhi Miamun, who invaded Egypt and advanced as far north as Heliopolis. On a stele, discovered at Gebel Barkal in the year 1862 and now in the Boulak Museum, Piônkhi has left us an interesting and somewhat amusing account of the invasion.[1] It appears that ultimately Tafnekht, who had fled to an island in the Mediterranean, professing himself overcome with terror, sent his ambassador, made his humble submission to the Ethiopian King, and took the oath of allegiance in the presence of Piônkhi's envoys. This astute ruler, however, in the hour of his seeming defeat, managed matters so cleverly that he contrived to obtain from the conqueror a formal recognition of his rule at Sais, even although the Twenty-third Dynasty was still nominally in power. On the retirement of Piônkhi to Ethiopia, Tafnekht, though still acknowledging the Ethiopian supremacy, was able yet further to consolidate and extend his power. On his death he was succeeded by his son Bukunirinif, the Bocchoris of the Greek writers, the sole representative, according to Manetho, of the Twenty-fourth Dynasty. Unfortunately, very little is known about this prince from native sources, but in the year of Sargon's accession, 722 B.C., he appears to have assumed the rank of Pharaoh, a usurpation in which the Ethiopians, busied in their own affairs, seem to have acquiesced, even although it involved a partial repudiation of their own supremacy. Meanwhile Piônkhi had died, and shortly after his death an Ethiopian of the name of Kashto had succeeded in making his way from the throne of Thebes to that of Napata.

Such, then, was the state of things when, in 720 B.C., Sargon met and defeated an Egyptian army at Raphia. The brief account of this defeat on the Khorsabad Inscription runs thus:

"Hanun, King of Gaza, along with Sib'e, the Tartan of Egypt, came against me at Raphia to offer battle and combat. I put them to the rout. Sib'e avoided the shock of my arms; he fled, and his whereabouts was not seen. Hanun, King of Gaza, I captured."

In the parallel passage in the Annals the scribe introduces a playful touch, and since the same cuneiform character which has the syllabic value *sib*, when taken as an idiogram, also signifies "a shepherd," he assures us that "Sib'e, *like a shepherd robbed of his sheep*, fled away alone."

The above account of the battle of Raphia, while it shows

[1] For a translation of this stele, see "Records of the Past," First Series, vol. ii., pp. 79-104.

incidentally how readily at this time the small States of Palestine looked to Egypt for help, is of special interest to the student of Scripture because of the mention of Sib'e, or Sibhe, who is evidently the "So," or rather "Seve,"[1] to whom Hoshea sent his messengers, as stated in 2 Kings xvii. 4, and who is there called "King of Egypt." In what relation this person stood to Bocchoris or to Kashto is uncertain. He may have been a sub-king, a vassal of the former, reigning in the Delta; or, again, he may have been Shabaku or Sabaco, the son of Kashto and future ruler of the Ethiopian-Egyptian empire. That Sib'e is to be identified with Sabaco, Dr. Pinches assures us, is the general opinion of scholars; but he himself points out one objection to this identification—viz., that in the Annals of Assurbanipal Sabaco's name is correctly written *Shabaku*.[2] Further, during the reign of Bocchoris, the Ethiopian suzerainty over Egypt seems to have been almost in abeyance. But if there be some difficulty in establishing the identity of Sib'e with Sabaco there is at least, no doubt as to his position and office. The Assyrian scribe, in giving him the title *Tar-ta-nu, Tur-tan-nu*, means to indicate that he was commander of the Egyptian army. If we had only the former reading we might be tempted to read the characters *shil-dha-nu*,[3] "ruler," since the same cuneiform character has the values *tar* and *shil*, whilst *ta* and *dha* are also expressed by one character. But the variation *tur* instead of *tar*, which occurs in the Annals, leaves us in no doubt that we have here the style and title of the Assyrian commander in-chief somewhat curiously transferred to the head of an Egyptian army.

In 716 B.C., four years after the battle of Raphia, Shabaku succeeded his father Kashto on the throne of Ethiopia. This monarch is recognised by Manetho as the first King of the Twenty-fifth (Ethiopian) Dynasty. Being an able and energetic prince, and unable to tolerate any rival, he at once declared war against Bocchoris, and in the following year captured him and burnt him alive. Having thus made himself master of all Egypt, he in the same year offered gifts to Sargon, along with Samsi, the Arabian Queen, and Itamar the Sabæan. In the Annals of Sargon's seventh year he is spoken of as *Pir'u shar mâtu Mutsuri*, "Pharaoh, King of Egypt," and his act of homage is recorded immediately after the description of

[1] With a different punctuation the Heb. סוֹא, *So*, may be read סֵוֵא, *Seve*.

[2] See the Annals of Assurbanipal, Col. ii. 22.

[3] Whence the modern "Sultan."

Sargon's victories in Northern Arabia.[1] Such an act was most politic on the part of a prince who had but recently established his rule over so vast an empire. We must look upon it as a sign of wisdom, rather than a mark of weakness. Indeed, the sway of Shabaku, so far as Egypt was concerned, was a very different thing to that of Piônkhi. Once set up, it was quickly consolidated, so that by the time of the Ashdod troubles (712-711 B.C.), Egypt, according to Professor Maspero, was united from end to end.[2]

The new empire of Egypt-Ethiopia, which had so rapidly risen to a place in the first rank, must have appeared to the petty States of Palestine as a most formidable rival to Assyria, and therefore likely to prove a deliverer to them. Its duality was, no doubt, regarded by them as a source of strength, rather than of weakness, for Egypt could now draw on the vast resources of Ethiopia, whilst her armies would be led and reinforced by a martial race, the "nation tall and smooth,"[3] described by Herodotus as *μέγιστοι καὶ κάλλιστοι ἀνθρώπων πάντων*. This strong trust on the part of the Jews and other Palestinian States in the Egyptian-Ethiopian power is vividly portrayed in the prophecy now before us, in which, as if to emphasize the dual character of the great empire which had so suddenly risen up, the language is made to fall into pairs in a very marked manner.[4] Thus, the prophet is to walk "naked and barefoot"—"for a sign and a wonder"—"upon Egypt and upon Ethiopia." Also, the King of Assyria is to lead away "the captives of Egypt and the exiles of Ethiopia"—"young and old"—"naked and barefoot"; whilst those who had looked to the dual empire for help are to be "dismayed and ashamed"—"because of Ethiopia their expectation, and of Egypt their glory." Thus derisively does the prophetic message harp on that characteristic which seemed to the men of those days to form the strength of the newly-risen power.

It will be noticed that the picture given us in this chapter of the strong trust placed by the States of Palestine in the Egyptian-Ethiopian power is in exact agreement with the

[1] Owing to a misleading plan, sometimes adopted by the Assyrian scribes, of grouping events geographically rather than historically, this homage of the Pharaoh is placed in the Khorsabad Inscription immediately after the account of the battle of Raphia, which took place five years before. Similarly, in the Nimrûd Inscription of Tiglathpileser III. we find blended together the events of two Chaldean campaigns undertaken in the years 745 B.C. and 731 B.C. respectively.

[2] See Maspero's "Passing of the Empires," p. 252. I am chiefly indebted to this writer for my sketch of Egyptian affairs.

[3] Isa. xviii. 2, 7 (Revised Version).

[4] See Stade, "De Isaiæ Vaticiniis Æthiopicis," pp. 67, 68.

record on the broken cylinder K 1,668, where Sargon informs us that Philistia, Judah, Edom and Moab, at that time Assyrian tributaries, had even gone so far as to form a secret alliance with Shabaku. His words are: "The people of Philistia, Judah, Edom, and Moab, dwelling beside the sea, bringing the tribute and gift of Assur my lord, speaking seditions and acting with base wickedness . . . in order to stir up rebellion against me, to Pharaoh, King of Egypt, a prince who did not save them, brought their offerings of peace and requested an alliance." It was either to dissuade from such an alliance, or, at any rate, to show the fruitlessness of it, that Isaiah uttered this striking prophecy. To all outward appearance, the vigorous beginning of Shabaku's reign seemed to point to Egypt-Ethiopia as the future world-power; but the prophet, taught of God, dared to predict that within a short fixed time Egypt and Ethiopia should suffer the deepest humiliation, and from some unexplained cause be powerless to retaliate.[1] Strings of Egyptian and Ethiopian captives would then be seen on their way to Assyria, marching in that same shameful condition which we see depicted again and again by Shalmaneser II. (860-825 B.C.) on the gates of Balawât.[2] Then, "in that day, the inhabitants of this coastland,"[3] or, to quote the well-nigh parallel phrase of Sargon, "the people of Philistia, Judah, Edom, and Moab, *dwelling beside the sea*," would say, in the deepest consternation, "Behold, such is our expectation, whither we fled for help to be delivered from the King of Assyria: and we, how shall we escape?"

But it may be asked, What proof have we that there were

---

[1] We do not know how it was that Shabaku, an able and energetic ruler in his own kingdom, was so powerless against the might of Assyria. Perhaps the explanation is to be found in the wonderful activity of Sargon, "the fiery flying serpent" of Isa. xiv. 29. Or, again, it may be that the armies of Egypt were no match for the military genius of the Assyrians.

[2] This monument of ancient art, to be seen in the Assyrian Saloon at the British Museum, is most instructive as to the usages of war practised by the Assyrians. Strings of naked captives are depicted in the siege and capture of Suguni, a city in Ararat, and also in the capture of the Syrian town Khazazi. For a Scripture parallel to Isa. xx. 4 B. Stade very aptly points to 2 Sam. x. 4, the treatment inflicted by Hanun on David's ambassadors, but can find no instance of captives being led naked on the monuments of Assyria. His learned essay, "De Isaiæ Vaticiniis Æthiopicis," was written six years before the discovery of the Gates of Balawât by Rassam in 1879.

[3] "This isle," or "coastland"—Kimchi, Vitringa, Gesenius, Delitzsch, Birks, and George Adam Smith understand this term of the whole of Palestine, an interpretation confirmed by the language of Sargon. Others have taken it to refer to the kingdom of Judah only. Stade applies it to Ashdod.

any Egyptian and Ethiopian troops in Ashdod at the time of its fall? I answer that on *a priori* grounds it is very probable that there were. The Philistine cities would hardly dare to withstand the military power of Assyria in their own might. In this instance they had not only found a coalition with the neighbouring States, but, in common with those States, it was to Egypt that they had "fled for help to be delivered from the King of Assyria." As Sargon himself testifies, they were already in alliance with Egypt. Since then it was so evidently Shabaku's interest to use them as a buffer State between his own country and Assyria, what could be more likely than that he should send a picked body of troops to help to defend one of their strongest cities? This could easily be done even up to the last moment; for, if the land approaches were blocked by the invader, still the sea was open. Ashdod had a port of its own, and the Assyrian was no sailor.[1]

But by far the strongest proof of the presence of Egyptian and Ethiopian troops within the walls of Ashdod at the time of the siege lies embedded in this prophecy itself. For the passage can only have two interpretations:[2] either it is to be understood in the way I have just indicated, or else it points to the conquest of Egypt and Ethiopia on a large scale. This latter interpretation, which at first sight seems to suit so well the language used, nevertheless cannot be maintained because of the state of things so graphically depicted in the prophecy. "The people of this coastland"—*i.e.*, the inhabitants of Palestine generally—are represented as trembling with fear while they view the long train of Ethiopian and Egyptian captives on their way to exile. They are trembling with fear; still it is evident that their own fate, though it seems close at hand, has not yet come. The sight of Egypt's failure, and her deep disgrace, draws from their lips the anxious question, "And we, how shall we escape?" But that very question itself shows that *as yet they themselves are still untouched.* Now, is it likely, we may ask, that an Assyrian army should proceed to overrun Egypt, leaving behind it in its rear a number of

[1] The words of Amos iii. 9, "Publish ye in the palaces at Ashdod and in the palaces of the land of Egypt," are significant as to the importance of Ashdod some fifty years before the time at which we are looking, and point possibly to some connection then existing between that town and Egypt.

[2] A third interpretation is, indeed, given by B. Stade, but one so far-fetched that it seems to me to be out of the question. Identifying Melukhkha with Ethiopia, he maintains that the words of ver. 6 are put into the lips of fugitives from Ashdod, who, along with Yamani, have fled for refuge to the King of Melukhkha—*i.e.*, to the Ethiopian King of Egypt. See "De Isaiæ Vaticiniis Æthiopicis," p. 74.

small States, seething with rebellion, but as yet untouched? What was it that hindered Sennacherib in his advance on Egypt? Was it not his failure to take the strong fortress of Jerusalem? It was dangerous for him to advance beyond a certain point as long as Jerusalem remained intact in his rear. Since then Isaiah depicts the coastland of Southern Syria as still unsubdued at the time when the shameful spectacle passes through, we are forced to conclude that it must be from Ashdod, and not from Egypt, that the captives come, and that the town is pictured in the prophet's prediction as having fallen before the might of Assyria. This explains the parenthesis in ver. 1, "and he fought against Ashdod and took it," which was no doubt inserted to assure the reader that Isaiah's prediction was fulfilled.

Some, however, will ask whether the expression "young and old" in ver. 4 does not point to some more wholesale deportation of Egyptian and Ethiopian captives than could result from the capture of Ashdod. To such I would answer that, while these words taken alone might very naturally be supposed to describe the leading of a nation into exile, still there is another sense which they admit of, and which, in view of the proof just given, we are forced to put upon them. The prophet means to say that as the Assyrian would show himself utterly regardless of decency, so he would be devoid of all pity for the young or respect for the aged. A parallel to this passage may be found in 2 Chron. xxxvi. 17, where it is said of the King of the Chaldees that at the taking of Jerusalem he "had no compassion upon young man or maiden, old man, or him that stooped for age." Such an interpretation is also agreeable to the tone and spirit of this Book of Isaiah, respect for the aged being a characteristic of our prophet.[1]

I have now completed my exegesis of the passage, but there are still some points which call for notice in the extracts from the inscriptions of Sargon given in my first paper.

In the inscription on the broken cylinder K. 1,668, Sargon speaks of the States of Southern Palestine as seeking an alliance with "Pharaoh, King of Egypt, *a prince who did not save them.*" The words might simply mean that the Pharaoh was powerless to help his allies, or that he took no steps to do so. But there is, methinks, a dry caustic tone about this brief remark, giving it the character of an ironical reflection. Sargon means to hint that the Pharaoh *tried, and was not able;* nay, more, he met with just such an ignominious blow to his prestige as the Jewish prophet had foretold.

[1] See iii. 2-5, ix. 15, xlvi. 4, xlvii. 6.

The town, which, according to my interpretation of Isaiah (chap. xx.), had admitted Egyptian and Ethiopian troops within its walls, according to Sargon, had chosen a Greek adventurer for its King. This adventurer is called Yatna in the Annals, and Yamani in the other inscriptions. This interchange of names is most instructive. Yamani "Ionian," is the same word as the "Javan" of Gen. x. 2, and denotes a Greek from Asia Minor or the Islands. In his Cylinder Inscription Sargon boasts that he has "drawn out the Yamanians in the midst of the sea like fish," for the Assyrians being an inland people were very proud of anything they were able to do on the sea. The name Yatna tells us the particular island from which the adventurer came, for it is the Assyrian name for Cyprus. Thus Yamani-Yatna must have been a native of Cyprus of Ionian race.[1] Commenting on these two names, Professor McCurdy makes the following apt observations: "These phrases indicate that the Greek adventurers, who, as pirates, kidnappers, and slave-dealers (Joel iii. 6; Zech. ix. 13), had for centuries been harrowing the Mediterranean coasts as far as Egypt, had now an actual settlement in Ashdod and its vicinity, and were aspiring to a leading place. We could not wish for a better explanation than this fact affords of a passage written a few years before: 'And a spurious race (LXX. ἀλλογενεῖς) shall have its seat in Ashdod, and I will cut off the pride of the Philistines' (Zech. ix. 6)."[2]

It will be observed that Sargon calls the people of Ashdod the "Khatte." The name is identical with the "Kheta" of the Egyptian hieroglyphs and the "Hittites" of Scripture. But we must not conclude from this that the Philistines were regarded as Hittites by the Assyrians. The term *mât Khatte*, "land of Heth," was the Assyrian name, as Dr. Pinches tells us, for the whole of Southern Syria, including Samaria, Sidon, Arvad, Gebal, Ashdod, Beth-Ammon, Moab, Edom, Ashkelon, and Judah.[3] It points undoubtedly to the former predominance of that mysterious and interesting people. So then the men of Ashdod are called "Hittites" merely because their town lies in what was formerly the land of the Hittites.

Besides the mother city of Ashdod, Sargon captured the dependent towns, Gimtu and Asdudimmu. Gimtu is the Hebrew גַּת *Geneth*, of which *Gath* is a contraction. It is

[1] The population of Cyprus was of a mixed character, partly Greek, partly Phœnician. In the days of Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal the island was under several Greek Kings.

[2] "Prophecy, History, and the Monuments," vol. ii., p. 418.

[3] See Pinches' "Old Testament," p. 322.

uncertain whether the ancient and famous Philistine city is here meant. The absence of any mention of Gath in Amos i. 6-8, Zech. ix. 5-7, Zeph. ii. 4, and Jer. xxv. 20, where all the other four chief cities of Philistia are mentioned, lends colour to the view that it fell into insignificance after its dismantlement by Uzziah,[1] and renders it not unlikely that it may now have been under the sway of Ashdod, from which city it was distant only some ten miles in a south-south-eastern direction.[2] In harmony with the silence of the above passages of Scripture as to Gath is the fact that from the time of Tiglath-pileser III. onwards no mention is made of Gath in the Assyrian historical inscriptions, though we hear from time to time of the other four cities. On the Tablets of Tel-el-Amarna, written about 1400 B.C., Gath, Gaza, and Ashkelon are all mentioned.

The name Asdudimmu is with some probability interpreted by Professor Franz Delitzsch as "Ashdod by the Sea," *immu* being equivalent to the Hebrew יָם, *yâm* "sea."[3] In this case it would represent the port of Ashdod, distant some two miles from the lofty Tel which formed the citadel.

Melukhkha, the country to which Yamani fled, was formerly thought to be the Ethiopian kingdom of Meroe. It is now regarded by most authorities as a name for the Sinaitic Peninsula. Jensen compares the name with an Arabic word signifying "desert." Sayce interprets it as "the salt land," the salt desert between Egypt and Palestine. Compare the Hebrew מֶלַח (*melakh*), "salt," and the names "The Salt Sea" (Gen. xiv. 3) and "The Valley of Salt" (2 Sam. viii. 13).

In line 222 of the Annals Sargon speaks of himself as "riding in my war chariot," where the literal rendering is "the chariot of my feet." Again, in line 124 he speaks of "the cavalry of my feet." These expressions are equivalent to "the chariot that waits on me," "the cavalry that attend me." Compare the words of Benhadad in 1 Kings xx. 10: "The gods do so unto me and more also, if the dust of Samaria shall suffice for handfuls for all the people that follow me," literally "that are at my feet." See also Exod. xi. 8 and Judges iv. 10.

In line 223 of the Annals we find the King using the following strange expression with regard to his cavalry: "Who do not retreat from the place of the turning of my hands." Com-

[1] See 2 Chron. xxvi. 6. The mention of Gath in Micah i. 10 is of a proverbial character, derived from 2 Sam. i. 20.

[2] See 1 Sam. v. 7, 8.

[3] See the "Paradies," p. 290.

pare with this 1 Kings xxii. 34, where Ahab says to his charioteer, "Turn thine hand and carry me out of the host," literally "turn thy *hands*," because, as noted in the "Speaker's Commentary" *in loco*, "the driver of a chariot both in Egypt and Assyria held the reins with his two hands." Compare also 2 Kings ix. 23. When the Great King says that his cavalry do not retreat from the place of the turning of his hands, he means that in whatever direction he drives his faithful bodyguard will go with him.

In the extract from the Khorsabad Inscription Sargon speaks of some long-ago period as "the *adu* of Nannar." He declares that the Kings of Melukhkha from ancient days, the *adu* of Nannar, had never been known to pay homage to the Kings of Assyria. Nannar is the Babylonian name of the moon-god, Sin; and *adu* has here the sense of the Greek *αἰών*, "age." The "*adu* of Nannar" is, then, the age or epoch of the moon, as is well explained by Winckler.[1] He points out that in the planetary system the moon-god was the father of the gods; also that in the sixth millennium B.C., owing to the precession of the equinoxes, the beginning of the year, which was ruled by the Vernal Equinox, fell, not on the first of Nisan, but in the third month Sivan, which was sacred to the moon. Thus by the *adu* of Nannar Sargon means the first dawn of Babylonian history. In Ps. lxxxix. 37, curiously enough, we find the Hebrew עַד, *ȧd*=*adu* also used in connection with the moon. In accordance with the laws of strict parallelism, this verse may be rendered thus:

> "As the moon which is established for ever,
> And as the epoch (*ȧd*) in the sky of long continuance."

The Psalmist's words thus rendered may be understood in a sense somewhat similar to that of Sargon, the word *ȧd* signifying the whole period from the dawn of history up to the time of the writer; or we may give them that grander sense—viz., the period from the moon's creation—which suits better the context, seeing that it is the Creator who is speaking.

CHARLES BOUTFLOWER.

NOTE 1.—*On the Ethiopian Kings of Egypt of the Twenty-fifth Dynasty.*

The following summary may be of interest to the reader:

716 B.C.—Shabaku (Sabaco), the son of Kashto, King of Ethiopia.

704 B.C.—Shabitoku (Sebichos), the son of Shabaku, whose troops, led by Tirhakah, fought with Sennacherib at Eltekeh in 701 B.C.

693 B.C.—Taharqa (Tarakos), the Tirhakah of 2 Kings xix. 9, and Tarqu, of the Assyrian monuments. He was a man of royal—*i.e.*, of

[1] See "Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament," pp. 332, 333.

priestly—descent. In his reign Egypt was invaded by Esarhaddon in 670 B.C., and again in 668-667 B.C. On the latter occasion the Assyrian King died on the march, but his troops pressed on, and, according to one account, advanced as far as Thebes.

666 B.C.—Tanuatamanu, called Tandamanu by Assurbanipal. He was a son of Shabaku and a stepson of Taharqa, who had married Shabaku's widow. In the fourth year of his reign took place the sack of Thebes (No-amon) by the Assyrians, as described in the Annals of Assurbanipal. It is to this that the prophet Nahum refers (chap. iii. 8-10) in his solemn warning to the ruthless conqueror. Egypt shook off the Assyrian yoke *circa* 650 B.C. Nahum's prophecy was fulfilled in the fall of Nineveh, *circa* 606 B.C.

NOTE 2.—*On the Order of the Three Prophecies in Isaiah (chaps. xviii., xix., and xx.).*

The first of these prophecies in chap. xviii. belongs apparently to the time of the invasion of Sennacherib, and was uttered probably in the year of its fulfilment—*i.e.*, in 701 B.C. See verses 5, 6.

The prophecy against Egypt in chap. xix. speaks of a time of civil war in that country, to be followed by the rule of a "cruel lord" and a "fierce king." This description of the conqueror "suggests," as Cheyne observes, "a complete stranger to the culture of Egypt—*i.e.*, an Assyrian rather than an Ethiopian conqueror." It therefore points forward to the Assyrian conquest of Egypt, begun by Esarhaddon in 670 B.C., and completed by Assurbanipal in 662 B.C. How long it was uttered before its fulfilment we cannot tell, but the glorious evangelic close (vers. 23-25) is suggestive of the old age of the prophet. Isaiah can hardly have lived to witness its fulfilment, not only on the score of age, but because of the fact disclosed by the monuments that Manasseh was on the throne of Judah during the latter part of the reign of Esarhaddon.

The prophecy of Isaiah, chap. xx., belonging to the year 711 B.C., is the earliest of the three; but it is placed last because of its close chronological connection with what follows. Chap. xxi. 1-10 is virtually an answer to the question at the close of chap. xx., "And we, how shall we escape?" Read in the light of history, it shows, as a matter of fact, how it came about that they *did* escape.

ART. II.—HISTORICAL METHODS AND ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORIANS.

AMONG the great and lasting achievements of the nineteenth century has been the acquisition of that faculty, or fact, which may be described, in one aspect of it, as the sense of historical perspective. It is a faculty of the highest value, because it puts into our hands a new weapon of precision. It is a fact, so far as it influences, and even dominates, not only the wide realm of history, but the wider and more various fields of literature, as well as every branch of learning which is dependent on those two great subjects. In other words, this new faculty of ours throws a fresh and

more searching light upon everything which mankind has done and thought. So great a change in our point of view has affected necessarily the position and tenure of every ecclesiastical organization, as well as our attitude towards them. The causes of this change are easily explained, and its effects should not require a demonstration. It may be pointed out, however, that a more exacting and rigorous scholarship, a wider and more detailed knowledge, and scientific methods of applying them, are among the primary causes which have brought about this change. For instance, we are no longer satisfied in these days, as the leaders of the Oxford Movement appear to have been, if we are assured that certain old writers have said such and such a thing, or have recorded this and that belief or practice. Before we can accept such evidence as authoritative and final, we think it necessary to examine its weight and worth. We reconstruct, so far as we are able, the times in which those authors lived. We inquire very carefully into the contemporary meaning of the words they used. We do all that is possible to discover, and if necessary to restore, their original or their most authentic text. Their characters and their practicable bias are scrutinized, too, as minutely as their writings. We test all these results by external evidence, whenever it is available; for we know that one author may be corrected or tested by another, and no single author, without the most convincing reasons, should be relied upon if his statements are not borne out by the general opinion and practice of his time. We realize, too, that indirect evidence, such as legislation, acts of councils, inscriptions, coins, archæological remains, are often more important than any other evidence, both for establishing facts and for estimating character. All these methods and processes have combined to give us that new weapon of precision which I have described as the faculty of historical perspective. Neither the modernity nor the precision of this faculty can be denied by anyone who thinks. In the Middle Ages, for example, it did not exist at all. Their literature proves to us that they saw no difference between history and legend; neither had they any discrimination between one age and another, so far as its thoughts, its institutions, or even its costumes and habits, are concerned. Mediæval and even Renaissance paintings, delightful and admirable as they are, bring us to a similar conclusion. The heroes of Greece and Rome, the characters of the Old and New Testaments, all wore the clothes, spoke the language, and were judged, solely by the standard of the Middle Ages. They were not only made to use mediæval terms, but mediæval meanings were attached to their genuine words and thoughts. History, philosophy,

theology, the Holy Scriptures themselves, all wore a mediæval dress, and were regarded from a mediæval point of view. The result of all this upon mediæval notions of Scripture, of Church history and government, of Christian antiquity, of theology and worship, is self-evident to those who know the Middle Ages. The unfortunate results of all these misconceptions upon the following ages, even to within half a century of our own time, have not been so manifest, except to those who have realized what the historical spirit and scientific methods have accomplished. Men like Scaliger, Casaubon, Ussher, with their exhaustive erudition of all that was then known of Grecian, Roman, or Hebrew antiquity, were deprived of that illuminating and illustrative knowledge which has revolutionized our own conception of these studies, through the influence of philology, archæology, and the sciences of comparative religions and the growth of institutions. Those great scholars had no understanding of the truths and principles which the French describe shortly as *les origines*. In other words, they had much less archæology than we have; they had very little scientific method in their history, and no historical perspective. Gibbon himself, though more than a century later, was almost in the same case: the theories of Niebuhr about the Roman kings, or the vindication of the Cæsars and their administration by Mommsen, supported as it is by the most solid evidence, would have enlarged his views of the Roman Empire, and have modified his use of Suetonius and the Augustan histories.

To come a great deal nearer to our own times, that romantic and unreal vision of the past, which is to be found in some of the Waverley Novels, pervaded the whole domain of classical and mediæval history. It also affected the notions of ecclesiastical history which were current in those days, as well as the prevailing notions about the Middle Ages. It is true that we have had access to many documents which were inaccessible then. Our knowledge of facts is, therefore, wider and more accurate; but the alteration in our attitude is due less to these causes than to the difference in our point of view. The Middle Ages exist for us now very much as they were presented by Bishop Stubbs, or as they are being interpreted by Professor Maitland; and there is a whole world of difference between the presentation given us by these writers and the picture drawn by Sir Walter Scott. Putting out of account the essential differences between history and fiction, it still remains true that the older presentation of history was romantic, and that the current presentation is more scientific. I have only taken the Waverley Novels as an illustration of those notions of history which were fashionable in that time; but I go on to

draw the conclusion that the notions of ecclesiastical history and of patristic literature which prevailed at the initiation of the Oxford Movement were quite as unscientific, were perhaps more romantic, and are as untenable now as are the historical conceptions and positions of those fascinating works. In romance and literature these novels may be immortal, but, as contributions to history, those of them which aimed at presenting the Middle Ages are fallen dead. Surely the same thing is true of other histories, and for similar reasons. From Hume downwards, many English historians have become useless and misleading. Church historians have not escaped the same fate; and the results in their case may be more serious from our point of view, because theological systems and ecclesiastical organizations depend so largely upon Church history. These historians should therefore, beyond all others, realize the conditions and requirements of modern scholarship; they should acquire the historical spirit, and apply in the most rigorous way our present scientific methods. As a means to these ends, they should understand what is meant in history by a spirit of detachment, by that scientific aloofness and impersonality without which no abiding or profitable work is done in history and criticism. Now, there is no quality more valuable to historians than a spirit of detachment. Without this as a foundation, any higher qualities are likely to be misused, and true scholarship or criticism is impossible. True scholarship yearns to see things as they really are, to come to them without any prepossessions, to handle them temperately and impersonally, to hand them on without any prejudice. It wishes to serve no party, to work in the interests of no sect, nor even of any race or country. It aims at being detached from everything but the facts themselves, so far as they can be ascertained. Its ultimate object is to discuss and set them in the dry light of reason. True scholarship will assert nothing which it may suspect of being untrue, or even dubious. It neither suppresses, nor denies, nor colours anything which may affect the evidence. It should be parsimonious in its use of adjectives, and it should have more respect for the comparative degree and the subjunctive mood than is usual among recent English authors. Above all, it must be ready to accept logical conclusions, and to follow them loyally at any cost whithersoever they may lead. Such would be the aims and methods of the perfect historian. So rare, however, is this quality of detachment or true criticism, especially among British authors, that Renan says Hengist and Horsa forgot to put it on board among their outfit when they embarked from Scandinavia. The quality of detachment is not easy to attain, and is more difficult to observe, even when

history is written on the largest scale, and the writer can guard or explain himself at every point. In short histories, in summaries, and still more in biography, the quality of detachment is, for obvious reasons, even more difficult to acquire and practise.

There are some periods, too, in which it is unusually difficult for historians to be impersonal and scientifically detached from the matters which they treat. Such periods in our own history are the reigns of the Tudor and Stuart Sovereigns. Theological prepossessions too commonly bias writers who are dealing with the sixteenth century; and political prejudice may even colour modern presentations of the Commonwealth and Protectorate, or of the Revolution which deposed and exiled James II. The reign of Henry VIII. is, perhaps, more contentious than any other in our history, partly because the controversies of his time were theological, and also because the theological problems themselves are too seldom faced rigorously on their own merits, or examined broadly in the light of patriotism or of the economical, social, and intellectual conditions of that age. For example, the first divorce of Henry VIII. is discussed by too many so-called historians solely in its personal aspect. They regard it so exclusively in its relation to Queen Katharine that they exclude from their reasoning those essential factors on which the real controversy depends. They ignore the pertinent fact that Henry was married for political reasons to his deceased brother's widow; that the Papal authority to dispense in such cases was denied altogether by many canonists; that even Julius II. only dispensed on the presumption that the previous marriage had not been consummated, and that the more serious and tangible evidence is against the credibility of that condition upon which alone the validity of the dispensation rested. As a rule, they omit to lay any stress on the Emperor's relationship to Katharine, or to acknowledge the political dependence of Clement VII. on the Emperor, both with respect to the Papal States and the dynastic interests of his family. They ignore, too, the succession to the English Crown, and all the hazards to which the country was liable from a disputed title. In other words, they do not present the question to the reader as it presented itself to responsible statesmen and contemporary actors.

Again, the dissolution of the religious houses is too commonly discussed solely from a theological or a sentimental point of view. The social, financial, and political problems which underlie the whole matter are usually eliminated by Church historians. There is an obscure summary of the Tudor reigns which Matthew Arnold has

made classical: "The religious persecution of Henry VIII.'s and Edward VI.'s time abated a little in the reign of Mary, to break out again with new fury in the reign of Elizabeth." This was the Abbé Migne's way of correcting a "popular error," for Roman Catholic purposes; and history is still composed too often by the recipes of the Abbé Migne. Another historian, Miss J. M. Stone, after boasting that the Papal partisans executed under Henry and Elizabeth were genuine martyrs, goes on to say that the Protestants under Mary were only "inflamed" by what "they were pleased to consider suffering for conscience' sake." To say they were "pleased" is adding insult to injury, and a good many of them were "inflamed" in a more horrid way, even when every allowance has been made for Protestant exaggeration. That exaggeration would reverse the picture of the Tudor Sovereigns and of those who suffered under them. It paints every English Romanist as dishonest or disloyal. It fails to distinguish between the Roman Court, with its political agents and its aggressive methods, and that majority of English Roman Catholics who were loyal, so far as it was possible, both to their Sovereign and the Papacy. Such writers make no allowance for the traditions, habits, beliefs, and sentiment of nearly a thousand years. Both extremes are equally destructive to history and honesty; both are equally repugnant to truth and scholarship.

Moreover, the whims or prejudices of historians are not confined to theology and politics. They affect individuals, too, and taint biography; and so disputes and misunderstandings about this period are multiplied indefinitely. Yet all these conflicting judgments about individuals need not, and should not of themselves, affect our general estimate of the period in which they lived. We may agree about the character of an age, though we may differ about the characters who lived in it; for biography and history aim at different ends, work on a different scale, proceed by different roads; and it is fatal to confuse them or to argue from the special conclusions of one to the general conclusions of the other. A fact may be of great importance to a biographer, and of little or no importance to an historian. Through the want of this obvious distinction grave misunderstandings have been caused and idle controversies have raged, especially among historians of the Reformation, in which the controversialists have only been talking at cross-purposes. For instance, the general state of society, or of a country, or of a profession may have been good or bad in some particular age. The evidence for this may be overwhelming and indisputable, or it may be indirect and complex, or it may be various in degree and quantity;

but, in any case, it cannot be altered merely by proving or disproving some detail in the biography of a prominent character belonging to that age. As Matthew Arnold points out: "Eminent examples of vice and virtue in individuals prove little as to the state of societies." And, with regard to such biographical facts themselves, how seldom they can be proved or disproved completely; how often they are doubtful, and must remain so. A statement is not necessarily false because the sole authority for it may be suspected, or even convicted, in other instances. Foxe, the martyrologist, is not to be rejected in all his details because a few of them may be inaccurate or questionable. After making the fullest allowance for such defects, enough unquestioned matter remains in him, established by unimpeachable and external evidence, to influence our general impression of his age; and every historian who aims at being complete is bound to reproduce that impression, or his work would be deceptive and deficient, though it were accurate in every recorded fact.

An historian has not merely to deal with isolated facts. They are indispensable, of course, as ingredients or crude material; but a true historian must convey to us, through and beyond his facts, the thoughts, habits, feelings, desires, aims, of the people he describes, and of the whole people, of every class, and rank, and party, and creed, among them. It is here, much more than in facts, that the lesser kind of historians are sectarian and partial. A Roman Catholic or a Protestant might be unimpeachable in all his facts, and yet might fail, with regard to his opponents, in this larger part of history. The extent of his failure would be the gauge of his incompleteness. He might be precise enough, but he would be precisely wrong. A Radical or a Conservative historian might fail in like manner through a similar defect. Neither politics nor religion should be taken into history; at least, not by the historian, only by his characters. The more perfect his work, the less will any reader know his opinions as a private man. Macaulay's work, for instance, is spoiled and weakened by his own political opinions and position. He has not written an history of the English nation, but of the Whig party. So perfectly has he done this, however, so large and dominant was the Whig majority, that Macaulay's presentation of that period must always be considered, and the accuracy of his facts is almost unassailable. It is in his conclusions and generalizations that he is open to attack. Another sort of historian might fail grievously in his facts, and yet not be so very wrong in his conclusions, in his general presentation of the age and people he delineates.

It may prove in the end to be somehow thus with Mr. Froude's "History of England," in spite of the current opinion about it, even among professional historians. For biographers of that period, Mr. Froude would certainly be a misleading guide. For those who seek minute and accurate details, he is too often unreliable. In some paragraphs he may have almost as many mistakes as words, and an obliquity or malignity far worse than his mistakes. He may deceive the unlearned and irritate scholars perpetually in every chapter. Yet he does give us the thoughts, habits, feelings, desires, aims, of Englishmen, and those not the least important, in the sixteenth century; just as Macaulay has recorded them for the seventeenth century. It is impossible to lay down his volumes without feeling that we have got near to the English of that stormy period, with all their prejudice and passion. These, assuredly, lose nothing in the hands of Mr. Froude. His pages are alive and throbbing with prejudice and passion; but, then, the age itself was labouring with a similar disease, the prelude to a renewed health. It may be, therefore, that in consequence of these very defects the characters in Mr. Froude's "History" not only have more life and interest, but are even more true to nature, than the portraits of colder, more accurate, and calmer historians. Surely the statesmen and soldiers of the Commonwealth have lost something in the cautious hands of Mr. Gardiner. We should hardly realize them as living and human beings unless we knew them outside the calm sentences of that recorder. Mr. Froude's power is often attributed to his style. I attribute it even more to his temperament, his temper. These, which would be ruinous to the historian of a different period, work most effectually for Mr. Froude, since they enable him to represent an age of revolt and passion. His style may be described as brilliant and hard, seldom sympathetic, as never winning or pliable. There are too few pieces in him like those moving sentences near the beginning of his "History," in which he describes the enlargement of human intellect and of the material universe, the passing of the Middle Ages, the pathos of mediæval tombs and the sound of bells. He inspires less affection for his heroes and their causes than hatred or contempt for their opponents. He works always by prejudice or passion, never by persuasion; and here again he is equipped as the historian of a revolutionary time. His great skill is in the arrangement of his material, in which he displays a genius for tactics; and his chief strength is in a remarkable dramatic power, as in his execution of Mary Stuart, and in every passage when he can deal with life and movement. But the defect or penalty of

hardness, of a deficient sympathy, is dulness; and we find plenty of it both in Mr. Froude's ordinary narrative and when he has to treat of theories instead of presenting action. In such places we find a dulness of matter, dulness of perception, monotony of tone and treatment, a lamentable want of grace and flexibility. All these betray the radical weakness and limitations of a style, or rather of a temperament, like Mr. Froude's. He cannot illuminate and enliven his ordinary narrative as Gibbon does, nor relieve its monotony in the same inimitable way. There is hardly a stroke of wit or humour in all his dozen octavos; and there are scarcely any traces of our English classics, especially of those who adorn our great century of prose. From them he could have learned something of ease, of gaiety, of variety, and something more of their exquisite urbanity, which is almost a lost virtue. These lighter gifts were withheld by nature from Mr. Froude, and apparently he never condescended to acquire them by frequenting the best English masters of his art. But whatever his failures in detail or his defects in style, the general impression which he conveys cannot be explained away, notwithstanding all its faults in material and manner. The greater part of it must be accepted, and will probably endure, in spite of all its errors and exaggerations. And, after all, that part of Mr. Froude's "History" which formerly was most ridiculed and attacked has been vindicated amply by more recent and more scientific investigation.

Mr. Pollard is an historian who possesses all those modern qualities, and is a master in the use of those weapons which I described at the beginning of this article; and his Henry VIII. is a greater and better personage than the hero of Mr. Froude. Nevertheless, we may sum up by saying that the younger historian has reached his conclusions by scientific methods and rigorous accuracy of statement; while Mr. Froude arrived at his conclusions by methods which are too often demonstrably incorrect. The two conclusions, however, are substantially in agreement; and this will explain the reasons for my inference when I venture to foretell that Mr. Froude's general presentation of the sixteenth century may prove to be right, notwithstanding his erroneous detail and his fallacious arguments. His position may be impregnable, though many of his defences are ruinous. At any rate, Mr. Froude has a clear, and as I think a right, conception of the spiritual, social, and intellectual forces which were battling together in that Titanic age. He saw both the causes and the consequences of the struggle, as it affected the destinies of the modern world; and if Mr. Froude be wrong in his general presentation of those causes and consequences, then the

whole evolution of our race will also prove in the end to be disastrous. Moreover, if ever those "lost causes, and forsaken beliefs, and unpopular names, and impossible loyalties," should revive among us, and become a serious danger, the nation would find a rallying-point in Mr. Froude's "History," as our predecessors found one in Foxe's "Acts and Monuments."

I have taken Mr. Froude as an example, but also as a warning. Though I accept his position and his conclusions, I detest his methods as being the violation of all those principles which I desire to see established and accepted. I have dwelt on Mr. Froude at some length, because he fills so large a space in the history of the sixteenth century, and also because his position has been so blindly adopted or so fiercely assailed, with perhaps too little justice or discernment in either case. The whole truth is decidedly not with Mr. Froude, but neither is it with those who would accept or reject him wholesale. My particular instance may, of course, be challenged. My principle cannot be denied so easily, if it will apply to other instances. How many thousand errors there seem to be in Livy. Yet we learn more about the genius of the Roman people from his writings than from all his commentators. He conveys to us the thoughts, habits, feelings, desires, and aims, of the Roman people; but we must say of him, too, in the light of modern scholarship, as we might say of Mr. Froude, that his prejudice is only excelled by his talent for manipulation. Or take a greater than Livy; at least, a greater favourite of mine: a very great thinker and writer, though I believe a malignant and unreliable historian. How many exaggerations there are in Tacitus; how many verdicts and conclusions founded on nothing but spiteful inference and the flimsiest gossip; how many contradictions, even of himself, in his character of Tiberius. Everything we really know, outside the "Annals," and much that we are told indirectly by them, is favourable to the Emperor, and destructive to the laboured portrait of the historian. Mommsen has proved conclusively that Tiberius was one of the greatest and best administrators of the Roman Empire. He gives us an explanation of the reign which can hardly be reconciled with the traditional portraits of the monarch. Yet, in spite of all that may be established by legislation and archæology, we probably get closer to the personages and period of Tiberius in the great artist than in more accurate though less great authorities. A biographer of Tiberius would have to use Tacitus with the greatest caution, weighing him against himself, testing him by other evidence; but an historian of that age would be wrong and foolish if he ignored

him because his estimate of the Emperor's life and character is inconsistent with other recorded evidence, or does not even tally with itself. So great is the historian's inconsistency that his own pages are a sufficient refutation of his thesis. As we become familiar with his words, as we ponder and compare his statements, we begin to suspect his impartiality and to mistrust his inferences. A new impression of Tiberius begins to steal in upon us, and a second and a third, until there grows imperceptibly within us a wholly different conception. Out of these dim and floating visions a clearer image is gradually formed, with lineaments and features; and at length a new Tiberius is created within our minds: just as we may have seen a portrait emerge under the artist's hand from the intricate and scattered lines upon his easel. That new Tiberius is really sketched in outline by Tacitus himself; but he is drawn firmly and fully by Mommsen, who confutes, or at any rate must qualify, the suspected witness of Suetonius and Tacitus.

It may be urged, however, that we can't in the nature of things have another Tacitus or Livy, but that we might have another English historian of the sixteenth century equal to, or greater than, Mr. Froude. That may be, and when such an historian has come the whole position will have to be reconsidered. In the meanwhile, Mr. Froude, like Gibbon, occupies his chosen field, and he must be reckoned with until his position be proved untenable. Then, but not until then, he can be dislodged. He stands at present as the Englishman of the keenest intellect and the greatest power who has devoted himself to history since Gibbon.

So far, then, for the traditional Protestant position, as it is presented by Mr. Froude, and as it should be modified by scientific methods and the historical spirit. Let us now turn to the other side, and see how the position of the rival hosts may be affected by modern processes. Putting all sectarian or party questions on one side as trivial, and almost irrelevant, those historical methods, principles, and positions which I have described must prove still more destructive both to the traditional Roman case and to the whole fabric of mediæval theology. They show us how Papalism and mediævalism were developed. We can explain the causes, and trace the growth, and give dates for the successive stages, until we find ourselves confronted by the matured system. However imposing that system may have been, it no longer imposes on competent historians. It cannot much longer impose upon educated theologians. Protestantism, too, has its problems and its difficulties, though this is not the occasion for dealing with them. We need only say that the sixteenth century

was not, as Romanists contend, the beginning of our reformed religion; nor was it, as some extremists appear to hold, the end of our development. All healthy organisms must grow, even ecclesiastical organizations. We cannot possibly, in this twentieth century, occupy precisely the positions of the sixteenth, any more than we can go back to the theology, the Church discipline, the social conditions, or the intellectual standpoint, of the thirteenth. It is with these truths before us that we must study Church history and theology, and apply historical methods both to ancient controversies and to our modern problems.

ARTHUR GALTON.

ART. III.—STUDIES ON ISAIAH.

3. *THE Return of the Exiles* (ver. 10 to end).—Two points may be noted here: First, the return of the remnant referred to in this passage is figurative, not literal. That is to say, it refers, not to the return of the Jews from the Babylonish captivity, for they were not driven to the places named, neither are any known to have returned thence, but to *the return of exiled humanity in general to their God through His Anointed One* (*cf.* ver. 10, and chap. xlix. 22). And, next, a *second* return is spoken of. The first return was the return of the first fruits of the heathen in the days of the Apostles. Their work of evangelization was chiefly confined to the countries bordering on the Mediterranean. The *second* is the era upon which we have lately entered, when the principles of Christianity are being increasingly acted upon by Christians, and increasingly accepted by heathen nations as the true principles on which men should act. The "root of Jesse" is to be the banner to which all men shall gather, and under which they shall combat (*cf.* vers. 10, 13). The obvious leavening of mankind by Christian civilization which is going on at present is the destined preparation for the proclamation of Him as King. The "spoiling" of Philistia, Moab, and Edom, the destruction of the "tongue of the Egyptian sea," signify the victory of truth, moral and spiritual, over the superstitions and errors of heathendom; the "highway" signifies the "way of holiness" (chap. xxxv. 8),[1] which is

[1] There are some curious undesigned admissions of the homogeneity of the writings which go by Isaiah's name in the Cambridge Bible for Schools. Thus the "highway" (ver. 16) is stated to be "a frequent

Christ Himself, Who is "the Way, the Truth, and the Life" (John xiv. 6); and the reference to the deliverance from Egypt recalls the language of St. Paul, when, in 1 Cor. x., he speaks of Christians as passing through the waters of baptism as the Israelites passed through the Red Sea.

We proceed to make a few special remarks about the character of the epoch which is here predicted. It is to be specially an era of peace and brotherhood. It is not described as an era of the proclamation of dogmas, though without a knowledge of Christ, as revealed in His Word, such peace and brotherhood would be impossible. But the insisting on dogmatic propositions as such, apart from their spiritual vitality, has ever been the source of misery and strife. It is not characterized by the inauguration of a ritual, for they who would worship the Lord must do so "in spirit and in truth" (John iv. 24). It is a time of laying aside ancient jealousies and antagonisms, of reconciling conflicting interests, of the abandonment of former hatreds, prejudices, and resentments. It was the love of pre-eminence and power in Israel which envenomed Ephraim and Judah mutually against each other. It will be the inward acceptance through faith of the Spirit of the one Perfect Man—of Him who bade us be as little children, and not to seek pre-eminence—which will enable men to lay those animosities aside.

Let this be henceforth the object of the Christian ministry. We of the Church of England have been somewhat too much afraid of entering upon politics in the pulpit. We have left this difficult task to our Nonconformist brethren. And truly our task is a far more difficult one than theirs, and must be performed in a different spirit than that which they have

---

picture in prophetic descriptions of the return from exile. *Cf. chaps. xxxv.* 8, *xl.* 3, 4, *xlii.* 16, *xlix.* 11, etc." (The italics are mine.) The word used here is found almost exclusively *in Isaiah* among the prophets. It signifies a *highway*, one *raised* above the surrounding land. And it is found in the sense specialized in chap. xxxv. 8, not only in the passages cited (Isa. xlii. 16 excepted), but in chaps xix. 23, lxii. 10 (*cf.* lvii. 14). Elsewhere it occurs in this sense only in Jer. xxxi. 21. The word used in chap. xlii. 16 is a different one; it signifies a *path*. And this only occurs once in Jeremiah and once in Hosea. The mode of citation mentioned above throws the argument for common authorship into the shade. The other undesigned admission refers us to chap. xlix. 22 in explanation of the "ensign" here mentioned. It is true that *all* these passages have been ingeniously torn from Isaiah and assigned to someone else. We shall discuss this question later. Meanwhile, let the reader observe that the allusion to the "ensign" or "banner" is found in chap. v. 26. Possibly some day *this* will be found to be by another hand. The ultimate conclusion will probably be that *all* Isaiah was written by someone else. This is the result which has already been attained in regard to the Psalms.

too frequently adopted. They have addressed themselves to a particular party or a section of society. The Church has aimed at ministering to all. And her task in reconciling differences, adjusting claims, softening down jealousies, holding the balance even between classes, is one of immense perplexity and difficulty. The clergy have certainly been right in avoiding *party* politics. But, however difficult the task may be, it is their duty to see that the principles of the Bible—of the Old Testament as well as the New, because the Old Testament especially lays down the principles of corporate civil life—are properly understood by their flocks. They cannot avoid politics altogether. That they have endeavoured to do so is one source of the present weakness of the pulpit among us. There are certain fundamental principles of practical Christianity which neither nations nor individuals should be allowed to forget. Among such is the duty of patriotism, by which is meant not an arrogant and aggressive spirit, which strives after conquest and domination, but a serious and sacred conviction that our first duty is to seek the welfare of those with whom God has conjoined us in ties of race, language, and religion. In enforcing this duty the pulpits of our Church have been much too slack. As has already been intimated, it is ingratitude and even treachery to God to imply that the blessings He has showered upon us have been the result of our sins. Our historians have shown that British expansion has, as a rule, been the result, not of an aggressive, but of a defensive attitude. In America, in Asia, in Africa alike, we waited almost too long. We delayed to strike until we were in imminent danger of being deprived of our fairly-earned privileges as traders or as settlers. Then, indeed, we turned to bay, and too often retorted on our adversaries with unnecessary harshness the treatment they had designed for us. Yet our vast heritage has, as a rule, been honourably acquired, and summary has been the punishment meted out by the nation to any able but unprincipled rulers who have tarnished the honour of the British people.[1] We may therefore justly cling to what God has given us. Nor is it an unworthy boast that we mean, with His help, to hand down to our descendants what our forefathers by their valour, wisdom, and forethought have acquired.

In home politics we have the task of composing the class jealousies and hatreds which men ambitious of power rather

[1] *E.g.*, Clive and Warren Hastings. The innocence of the latter was affirmed by a court of law, and its verdict has of late been confirmed by fresh evidence. But Warren Hastings suffered long under the *imputation* of guilt.

than observant of principle have done their best to foment. On one side we have numbers; on the other wealth. In time past the wealthy few have undoubtedly oppressed the ignorant many. But those times have passed away. The franchise has been widely extended. The combination of numbers has been opposed to the ascendancy of wealth. In the Spirit of Christ, which should animate both parties, old jealousies such as these ought to disappear. The poor man should not "envy" the rich; the rich man ought not to "vex" the poor. Accumulations of capital, *as* such, ought to excite neither disapprobation, jealousy, nor cupidity. They are as necessary for the supply of labour as reservoirs of water are to insure cleanliness and to slake thirst. It is only when they are misused that a Christian public opinion should rise up and protest. The "trusts" which some fear as a public danger ought no doubt to be closely watched. But they ought not to be put down unless they conflict with the public welfare. We Christian nations are at present shamed by the example of Japan. No nation—not even England in her colossal duel with Napoleon—since the world began has ever shown such an example of true Christian morals as she has. The heroism of her troops; the modesty, patience, and truthfulness of her leaders; the self-sacrifice of the whole nation as well as of her soldiers; the humanity with which the war has been carried on; the chivalrous treatment of fallen foes; and, above all, the hushing of all petty and party disputes in face of a war waged, not for aggression, but for existence—all these present a spectacle to which the world's history affords no parallel. If we seek for an explanation of this phenomenon, we shall find it in the fact that Japan is acting up to her principles, and Christian nations are not acting up to theirs. Japan, in religion, has chosen the policy of a wise eclecticism since she began to seek her inspiration from the West. She has preserved the spirit-worship of Shintoism without its superstition and obscenity; she has preserved the self-abandonment of Buddhism without its fatalism and apathy. And, impelled by Christian civilization, she has garnered and acted upon all that is best in the morals of both. Some day she will crown her amazing intellectual and moral progress by becoming perhaps the brightest jewel in the crown of Christ.

The glorious age predicted by Isaiah is indeed coming. The progress of the world towards the ideal pictured by Isaiah in this chapter is undeniable, in spite of dark spots here and there. The most serious blots in our social system—poverty and its attendant miseries—are due, not to the want of will to deal with them, but to our having as yet failed to

find the best means of doing so. The enormous aggregations of population, the difficulty of doing good to the individual without demoralizing the race, the seeming impossibility of bringing the principles of Christ to bear upon the lives of the people—all these are at this moment perplexing and harassing the Christian conscience and driving it almost to despair. But the heart of society is right, and the blessed result will one day follow. But there is much to be done first. Each one of us, young and old, male and female, must gird up our loins, and address us to the fight with "ancient forms" of ill. We have too long made it our sole object to attain our own salvation. We must combine together now, as men in whom the Spirit of Christ is working, for the regeneration and salvation of society. And one by one the old fortresses of Hate, Pride, Convention, Custom, Suspicion, Jealousy, Ambition, as well as the inner keep of Self, will fall, as they are undermined by the working of the "Spirit of holiness" flowing from the Resurrection of dead humanity to a regenerated life.

"After madness, after massacre, Jacobinism, and Jacquerie,
Some diviner force to guide us through the days shall I not see?

"When the schemes and all the systems, Kingdoms and Republics fall,
Something kinder, higher, holier—all for each and each for all?

"All the full brain, half brain races, led by Justice, Love, and Truth;
All the millions one at length with all the visions of my youth?

"All diseases quenched by Science, no man halt, or deaf, or blind;
Stronger ever born of weaker, lustier body, larger mind?

"Earth at last a warless world, a single race, a single tongue—
I have seen her far away—for is not Earth as yet so young?

"Every tiger madness muzzled, every serpent passion killed,
Every grim ravine a garden, every blazing desert tilled.

"Robed in universal harvest up to either pole she smiles,
Universal ocean softly washing all her warless isles."

TENNYSON: *Locksley Hall Sixty Years Afterwards.*

And all this in the power and in the name of Christ. The days are gone by when the warrior was wont to carry on his warfare by "spitting the child" "on the spike that split the mother's heart." The King Arthur who centuries ago was pictured by Spenser as the fierce redresser of wrongs, riding backward and forward rescuing hapless maidens and slaying wicked oppressors and devouring dragons, the champion of Gloriana, Queen of Fairyland, comes now in the shape of a "modern gentleman"—in the only true sense of that much-abused word—imbued from head to heel with the Spirit of Him who is pattern of all humanity.

"There came a bark that, blowing forward, bore
King Arthur, like a modern gentleman
Of stateliest port; and all the people cried
'Arthur is come again: he cannot die.'
Then those that stood upon the hills behind
Repeated—'Come again, and thrice as fair.'
And, further inland, voices echoed—'Come
With all good things, and war shall be no more.'
At this a hundred bells began to peal,
That with the sound I woke, and heard indeed
The clear church-bells ring in the Christmas morn."

TENNYSON: *Morte d'Arthur.*

"Even so," in Thine own good time, "come, Lord Jesus."

V. *The Song of Praise* (chap. xii.).—This needs no explanation. It is a perfectly natural outburst of joy and thanksgiving at the thought of the blessings which God has in store for His people; at the turning away of God's just anger (this last a tremendous fact in the Divine order in which the present age refuses to believe, although it is stamped in ineffaceable characters on the history of mankind); and at the salvation which He will bring about in due time. Such songs of praise the Church is now wont to lift up at Christmas and Easter. They may be intensified by the thought that so many centuries back they were revealed in anticipation to the inspired seer Isaiah.

J. J. LIAS.

CRITICAL NOTE.—The passage xi. 10—xii. 6 is the first which modern criticism has severed from Isaiah. It may be well to inquire into the reasons for this. Something has been said already on this point. It has also been pointed out that the passage has many signs of affinity with what is called the "second Isaiah." Probably this is one of the reasons why it has been torn from the context. Here, as elsewhere, the criticism is built upon the theory, instead of the theory being derived from the facts. As we have already seen, the passage displays signs of connection with the undisputed work of the "first Isaiah." Then there is the fact that Isaiah constantly quotes or repeats himself to an extent that no other prophet does. This passage is quoted almost word for word in chap. xlix. 22, as are vers. 6, 7, 9 (admittedly Isaiah's, be it remembered) in Isa. lxv. 25. Then, further, ver. 10 evidently does *not* belong to vers. 11-16, in which a new branch of the subject commences. But it contains the allusion to the "banner" mentioned in ver. 16. So once more it must be torn from the context to which it obviously belongs, for the prophecy of the "earth" being "full of the knowledge of the Lord" is the consequence of the "banner" of the "shoot of Jesse" having been raised, and having attracted "the

Gentiles" to it. Then we have the word *shear* in vers. 11, 16, which, as we have seen in the January number, p. 204, is admitted to be "an Isaianic word." It only occurs elsewhere in the "first Isaiah." And so a good deal of special pleading is required to prove that it is here used "in a non-Isaianic sense." See for it "Cambridge Bible for Schools," p. 95. The reasoning will hardly be found convincing, save by those who have made up their minds beforehand. Lastly, we are told that "the variation of the figure from ver. 1 rather tells against the Isaianic authorship of this passage." *Is* there any "variation of the figure"? There is an *addition* to it, certainly. The "shoot" which has "grown" and "come forth" afterwards becomes a "banner." But even if there *were* a "variation of the figure," is that a thing unheard of among poets and orators, of whom Isaiah is certainly not the least? Are they bound to repeat their similes until everybody is tired of them? We may further compare ver. 9 with chaps. ii. 4 and lx. 18.

NOTE.—In the last article, on p. 240, line 14, "iv." should be "ix." In the last line but one, *for* "the coming" *read* "the coming One." And in note 4, last line but two, omit the word "here."

ART. IV.—THE ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY AND THEIR CONNECTIONS WITH SUSSEX.—I.

DESPITE the distance of Sussex from the centre of their province, the Archbishops of Canterbury, from the very foundation of their see, were lords of many manors therein, and owners of the bodies as well as shepherds of the souls of many men abiding in them. Beginning with the days of the earliest Christianized Saxon Kings and kinglets, the acquisitions of the Archbishops continued to increase, till at the cataclysm of the Reformation their possessions in Sussex extended across the county from Pagham in the south-west to Wadhurst and Lamberhurst in the north-east, part of the latter—the Manor of Scoteney—indeed, extending into the neighbouring county of Kent. Between these two extremes so many manors lay under their lordship that it was said a Primate of all England could travel across the county of Sussex through his own territory, from the sea on the south-west to his homeland of Kent on the north-east, without passing over the land of any other lord. Be this as it may, the arrangement of these lands in Sussex was such as to go far to justify the saying, since they lay along a line stretching in the aforesaid direction, and not scattered here and there, up and down the county. It is possible that this particular

local distribution of archiepiscopal property arose from the line of travel usually taken by the Primates when journeying from Kent to the first of their outlying possessions in Sussex. For the earliest acquisition of land by the See of Canterbury was in the extreme south-west—namely, the Manor of Pagham, with its submanors of Slindon, Shripney, Charlton, Bognor, Bersted, Crimsham, and North South Mundham. All these had been conferred on Wilfrid, the Apostle of Sussex, Bishop of Chichester and Archbishop of York, by the Wessex monarch Ceadwalla in 680. Under the terms of this grant for life Wilfrid had power to bequeath these manors to whom he willed.[1] The deed embodying this grant was drawn up by Theodore, then Archbishop of Canterbury, and upon his see all this territory ultimately devolved, notwithstanding the frequent and prolonged differences which existed between these rival prelates of the North and South. For, as William of Malmesbury says, "Illi duo oculi Britanniæ controversias inter se egerint." But Theodore on his death-bed, desirous of dying at peace with all men, became reconciled to Wilfrid; and the latter, when his turn came to bid farewell to things temporal, "remembering the benefits and honours which he had obtained at Canterbury, gave the vill called Pagham, with all its appendages, which the King had given him, to the church of Canterbury, to be held for ever." This account by so early and reliable an historian as Eadmer satisfactorily explains the acquisition of this territory by the Southern see, albeit a surprising number of writers describe it as resulting from Wilfrid's succession to the chair of St. Augustine, a position which, in fact, he never held.

The Manor of Pagham, comprising the large extent of lands and vills already named, derived its title from the little village of Pagham, situated on Selsey Bill, the most southerly portion of Sussex. Its harbour was formed by an irruption of the sea in the fourteenth century. To this catastrophe the Nonæ Rolls of 1340 appear to refer, wherein we find the assessors of the "ninths" record that at Pagham "2,700 acres of land were devastated by the sea, from which land the rector had been accustomed to receive xl^{li} x^{s} per annum."

In fact, all along this coast extraordinary changes in the frontier between land and sea have taken place, some of them within the memory of our grandparents. From Selsey Bill eastwards wood and common stretched along the coast, and over the site of the park of the ancient Bishops of Chichester the local fishermen now have a favourite anchorage, still called "the Park." Further east of Pagham a common

[1] "Post obitum suum dimittere cuicunque voluerit."

stretched, with patches of woodland, whereon grew great elms, and over it tenants of the Manor of Bersted—of which Bognor is a part—had rights of commonage; while in a lease of a part thereof made in the reign of Henry VIII. herbage for nearly a hundred deer was covenanted to be reserved. All this is now under the waves. In those far-bygone days Pagham was a place of a larger life and importance than to-day, even from the pre-Christian times; for the numerous finds of British and of Roman coins, weapons and ornaments of the Bronze Age, and other evidences of a civilization long passed away, point to a concentration of population and industry around the Selsey peninsula.

From an early date Pagham has been remarkable for the fertility of its soil, particularly in that most important respect of its corn-growing powers, which most of all attracts and maintains a rural population in prosperity. When Caedwalla conferred this territory upon Wilfrid, nearly 300 serfs were among the inhabitants, a number indicating a large general population at a period when the total population of Britain was so scanty. And here we may remark that, greatly to his credit, Wilfrid emancipated all the serfs upon this large estate. Further witness to its wealth is borne by Domesday, wherein it is valued for taxing purposes at £40, a sum far in advance of the average assessment of a Sussex manor. In the succeeding centuries similar testimony to the richness of this neighbourhood is to be found in various documents. In particular, additional evidence of the fertility of the soil of this neighbourhood is afforded by the record of the Nonæ Rolls, wherein the value of the *ninths* of fleeces, corn and lambs is returned at the large sum of £47, an amount exceeded only by one other Sussex parish—namely, neighbouring Bosham—while the average value in 272 parishes was only £6 odd. And this reputation for fertility has continued till modern times, and Horsfield, in his "History of Sussex," writes of Pagham as one of the most fertile parishes in the South of England.

It is a quiet enough little place to-day, but by no means without interest. Its church, mainly Early English in character, is dedicated to St. Thomas of Canterbury; but we know not under what invocation was the earlier church which Domesday mentions as existing here. Close to the south-east of the churchyard are visible the traces of the mansion which some early Archbishop built here, though they consist but of some ancient walls, and the terrace of the garden. The church consists of a chancel, nave and aisles, a transept, and a tower, surmounted by a low shingled spire. The chancel and transept contain three light lancet windows with filleted

pilasters. In addition to its high-altar, this church had an altar of St. Nicholas—doubtless as the patron of mariners—and also a chantry at the east end of the north aisle, founded in the fourteenth century; a patent roll of the sixth year of Richard II. according license to a certain John Bourere (*hodie* Borrer) for its erection. There were also three brotherhoods attached to this church—of St. Andrew, St. Matthew, and the Holy Rood. All these things are additional evidence of the comparative importance of Pagham in days of old.

As for the other vills of this manor, they varied in size and character from Slindon, of hardly less note than Pagham; Bersted, little more than a hamlet, albeit possessing a chapel from an early date; Bucgenora, the modern Bognor, also a hamlet with a chapel; down to Shripney, Charlton, and Crimsham, to-day nothing but groups of farm-buildings.

In course of time Slindon increased in importance, and some early Archbishop erected a mansion here, to which many subsequent Primates resorted for visitations or vacation. Its church, which is mentioned in Domesday, is mainly Early English in character, of small size, and consists of chancel, nave and aisles. As late as Victorian times it had coloured decoration in almost every part; but little, alas! remains. There is another possession of the See of Canterbury—namely, the vill of Tangmere—which was probably a member of this large lordship, and included, consequently, in the original donation. Tangmere is a village lying a few miles east of Chichester, and about a mile south of Boxgrove. Its church, dedicated to St. Andrew, consists of nave and chancel, mainly Early English in style. In the churchyard is a venerable yew-tree, 24 feet in circumference, reputed to be as old as the Conquest, a by no means exaggerated estimate for such long-lived trees. Such was the Sussex territory which accrued to Archbishop Brithwald on the death of Wilfrid in 709.

The next Primate who became particularly associated with this county by a grant of land was Celnoth, for in 838 Egbert conferred upon the see the large—one might say the huge—manor of Malling, which reached from "Cliffe juxta Lewes" to Lindfield, and included seven or eight submanors—viz., Glynde, Ringmer, Isfield, Buxted with Uckfield, Framfield, Lindfield, Wadhurst, and Mayfield, the latter, however, becoming early a separate manor. A previous donation of the same territory by Baldred had not taken effect, as being informal from want of ratification by "the magnates of the kingdom."

This large tract of land was of a very different nature from that of Pagham and its appendant vills, comprising a large

amount of the forest and waste of the great Weald of Sussex. Hence we find a number of parks, the Forest of the Broyle, and part of Ashdown Forest comprised within its boundaries, over all of which the Archbishops had hunting rights, probably inherent in the original grants, in any case by charter of free-warren conferred in 1052 by Edward the Confessor, and confirmed by succeeding Norman Kings.

Of all these vills and manors, Malling, the titular head, was hardly larger than a hamlet; but it was distinguished by having one of the earliest founded houses of religion in Sussex, albeit a little one, consisting only of four canons, one of whom was subsequently constituted the Dean. Its precise date of foundation is doubtful, but it was certainly of Saxon origin, and is recorded as already existing in Domesday. Its site was upon the pleasant peninsula of Malling, a down-sloping spur of the South Downs, thrusting out westwards into the alluvial valley of the Ouse, at the upper limit of its tidal portion—a valley which within historic times was an estuary of the sea. With countless other larger establishments, this house of religion was swept away by the floodtide of the Reformation, the very parish church falling, too, into such decay that an entirely new one had to be erected in the beginning of the seventeenth century.

The next territorial acquisition of the See of Canterbury in Sussex was the little Manor of Hamsey, barely a mile away from Malling. According to Sprott, the chronicler of Canterbury, "Agelfleda regina dedit Hamme in Southsex ecclesiæ Christi in Dorobernia" (Canterbury). A Saxon document gives details of a gemote held by Athelstane "in loco quod nominatur Hamme juxta Læwe" (Lewes), in which "Eadgyva regina mater Eadmundi et Eadredi regum," having been much vexed by a certain Goda about her land at Osterland, having made good her right to it, "offered it upon the altar of Christ's Church of Canterbury." Hamsey itself soon passed in some unknown manner from the possession of the see, for at the Conquest it is found part of the barony of Lewes, and soon after came into the hands of the Say family, who built a castle there, close to the south-east of the church. Few churches have such a picturesque appearance as the ancient one of Hamsey. Standing on a spur of land thrust out into the vale, it crowns a little eminence, to whose steep northern side a copse of ash and maple precariously clings. From its massive tower, clad with ivy from base to battlement, comes no more the sound of its ancient bell, whose founders fondly inscribed it: "In perpetuis annis sonet campana Johannis." For the church is now deserted for all services but funerals, and the main population is grouped around a new church a

mile away beside the London road. The old edifice consists of but nave and chancel and tower, though a blocked Early English arch in the north wall, in whose blocking is a Norman window and a rectangular piscina, points to the previous existence of a chapel or chantry at the east end of the northern part of the nave. The chancel is entered through a small round-headed arch, and contains, among other features, a tiny Norman light with a huge splay, a very good Decorated east window, and a fine so-called Easter sepulchre tomb, with traceried panels below and an Early Tudor canopy above—a tomb without arms, effigies, or names, so forgotten is its dead. Quite a short time ago there were abundant indications of colour decoration in various parts of the church, but copious and recent coats of whitewash have effectually obliterated them all.

This grant of Hamsey to the see took place in the first year of Odo's primacy; and seven years later a more important gift accrued, for in 941 "Athelstan Rex dedit villam de Terringes sitam super mare in Suthsexan ecclesiæ Christi in Dorobernia." This is the West Tarring of modern times, a village about a mile and a half north-west of Worthing. Its church, superior to the average, affords a good specimen of Early English architecture in its unaltered aisles and nave arcade surmounted by a clerestory of lancet windows. Its chancel is large, and contains oak stalls with carved misereres and panelling, and is entered through a carved screen. In its south wall is a piscina, and another piscina and aumbry exists at the east end of the south aisle. A chantry of the Virgin was attached to this church, its only remaining mementoes a chantry barn and a chantry field. The tower is a lofty structure, its octagonal shingled spire being visible for many a mile around.

Durrington and Heene, hamlets of this parish, each possessed in ancient days a chapel, the ruins only of each being visible to-day. Among the endowments of the Vicar of Heene was the tithe of herrings (called "Christ's share") at Flue-time. At Salvington, another hamlet, the celebrated John Selden was born. The Archbishops had a mansion-house in Tarring, traces only of which now remain. The village anciently possessed a market-house, which was not pulled down until 1778, and the charter establishing the market is said to be still extant in the church chest.

Under the same Archbishop Odo, the Metropolitan see was the recipient of another gift of landed property six years after the bestowal of Tarring. According to Somner, quoting an ancient record, the occasion appears to have been of a ceremonial or public nature, since, we are told, Peccinges—the

Patching of to-day—was given to the archbishopric by Wulfric, King Edred, his mother Queen Eadgiva, Odo the Primate, Wulstan Archbishop of York, and many of the nobles, being present. The village of Patching lies at the foot of the downs, about five miles north-west of Worthing. It has a fertile soil, both arable and pasture, and is noted for the quality of its butter and the quantity of its truffles in the beech-woods. A large pond in the southern part of the parish has had a great reputation for the abundance and variety of fish it contains, including, it is said, such as are not usually associated—pike, eels, and trout. The church, which is mentioned in Domesday, has been much restored. As with the majority of Sussex churches, it is mainly Early English in character; but it has a Norman tower on its north side, a position always indicative of an early origin.

Another property of the See of Canterbury was East Lavant, a little village lying to the north of Chichester. How it came into that ownership is uncertain; but since it is mentioned in Domesday under the "lands of the Archbishop," and with no indication of any previous tenure by some dispossessed Saxon, such as the plenteously plundered Godwin or Goda, it is probable that it accrued under the same grant as that of Tangmere, to which it is neighbourly. The parish derives its name from the little river or brook, the Lavant. Its church is dedicated to St. Mary, and, though not mentioned in Domesday, is evidently of Norman origin. In the chancel are some cruciferous grave slabs, on one of which appears the inscription in Lombardic lettering: "Priez qi passez par ici pur l'alme Luci de Mildebi."

It was under the primacy of Archbishop Odo's successor, St. Dunstan, that the personal connection of any occupant of St. Augustine's seat with his Sussex manors became more intimate. For a considerable part of his time—at least, in his vacation—was passed by this celebrated statesman and prelate in Sussex, chiefly at his manor of Mayfield. With this picturesque village the name of St. Dunstan is particularly connected. For here he erected a mansion for the convenient lodging of himself and his successors when visiting their *peculiars* in north-east Sussex; and here, too, as a consequence, he built a little church of wood.[1] For it was his wont—so Eadmer tells us—that, wherever he had an *hospitium* or manor-house, there he would build a church, be it only of wood.[2] At Mayfield

[1] "Apud Magavedam . . . ligneam ecclesiam fabricavit" (Eadmer).
[2] "Sicut in aliis hospitiorum suorum locis" (*Ibid.*).

it was that he had his celebrated encounter with the Evil One, who tempted him under the guise of a fair damsel while the saint was at work about his forge and anvil—for he was an expert metal-worker—whereupon Dunstan seized the devil by the nose with his red-hot tongs, whereby the fiend was put to such pain that with one bound he leaped from Mayfield to Tunbridge Wells—a trifling jump of about ten miles—and cooled his painful proboscis in the waters of the springs there, by which means they acquired their peculiar flavour.

Quitting the realm of fable for the region of fact, various doings of St. Dunstan in Sussex are related by historians as reliable as Eadmer, though even he lapses into the legendary when he adds to the historic fact of the erection of Mayfield church the fabulous accretion of the saint's rectification of its faulty orientation by the application of a push with hands and shoulders to the walls of the edifice.

Æthelgar, the Archbishop who succeeded Dunstan, had the particular association with Sussex of having presided over the spiritual affairs of the county as Bishop of Selsey. He was a prelate of some administrative experience, occupying successively the posts of Abbot of Winchester, Bishop of Selsey, and finally Archbishop of Canterbury. After him, Agilnoth, who succeeded to the primacy in 1020, is the next Archbishop of whom I find related anything of special reference to Sussex. According to Walter de Mapes —and his story is repeated by other writers—it appears that the powerful Earl Godwin, though already lord of many manors, "having seen Bosham below Chichester, coveted it, and, accompanied by a great troop of nobles, waited on the Archbishop, to whom it belonged, and in a smiling, jocular manner"—alluding to the *kiss of peace* (*basium*) anciently given—"said, 'Da mihi basium,' so pronouncing the Latin word for *kiss* that, when Agilnoth replied, 'I give you the kiss,' Godwin maintained that he had asked for and been granted the Bosham he had so desired, and, 'falling at the Archbishop's feet, returned him many thanks, and, withdrawing to Bosham, violently kept possession of it, extolling the Archbishop to the King for his liberality.'" I know of no confirmation of this monkish story, or of any connection of the Archbishops with Bosham, save such intervention as was called for by the constant disputes about jurisdiction between the Bishops of Chichester and those of Exeter, into whose possession this valuable manor came at the Conquest.

Only two Primates intervened between Agilnoth and Stigand who occupied the chair of St. Augustine at the time of the Norman invasion. The sympathies of this Archbishop

were too pronouncedly English to facilitate his tenure of the primacy, and he must have had much unpleasantness to endure in the concluding four years of his long occupancy of the see. It can hardly have been a pleasure excursion which the Conqueror summoned him to undertake, when in 1067 he journeyed into Sussex to attend the King, who was embarking at the port—as it was then—of Pevensey on his way to Normandy. Doubtless, it was in the capacity of hostages that Stigand, Edgar Atheling, Morcar, and other Saxon nobles, were invited to accompany William on this voyage.

W. HENEAGE LEGGE.

(To be continued.)

ART. V.—THE FIRST HUMAN FAMILY.

THE names given in the Book of Genesis to the members who composed the first human family have proved of great interest at all times, and very varying explanations of them have been given by different scholars. It is the object of the present paper, *firstly*, to sum up what has been learnt about their meaning and derivation through recent Oriental research, and *secondly*, to inquire what light is thereby cast on the date of the composition of those chapters of Genesis (especially chaps. iii. and iv.) which contain the names of Adam, Eve, Cain, Abel, and Seth.

I. (*a*) Everyone is aware that *Adam* is not originally a proper name at all; that in most places where it occurs in these chapters it is preceded by the definite article (הָאָדָם), which is often supplied by the Samaritan Pentateuch even when wanting in the Massôrâh; and that as a Hebrew word it means the "man" (*ἄνθρωπος*). It, however, gradually became used as the proper name of the father of the human race, as in later parts of the Bible. But we are at present concerned to know what is the origin and what is the primary meaning of the noun אָדָם (*âdâm*). Few scholars will now support its derivation from the Hebrew words for "redness," "blood," or "likeness," but some have claimed for it an Assyrian etymology, as the noun *admu* has been found in that language. But the word in Assyrian means "the young of a bird," though it may also apparently be used to denote[1] "a child." Other words[2] occur which are evidently of a cognate origin and meaning with the Hebrew meaning of *âdâm*, but they do not come from any known

Semitic Assyrian[3] root. As Adam is never represented as a child, it is evident that we cannot accept this proposed Assyrian derivation of the word. But if no root occurs from which the word may be derived in Hebrew, Assyrian, or any other Semitic tongue, we are naturally led to seek its origin in Accadian (or Sumerian), a language in which we find the derivation of not a few words (such as הֵיכָל, *hêykâl*),[4] once regarded as undoubtedly Semitic. The Assyrian dictionary is full of words borrowed from the Accadian spoken by the highly civilized inhabitants of Babylonia, whom the Semitic invaders overcame in arms, but whose arts and civilization in turn overcame them. It has now been discovered that *âdâm* is actually an Accadian word, and Dr. Pinches points out[5] its occurrence in a bilingual (Accadian and Assyrian) text in the British Museum. There, in a tablet[6] which gives an account of the Creation, we find in Accadian the words, UR NU GIM A(D)DAM NU MU-UN-YA, which in Assyrian are rendered "Âlu ul ê-pu-uš nam-maš-šu-u ul ša-kin"—"A city had not been built, a human being had not settled down." Here we see that the Assyrian version renders *a(d)-dam* by *nammaššu*, which latter word has various meanings in Assyrian, but among them occurs that of "human being," "mankind,"[7] which the mention of a *city* shows to be the one here intended. The cuneiform signs used to write *a(d)-dam* show that the word was supposed to be formed from words denoting "hand" and "lord" respectively, so that Man was in that language distinguished, not as in Sanskrit and Teutonic by his *thought*,[8] but by his possessing "hands" and the "power" which they bestowed on him. It is worthy of notice that the Accadian language possessed a *status prolongationis*,[9] or definite form, which the Assyrian did not, and that this form is *not* used here (it would be *a(d)-dam-mâ*). Hence we see that the word in the text means "*a* human being," "a person," and is not "*the* man," and hence does not refer to any person in particular. That is to say, we have no reason whatever given us to think that the Accadian writer was speaking of the first man, or that the Accadians used Adam as a proper name. The fact that the Assyrian translator rendered the word *a(d)-dam* by a common noun capable of several meanings shows that he was not aware of any Accadian tale in which the father of the human race was called by this name. We know, moreover, that in Accadian legend he was not called Adam, but *Adapa*.[10] Hence we conclude that, whereas the word *Adam* is Accadian, and was taken into Hebrew (at first only as a common noun), yet there is no *proof* that the Hebrew account of the first family on earth was borrowed from an Accadian source, or first composed in

that language—though doubtless it *may* have been so. It is of interest to note that the word—in the form *âdam*—is still retained as a common noun in the Turkish language, which is cognate with Accadian, and has thence been adopted not only into Persian and Urdû, but also into modern colloquial Arabic in the sense of "a human being."

(*b*) Eve's name first occurs in Gen. iii. 20: "And the man called his wife's name *Ḥawwâh*, because she was (*or* became) the mother of all living," rightly explained by Onkelos and Jonathan, "Mother of all the children of men." The LXX. translate Ḥawwâh by *Ζωή*, "Life," and this idea has been very commonly adopted, it being supposed that it comes from the form חָוָה, an older form of חָיָה "to live," preserved in the Phœnician חוא. But if so, the word could hardly mean "life," for it is *never* used in that sense in any part of the Bible. Even the form חַיָּה (*ḥayyâh*) is used in that sense "only[11] in late poetry." The word חַוָּה (*ḥawwâh*) *does* occur in the Bible, in its plural form, but in the sense of *a village of tents*,[12] which hardly seems suitable here. If we take Ḥawwâh as equivalent to *ḥayyâh*, its meaning is quite evident. This latter word is repeatedly used in Genesis, and it means "animal," "beast," or even "wild beast."[13] The name *might* then mean *ζῶον*, but not *ζωή*. It will be granted that this meaning does not readily commend itself to us. Nor does the suggestion of Nöldeke[14] that the word is equivalent to the Aramaic חִוְיָא, חִוְיָא (*ḥiwyâ*), Arabic حَيَّة (*ḥayyatun*), "serpent" (!!!). There is therefore a difficulty in finding a suitable derivation for the word if we refer it to a Semitic source; and this suggests the question whether its etymology should not be sought in Accadian, as that of Adam, and, as we shall see, those of the other members of the family.

Now, in Accadian there is a word *am* which means "mother."[15] In its definite form this word becomes *ammâ*. All students of Accadian know that in the latter tongue there was no distinction recognised between *m* and *w*, and that hence in the Assyrian syllabary these two sounds are denoted by but one set of symbols. Hence, "the mother" would be pronounced *awwâ* as well as *ammâ*. But the word is not apparently found with the strong *ḥ* (ح or ח) prefixed, and this may seem to prevent the possibility of identifying *Ḥawwâh* with *ammâ*. The difficulty is, however, greatly lessened when we find that, as is now generally admitted, *Ḥammu-rabi* is the same name as אַמְרָפֶל (Amraphel).[16] Here we see the converse change, in that the strong *ḥ* is dropped in Hebrew. Moreover, as *ḥammu* seems in Assyrian to be the same word as *ammu*, "family" (*cf.* *Ammi-rapaltu* = *Ḥammu-rabi*),[17]

and as these words are probably of Accadian origin and connected with *am*, "mother," it seems very probable that, in one of its dialectic forms perhaps, the latter word occurred as *ḥam*.* This probability is increased by the fact that the modern Samaritans, alike in their reading of the Pentateuch and in their own modern books, invariably omit to pronounce ח and the other gutturals.[19] Perhaps this originated from an early tendency in the country of Babylonia, whence[20] their ancestors came. If so, *ḥam* may well have been an earlier form of *am*. Now, if we accept this etymology of *Ḥawwâh*, the meaning of the name would be "the mother," and Gen. iii. 20 would mean, "And the man called his wife's name The Mother, because she became the mother of all living." I make this suggestion with some diffidence, but it seems to suit the context very well, which I hardly think any one of the other proposed derivations† of the name does. The fact that the names of the other members of the family are Accadian certainly indicates that Eve's name, too, should find its explanation in that language.

(*c*) Cain's name is introduced in Gen. iv. 1 in the words: "And she bare Cain (*Qayin*), and she said, I have gotten a man with (the help of) Jehovah"—if we take אֵת (*eth*) here, as do the LXX., in the sense of διά, regarding which I reserve my opinion, as that is not the matter under discussion. The most modern view is that the name is derived from the root found in the Arabic قَانَ, "to make artificially, to forge," and hence Professors Brown, Driver, and Briggs regard Cain as a *hero eponymos* and his name[21] as meaning "smith." The word, if Semitic, would have this meaning, as it has in Tubal-Cain; but in this passage it hardly seems appropriate. Hence we are led, with Schrader[22] and others, to turn to Accadian for the etymology. In that language we find the root *gin*, meaning "to send," and as a noun (*gin* or *kin*) it means "a message."[23] Adopted into Assyrian, it was sometimes[24] pronounced *qin*, as the hard Accadian *g* generally becomes *q* in Assyrian. Hence the

* An exact parallel is found in the name of the Tigris, in Hebrew חִדֶּקֶל (*Ḥiddeqel*), and in the original Accadian Id-igna[18] or Id-igla. In this instance we see that the Accadian has lost an original strong *ḥ*, or the Hebrew has added it.

† The Rev. C. J. Ball, in his note on Gen. ii. 18, in the Polychrome Bible suggests that *Ḥawwâh* is the Assyrian *Ḥamât*, "help, support, aid in warfare." But though Delitzsch gives this Assyrian word ("Handwörterbuch," p. 281), Muss-Arnolt ("Dict.," p. 322) shows that it should be written *Ḥamât*, with מ, not ת, for the final letter. Hence the proposed etymology is impossible.

name *Qayin* would mean something (or someone) *sent*, as the cognate *gun*[25] in Accadian means "a gift" or "tribute." This meaning suits the context well, for we might then understand the verse thus: "And she bare Qayin (a gift), and she said, I have gotten a man with (the help of, *or* from with) Jehovah."

Here we must notice the question raised by the evident *παρονομασία* found in the verse (אֶת־קַיִן וַתֹּאמֶר קָנִיתִי אִישׁ וְתִלֶד), where *Qayin* is evidently intended to be supposed to be connected with *qânîthî*, "I have gotten." Hebrew scholars are aware that the latter word comes from the root קָנָה, from which Qayin cannot come. But it seems probable that the verb קָנָה[26] is connected with the Accadian root *gin*, and, if so, we have not merely a *παρονομασία* here, but correct etymology.

(*d*) Abel's name (Heb. *Hebhel*) occurs in Gen. iv. 2, but *with no explanation of its meaning.* This is probably because at the time when the Hebrew text was written its signification was patent to everyone. The word cannot be the ordinary Hebrew word for "vanity," "emptiness," as the Jews of[27] later times have held, for Eve is not represented as possessed of foreknowledge of his early death. It is the ordinary Babylonian (Semitic) word *(h)ablu*,[28] "a son," which in Assyrian became *(h)aplu*, and is found as an element in such proper names as Aššur-bani-*pal*. In Accadian there is no sign to represent simple *h* (ה), and hence that sound is not represented in the Assyrian syllabary, though it doubtless existed in the language. The Assyrio-Babylonian *(h)ablu* is, however, derived from the Accadian *ibila*,[29] meaning "a son," an earlier form of which was *ugulla*.[30] Here again we see that Accadian supplies the meaning of the name, and this meaning suits the context. We still hear a boy called "sonny," though he may possess another name also.

(*e*) The last member of the family is Seth. He is introduced in Gen. iv. 25 in the words: "And she called his name Seth (שֵׁת, *Shêth*), for God *hath* (שָׁת, *shâth*) *appointed* for me another seed in place of Abel." If we turn to Accadian for the etymology of the name, there we find the root *šid* (*shid*), "to number,"[31] "to complete," "a seal," "a bond," etc., the same ideograph being also used, with the sign for a god prefixed, to denote Marduku (Merodach). Omitting the last-mentioned meaning, it seems that the original signification of the root was "to fix," "to set." The Hebrew root שִׁית (*shîth*), from which comes the verb שָׁת (*shâth*) used in this verse ("He hath appointed"), is probably the same; hence

the writer of the verse is not only using *παρονομασία*, but is giving us the correct etymology of the name Seth. The word *šid* (*shid*) in Accadian also denotes "a helper," though in this sense it is denoted by a different ideograph,[32] and *may* come from a different root.

II. We have now seen reason to believe that the names of the persons who composed the first human family are all Accadian.* The question now arises, What light does this throw on the date of the composition of these chapters (Gen. iii. and iv.)?

It is clear that, if we have correctly ascertained the meaning and derivation of these names, the original writer of the Hebrew account incorporated into the Book of Genesis must have been well acquainted with Accadian, using this expression to denote in its broadest sense the non-Semitic language of early Babylonia. There seems good reason to believe that this tongue ceased to be spoken about 1700 years before Christ, though it was studied as a classical language for centuries later. The writer of Gen. iii. and iv. must not only have known Accadian himself, but he must have been writing for people who knew that language and Semitic Babylonian in addition to Hebrew. This is evident both from the explanations which he gives and *from the points which he leaves unexplained*. As *Adam* was a word used in Hebrew as well as in Accadian, it is, of course, left without explanation. The name Abel (*Hebhel*), being used (in the form (*h*)*ablu*) in Semitic Babylonian, would require no comment to men who knew the word *well*, but others might confound it with the similar Hebrew word meaning "vanity," and for such persons a note would have been necessary, had there been any such readers at the time when these chapters were written. As there is no such warning given, it seems as if the writer had been writing at a time when his readers were sure to know Semitic Babylonian. His explanation of Ḥawwâh implies that his readers knew that the word meant "the mother" in Accadian, just as, if we were to write: "And the man called his wife's name *ἡ μήτηρ*, because she was the mother of all living," it would be clear that we fancied our readers knew some Greek. In the same way, if in what is said about Cain's name we substitute for the Accadian the meaning in Greek, we shall be able to appreciate the additional clearness afforded by a knowledge of the second language: "And she

* The names *Eden* (Accadian *Edin*), *Euphrates* (Accadian *Pur-rat*), *Tigris* (*Ḥiddiqel*), *Pishon*, and *Gihon*, are all Accadian. This supports my theory that *Eve* (*Ḥawwâh*) is also from that tongue.

bare Δῶρον,* and she said, I have gotten a man." The same argument applies to what is said in reference to Seth, only that here we can represent both the *παρονομασία* and the meaning in English quite as well as it is done in Hebrew, if we render Gen. iv. 25 thus: "And she called his name Seth, for God *hath set* for me," etc.

The question now arises, At what time in the history of any part of the Hebrew nation were there readers who would know Semitic Babylonian and Accadian, in addition to their own language? Not during or after the Babylonian Captivity, for Accadian was then a dead classical language. Must it not have been either before or soon after Abraham's departure from Ur of the Chaldees? It may be asserted that Abraham did not learn to speak Hebrew until after his settlement in Palestine, though that would be hard to prove, since the Phœnicians, who likewise came from the lower part of the Mesopotamian plain,[33] brought with them what was practically the same language as Hebrew, and not an Aramaic dialect. The chapters which we are considering do not bear evidence of having been translated into Hebrew from any other tongue; but, even if we suppose that they were first composed in an Aramaic dialect, our argument is by no means altered, except that in it we should have to put the word Aramaic instead of the word Hebrew. Nor can it be readily supposed that these chapters are a translation of an original Accadian document, the style being quite unlike that of any such that are known to us, and the doctrine purely Monotheistic. It should also be noticed that the name Abel, representing *(h)ablu* and the Accadian *ibila*, not the *earlier* Accadian *ugulla*, seems an indication of a date not much more remote than that we have suggested. As Abraham's ancestors seem to have entered Babylonia from Arabia (if Hommel[34] is right) with the founder of the dynasty to which Ḥammurabi belonged, or at least not more than a few hundred years before Abraham's own time, we have here too a date-limit for the composition of the narrative. From the fact that the names are Accadian, it may be that there existed a tradition in Babylonia incorporating the main details, even though we are not now able to adduce proof of this. But such a supposition by no means implies a doubt about the truth of the narrative as given in these chapters of Genesis. Accadian is the oldest language known to us, in that respect being rivalled only by ancient Egyptian, with which it has no slight affinity.[35] If traditions of the first human family lingered anywhere, we might expect to find them therefore among the Accadians;

* *Cf.* Θεόδωρος, which in Accadian would perhaps be Gin-Dingir-râ.

and the names by which its members would be mentioned by the Accadians would naturally be Accadian also.

But here we have to meet the objection that, whatever may be thought by Accadian students about the names we have dealt with, yet the Higher Critics are agreed that the verses which we have quoted all belong to a part of Genesis which they attribute to J. or to JE. As to the date of their composition, the Rev. J. C. Ball in his Polychrome edition of Genesis attributes them to "J.^{2}," a document which he[36] holds, "originated in the Southern Kingdom" about 650 B.C. Professor Driver, too, tells us that these verses belong to J.,[37] and says that J. and E. "appear to have cast into a literary form the traditions respecting the beginnings of the nation that were current among the people—approximately (as it would seem) in the early centuries of the monarchy."[38] With this Dillmann and Wellhausen are in general accord.

Well, of course the unknown writers who, "about 650 B.C.," in Judah, forged[39] these chapters (according to the Higher Critical hypothesis of their origin) *may* have had as perfect a knowledge of Accadian and Semitic Babylonian as they apparently had of ancient Egyptian language, manners, and customs.[40] But it can hardly be said that this is a hypothesis that commends itself to us on the score of probability. In the case of any other book than the Bible, the facts which are mentioned in the first part of this paper would be held to furnish internal evidence of date sufficient to refute the Higher Critical theory, at least so far as these chapters (Gen. iii. and iv.) are concerned. I cannot myself, therefore, avoid coming to the conclusion on philological grounds that, just as in the case of Gen. xiv.[41] (which the Rev. J. C. Ball terms "an Exilic Midrash"!),[42] so in these chapters we have a document belonging in the main to the age of Abraham himself.

If this conclusion be correct, it is a matter of great importance, for it may well lead us to examine with greater care than hitherto the accuracy of the "results" which the Higher Critics believe that they have attained. For, as Hommel says, "Kann[43] nur durch inschriftliche Denkmäler der Nachweis erbracht werden, dass auch nur ein Theil der in ihrer Echtheit bestrittenen hebräischen Tradition uralt und somit zuverlässig ist, so ist dem ganzen kühnen Bau der modernen Pentateuchkritik das Fundament entzogen."

W. StClair Tisdall.

NOTES AND AUTHORITIES.

[1] Delitzsch, "Assyrisches Handwörterbuch," p. 25; Muss-Arnolt, "Concise Dict. of the Assyrian Language," p. 20. [2] *E.g.*, *dadmu*: Muss-

Arn., p. 242. [3] The root *adâmu*, "to build, to make," is fictitious. [4] From the Accadian (*H*)*e*, "house," and *gal*, "large." [5] Pinches, "The Old Testament in the Light of the Historical Records of Assyria and Babylonia," 1st ed., p. 78. [6] "Cuneiform Texts from the British Museum," Part XIII., plate 35. Dr. Pinches' transcription of *ša-kin* by *šâššu* does not agree with the published text of this Tablet. [7] *Vide* authorities under *nammaštu* and *nammaššu* in Muss-Arnolt "Ass. Dict.," p. 689, and Del., "Handw.," p. 469, where it is shown that the former word equals Ass. *amêlûtum* and *tênišêtum*. [8] Skt. *manushya*, etc., from the root *man*, "to think," so *Mann* and *Mensch*, etc. [9] *Cf.* Hommel, "Sum-Akk. Sprache," p. 19; "Sum-Lesestücke," p. 142, [10] Sayce, "Religions of Ancient Egypt and Babylonia," pp. 383, 423-425, etc. [11] Brown, Driver and Briggs' new edition of Gesenius' "Heb. Dict.," *s.v.*, חַוָּה. [12] *Ibidem.* [13] *Ibidem.* [14] In *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, xlii., p. 487. [15] Hommel, "Sum-Les.," "Syllabary," p. 17 (No. 204). [16] *Vide* Harper, "Letters," iii., p. 257, No. 255 (K. 552), Pinches, *Proceedings of Soc. Bibl. Archæol.*, May, 1901, p. 191 (quoted in Sayce's "Rel. of Anc. Eg. and Bab.," p. 256); Hommel, "Die altisraelitische Überlieferung," pp. 88, 105, 193, *sqq*. [17] *Ibidem.* [18] Hommel, "Sum-Les.," p. 79 (No. 372). [19] Rosenberg, "Lehrbuch der Samaritanischen Sprache und Literatur," p. 11. [20] Under Shalmaneser, 2 Kings, xvii. 24. [21] New Ed. of Gesenius' "Heb. Dict.," p. 884, where see authorities. [22] Schrader "Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament," ed. of 1883, pp. 44-46 and p. 523. [23] Hommel, "Sum-Les.," p. 78. [24] Compare Sayce, Rosenberg, Hommel, etc. [25] Hommel, "Sum-Les.," p. 79. Dr. Pinches' remarks ("The Old Testament in the Light," etc., pp. 82 and 83) are worthy of notice, but he confesses that his proposed Assyrian derivation of *Cain* is unsatisfactory. [26] In Ass. *ganû*, Ar. ‌. [27] *Cf.* "Fuerstii Concordantiæ," p. 1274, *s.v.* [28] This is now generally acknowledged, but was first suggested by Schrader, "Die Keilinschriften und das A. T.," pp. 44-46. [29] Hommel, "Sum-Les.," p. 78 (No. 107). [30] *Ibid.*, p. 11, *fin.* [31] *Ibid.*, p. 77. *Šid* is also there given as *šiti*, where the second consonant, too, agrees with the Hebrew. Another form is to be found on p. 28. [32] *Vide* Hommel, *op. cit.*, Syll., No. 354. [33] Herodotus I., 1. [34] "Die Altisrael.: Überlieferung," pp. 56, *sqq*. He quotes Sayce's opinion to the same effect (in "Patriarchal Palestine") in pp. 95-97. [35] Hommel, "Die babylonische Ursprung der ägyptischen Kultur," *passim*. [36] *Vide* the explanation of the colours given on the cover of his "Genesis" in the Polychrome Bible. [37] "Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament," 5th ed., p. 12. [38] *Op. cit.*, p. 110. [39] Möller thinks this word none too strong to express the conduct of the compilers of the Hexateuch, *if* we accept the Higher Critical theory ("Are the Critics Right?" p. 94). [40] The knowledge of Egyptian is shown in the name, *e.g.*, of Joseph (Zaphnathpaaneah), etc. See Canon Cook's excursus on the subject in "Speaker's Commentary." Some parts of Eber's "Ägypten und die Bücher Mose's" are still of value in this connexion, as is his "Eine Ägyptische Königstochter." [41] Hommel, "Die Altisrael. Überlieferung," p. 193; "Dass . . . Gen. xiv. also ursprünglich auf einer Thontafel verzeichnet stand, geht übrigens noch ganz direct aus der Form des Namens Amraphel hervor." [42] *Vide* the cover of his "Genesis," as quoted above. [43] *Op. cit.*, p. 22.

ART. VI.—"THE UNEMPLOYED: A NATIONAL QUESTION."[1]

THIS is a book which ought to be widely read, for it is just the book which was wanted on this subject, which at the present time is causing so many of us such great anxiety. It is short, it is extremely clear, and its tone is eminently fair and judicious. Its author speaks with authority, for he speaks from unusual fulness of knowledge and experience. It is, too, a very *hopeful* book; and hopefulness as to the possibility of a satisfactory solution of such a problem as that of the unemployed is a feeling much to be welcomed, especially when, as in Mr. Alden's case, it is based upon an intimate acquaintance with all the various factors of the problem; and is certainly not justified through evading or ignoring any one or more of its many difficulties.

I would lay special stress upon this feeling of hopefulness, because one of the temptations of the present time is to feel oppressed by the apparent *hopelessness* of this problem. The social sore appears to be both so deep and so widespread that we are inclined to regard it as incurable; and we are apt to think that all that can be done is to mollify it by means of temporary relief funds, or relief works, and by the provision of free meals, etc.

Mr. Alden looks the facts in the face. He considers the problem from both sides: (1) The men that want work, and (2) the works that want men. The real problem is to connect the two. He helps us to see that to make this connection ought to be by no means impossible, and his book may be said to explain the methods he would pursue. Before we enter upon an examination of these let us note that (1) as for twelve years Warden of Mansfield Settlement in West Ham, (2) as a member of the Mansion House Unemployed Committee and (3) as Honorary Secretary to the Guildhall Conference of 1903, he does not lack experience. But, in addition to this experience, he brings two other qualifications to his task. First, he has most carefully studied and digested the various recent Blue Books on the subject, many of the conclusions of which are embodied in his own chapters; and secondly, he has personally visited and studied the arrangements of many of the labour colonies in Germany, Belgium, and Holland.

The book contains nine short chapters, followed by seven short appendices and a very brief bibliography.

[1] "The Unemployed: a National Question," by Percy Alden, M.A. London: P. S. King and Son, Orchard House, Westminster, 1905. Price 1s. 6d. net.

In Chapter I. we have a sketch of the chief causes and processes which have gradually produced the present position. By far the most powerful of these has been, of course, the rural exodus. How many people realize that the number of persons engaged in agriculture in the United Kingdom to-day is *nearly* 50 *per cent. less* than it was only forty years ago? A second most powerful cause has been the dislocation of an immense amount of hand labour by the introduction of machinery, a cause which is still at work, and will probably continue to be so. A third cause is the increasing keenness of the competition between masters, together with a decreasing "margin of profit"; consequently the demands of the masters upon the men must also increase. Only the young, the active, and the skilful can meet these; others are not wanted, for the master cannot afford to employ them. I would, from my own observation, add a fourth cause: women are in many branches of many trades (they work for somewhat lower wages) gradually displacing men, and with a very evil result.

Each of the first three causes Mr. Alden believes can be checked by the creation of a corresponding force which shall act in the exactly opposite direction. With regard to the fourth cause, it is surely at least conceivable that the area could be enlarged within which the members of trades-unions could show themselves sufficiently strong to be able to forbid the competition of women. Could a larger number of young women, by the sheer necessity of earning a living, be compelled to enter domestic service, a double benefit might accrue: there might be many more places found for men, and employers might have to offer men, at any rate, a somewhat higher wage than they are now paying to young women.

Let us consider the position at the present time. Partly owing to the Factory Acts and the Employers' Liability Act, we have thousands of labourers past the prime of life, or in some way or other below the standard, walking the streets and competing fiercely with each other for any casual work they can obtain. The longer these men remain unemployed the greater is the danger of their becoming demoralized and degraded, because no man can be idle for long without suffering at least some moral deterioration. This fact should not be forgotten.

Mr. Alden thinks that the theory of non-interference—"that it is best to leave men to fight for their own interests, since the most deserving are sure to obtain employment, while the rest can, if necessary, be provided for by the Poor Law"—can no longer be maintained. He thinks that the opposite view—viz., that the *community* has a responsibility towards the unemployed—is becoming more and more generally

accepted. The corollary to this view is, of course, that the community must discharge this responsibility by enabling the unemployed to obtain work. Charity, however well meant, is no remedy; it only intensifies the evil by lessening the independence and power of self-effort of those who receive it. On the other hand, "the Poor Law, by inflicting upon the man who applies for relief the stigma of pauperism, tends to place him permanently in the pauper category."

The problem, then, is to find sufficient work, and work of a suitable nature, for those who to-day are without work. Is this problem insoluble? Mr. Alden believes it is not. The rest of his book may be said to contain his justification for this opinion.

He commences with that class of the workless whom it has become the fashion to call "the unemployable." The term is expressive, but it is apt to be misleading; for among those so described there is not *one* class, but *many* classes, which must be grouped under at least two chief heads.

One of the chief causes of failure in our present methods of dealing with distress is our lack of sufficient discrimination. This arises from two main reasons: First, from circumstances we feel obliged to act in a hurry; we form relief committees, and obtain information, and decide upon methods, when the distress is actually upon us; second, we expect that, with very little machinery, and that by no means of a high order, we can produce a great deal of good work. Only the other day I came across an appeal to the voters in a certain union upon the gross extravagance in the administration of the Poor Law. This charge of "gross extravagance" arose from an attempt (1) to appoint certain additional officials, who were absolutely necessary for the proper administration of the law, and (2) to pay these an adequate salary, which was certainly necessary if capable men were to be obtained. In this union an additional capable relieving officer would more than save his own salary by being able to check out-relief being given in wholly unsuitable cases.

We must, then, have discrimination; and, if this is to be adequate, the administrative power to insure it must also be adequate, and for this power we must be prepared to pay. Money so spent will be a wise investment for the community.

Of the so-called "unemployable," Mr. Alden points out, as I said just now, that there are two great divisions: (1) All able-bodied men who refuse to work, or are refused work owing to defects of character; (2) the physically or mentally deficient. Both these classes must be *educated* to work, but they must be educated by very different methods.

Careful discrimination will show several separate classes within each of these main divisions. Among the first we shall find (1) criminals, (2) semi-criminals, (3) vicious vagabonds, (4) the incorrigibly lazy, etc. All these require, and should be compelled to undergo, reformatory treatment. The casual ward, as it exists at present, should be abolished in favour of the relief-station, now so common in Germany and Switzerland. The man on the tramp, who is seeking for work, should be compelled to carry identification papers, and should these not be found in order he should be detained by the police until proper investigation as to his identification and antecedents can be made. Above all, there should be a graded system of labour colonies, the lowest class of which would differ little from a prison; the highest would be a settlement in which we find men to all intents and purposes free and enjoying the results of their own labours. To these labour colonies it should be in the power of the justices to commit any man for habitual vagrancy, idleness, or refusal to accept work. The object of one and all must be to teach men to work, to prevent the existence of idleness.

The initial expenses connected with these colonies would doubtless be great; but character is a national asset for which we must be willing to pay something; and if we think of the cost to society at present of the criminal, the semi-criminal, the vagabond—the idle and vicious classes who infest the slums of our towns—the additional cost to the nation would not be so very great; and if these colonies were carefully placed and skilfully managed, a considerable return might be obtained in the improvement of the estates on which they were established.

The second class of the unemployable—the physically and mentally deficient—Mr. Alden divides into four sections: (1) The aged; (2) the physically weak and maimed, including the blind, lame, and deaf, and men with weak hearts; (3) epileptics; (4) weak-willed inebriates and the mentally deficient. Taking these various classes together, we feel that what is needed for them all is "a system which would allow us to utilize to the full any powers that these poor men and women may possess, at the same time imposing upon them nothing in the shape of punishment or of stigma for that which is entirely beyond their own control."

Among these various classes the "weak-willed inebriates" are the most difficult with which to deal. Probably the best, if not the only, remedy is the farm, or labour colony, in which they may be so long compulsorily detained as may be requisite to effect a cure. In such a colony they would "work under healthy conditions at suitable employment, and under strict

medical supervision; they might then regain their strength of mind and restore their wasted energies."

Having dealt with the unemployable, we are now in a position to consider the genuine "unemployed"—the genuine workers who are *unable* to find work. We will not discuss the question of the probable number of these, which, of course, varies with the season and the state of trade. It is, however, under the most favourable circumstances, probably very much larger than most people imagine.

Mr. Alden would first divide the unemployed into three main classes: (1) "Those who are unemployed owing to dislocation in trade, the death of a trade, or changes in methods of industry, and are therefore superfluous in such trades; (2) those who are unemployed owing to temporary depression in trade or a severe winter; (3) those whose labour is seasonal or casual."

Among many suggested remedies, Mr. Alden thinks something at least might be effected by (1) "improved education and technical training." For while it is true that a certain number of skilled workers are to be found among the unemployed, on the other hand, the better the education, and the greater the technical skill among our own workpeople, the less liability is there for trades which require these to a high degree being driven abroad (*e.g.*, to Germany) in search of them. (2) Another remedy may be found in legislative and other means of combating drink and gambling—both fruitful sources of individual unemployment. This suggestion opens out a wide field, one which, so far, in this connection, has not received the attention it deserves. Only those who have tried to compute the loss to the resources of the country by the evils of drink and gambling have any idea of the immense sums which are thus squandered; and the material or financial loss is only a small part of the whole loss. We have to think of the losses to national character, national health, etc. (3) A third need Mr. Alden believes exists in more "effective trades organizations, especially for unskilled labour." Here we enter upon a subject which must, to a great extent, be left to the expert. But that is only to say that it requires more knowledge, more investigation, more careful study, than has yet been bestowed upon it. (4) "The reform of taxation." This is a favourite remedy with a certain class of reformers: and here, again, we are in a field which belongs to the expert. There are those who assert that unemployment is due primarily to under-consumption. "The unearned elements of income are being capitalized at so rapid a rate that the demands of ordinary consumption are not able to proceed *pari passu* with the production that results" (p. 38). "The

object of the statesman should, then, be to make taxation tend to the greater distribution of wealth—*i.e.*, of power to consume." (5) "The checking of the exodus from the country to the town." This is of all remedies, I believe, really the one from which we may hope for the best and the most permanent results for good. And every means and every opportunity should be taken for putting it into effect. There are no doubt many difficulties in the way. The questions connected with a sufficient supply of cottages, of small holdings to be held by the municipalities, of security of tenure for tenants of small plots, of credit banks, etc., will all need to be carefully worked out. But when we think what is done in Denmark; when we remember that "five-sixths of that country is occupied by peasants with small holdings, while dairy-farming on co-operative lines, encouraged by the Government, is pursued with almost unparalleled success"; when we think of the immense sums spent upon imports of dairy produce by this country, we should surely feel that the time has come to devise some plan or method of producing the necessaries of life at home.

I have dealt with the first three chapters of this book at such length that a brief indication of the contents of the remaining chapters must suffice.

Chapter IV. deals with "suggested direct remedies for all classes of genuine unemployed." Among these the first is that of "the appointment of a Minister of Commerce and Industry, together with the reorganization of existing departments dealing with Labour." At present not only the Local Government Board, but the Home Office and the Board of Trade, are all concerned with Labour questions; while the Commissioners of Woods and Forests and the Board of Agriculture are also interested in rural industries. Whatever other reforms are made there should be a special department to be held responsible for the question of unemployment. The second suggestion is that "municipal and other local labour bureaux be established in every place of any size." These must not be, as too often at present, mere hastily devised adjuncts to reliefs works. What is really needed is a "clearing-house" in each district, which not only registers the unemployed, but systematically classifies them after investigation, and furnishes the Government with a statement of the numbers of unemployed, both skilled and unskilled, in the district under consideration, and finally brings together employers in need of men and unemployed in need of situations, in the briefest possible space of time.

Two other direct remedies are suggested in this chapter, the first being, "relief-stations and lodging-houses," which

should be situated within a day's walk of one another, in order to facilitate the search for work, and they should serve as labour bureaux for their immediate district. The methods whereby these are governed in Germany and Switzerland are fully explained. As a proof of their usefulness, we find that more than two millions of visits were paid to these relief-stations in Germany in the year 1902. The other remedy is that of "the Extension of Insurance against Unemployment." In England this movement is yet in its infancy, and so far is still confined to certain-trades unions; on the Continent, in various forms, it has been tried in different countries. In Mr. Alden's book readers will find much information on the subject, and those who desire still more complete knowledge will find it in the recently published "Report to the Board of Trade on Agencies and Methods for Dealing with the Unemployed in various Foreign Countries" (Cd. 2304).

Chapter V. deals with the difficult conditions created by a dislocation in trade, the death of a trade, or by changes in the methods of industry. Some years ago it was my lot to work amid, and watch, the agonies of a dying trade; at present I am working in a district where hundreds of capable and willing workers are being reduced to destitution by the rapid introduction of machinery and labour-saving apparatus. In the first case the situation was to some extent saved by the introduction of a new trade; in the present case I see no prospect of such an amelioration.

Mr. Alden's remedies are as follows: (1) "County Council farm colonies, together with a system of co-operative small holdings." I have already cited Denmark, and in both Lincolnshire and Norfolk (where the method of small holdings has been tried) it has been justified by success (pp. 70-72). (2) "Agricultural training schools and farm colonies for Town-bred Men." These have apparently been tried with success both in America and in Germany. (3) "Afforestment." It is difficult to understand why, after the Report of 1902, this opening for labour has not been utilized. By citing case after case Mr. Alden shows that wherever the experiment has been made it has proved a success. In one district in Germany, where land for agricultural purposes was worth not more than four shillings an acre, the profits of the same land under forest are now thirty-eight shillings an acre. In the Landes district in France afforestment has added, it is reckoned, £40,000,000 to the wealth of the country.

Mr. Alden has still many other suggestions to make, such as: (1) The reduction of the hours of labour; not so much as a cure for unemployment as tending to produce greater efficiency in the workers; (2) emigration of suitable families;

(3) the reclamation of waste lands; (4) the improvement of the canal system. But of these I must not stay to speak.

I would advise all who are interested in the present difficulty—and surely all should be so interested!—to study this little book.

The great danger is that, from want of knowledge and want of initiative, we sit down and regard the problem as insoluble, and then fall back upon the fatal method of temporary relief, and so be content to palliate where we ought to try to cure.

We must face the problem as other countries are facing it, and Mr. Alden's book will at least help to convince us that we have by no means as yet exhausted the possibilities of a solution.

I feel I cannot more usefully conclude this paper than by quoting the sentences with which our author closes his final chapter:

"The one hope for England is that *pari passu* with the growth of our national wealth will spread the desire to see a greater and more equitable distribution of that wealth. The unemployed question is largely an economic question, for which charity, however generous, is no solution. It is the first duty of the State, as also its highest and truest interest, to set on foot such constructive reforms as will check the wholesale demoralization of large sections of the working classes, and restore to the people the assurance, so long denied, that honest work will carry with it a just and certain reward."

W. EDWARD CHADWICK.

Notices of Books.

The Catholic Faith: A Manual of Instruction for Members of the Church of England. By W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS, B.D. London: Hodder and Stoughton. Pp. xxiv+462. Price 1s. paper; 2s. cloth.

Two notable features of this manual are the arrangement of the contents and the terse way in which the author puts his points. His book represents not only the reading and study of several years, but the teaching given in the course of parochial work, which accounts to a great extent for its practical character. The need of definite and systematic instruction in Holy Scripture and Christian doctrine is widely felt at the present day. Through lack of this many of our congregations have only the most confused notions of the principles of the religion they profess, and people

are led to suppose theology to be so dry and uninteresting that it had better be avoided altogether. Anybody who takes up Mr. Griffith Thomas's volume will be disabused of that idea. It treats of great subjects in a popular manner without vulgarizing them, and renders them a source of interest to the reader. We notice that Mr. Litton's "Introduction to Dogmatic Theology" has been referred to and used throughout, and are glad to see the testimony in the preface to its value. It was republished two years ago in a convenient form, and ought to be in the hands of every clergyman. The present manual is divided into three parts, of which the first deals with the relation of the individual Christian to God "according to the Prayer-Book," and the formation and maintenance of that relation. Under this head we have a series of instructions on the Baptismal Covenant, the Creed, and the Means of Grace; the sections on our Lord's redemptive work including two chapters on the Atonement and Justification, and those on the Holy Spirit including two more on Sanctification and Election. The remaining divisions deal with the relation of the individual Churchman to his fellow-Churchmen, and his relation to some important questions of the day. These divisions contain a sketch of the history of the English Church, with notes upon its formularies and system of worship and government, followed by discussions of numerous current controversies. It will thus be seen how comprehensive the contents are.

Considering the wide field which the book covers, it can hardly be expected that there will be no variance of opinion on some things, even amongst those of us who are in general agreement with the author. Statements occurring here and there would be put by some in another form, and matters of detail occasionally require correction. In the chapter on Nonconformity, for instance, Mr. Thomas omits to notice the chief defect of the new Federation of Free Churches—viz., that acceptance of a creed is in no way considered essential, neither is Baptism. We should also be inclined to put the argument against the public use of prayers for the dead on different grounds, and should question the statement that in the Church of Rome such prayers are not prayers for the "unconverted" dead. The Roman idea of conversion is not the same as Mr. Thomas's. On p. 431 it should have been noticed that the "Order of Communion," put out in 1548, was not issued "by authority of Parliament," nor had it even the formal sanction of Convocation. We agree with Mr. Thomas as to the meaning of "the second year" of Edward VI., but he has not quite caught the gist of the objection raised against it. With regard to the Ornaments Rubric he offers a new explanation, which he considers "more probable" than that laid down in the Purchas and Ridsdale judgments, where it was held that "other order" was taken. This new explanation appears to us a good deal less probable than the other, since it does not fit in with all the circumstances or meet the actual difficulty. Such matters, however, are comparatively trivial, in view of the general excellence and usefulness of the book as a whole. A wide

circulation, which it fully deserves, may be anticipated for it, and its contents will no doubt contribute largely to stimulate interest in Christian doctrine. Its keynote is struck in one of the opening chapters: "The Atoning Sacrifice of Christ is the essential truth of the Bible. Not Bethlehem, but Calvary, is the centre of gravity in the New Testament."

A Sacrament of our Redemption: An Inquiry into the Meaning of the Lord's Supper in the New Testament and the Church of England. By W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS, B.D. London: Bemrose and Son, Limited. Pp. xv+116. Price 2s. 6d.

This second book by Mr. Thomas, devoted to a single subject, is more of a formal treatise than his work on "The Catholic Faith," and consists of two dissertations for a degree, in an expanded form. The author starts from another standpoint than that taken in some recent treatises on Holy Communion. Patristic teaching is not discussed, the reader being referred to the catenas of authorities given by Dean Goode and Dr. Vogan, but an appeal is made in the first instance to Scripture, and then the formularies of the Church of England are examined. The method adopted simplifies the question greatly, and it will be recognised that in this way the true issue, so far as it concerns English Churchmen, is best raised. Mr. Thomas goes very carefully through all the Scripture passages, and alludes incidentally to the alleged distinction between the original supper and the observance of the rite after the Day of Pentecost, with reference to the view taken by Bishop Gore and others on the ground that the Eucharist was designed to be a reception of the glorified Christ. The argument against this opinion on pp. 35, 36 might well have been amplified, being a little too condensed in its present shape, so that a person unacquainted with the subject would not readily perceive the exact point. Several chapters are occupied with a review of the evidence from the Prayer-Book, which is shown to demonstrate the existence of "a great gulf," both historically and theologically, between England and Rome. Mr. Thomas further points out that the doctrine of our Church on the Eucharist is "Reformed," not "Lutheran," as to which we are in agreement with him, though we are surprised to see that he does not quote the remarkable chapter in the "Reformatio Legum" ("De Hæresibus," cap. xix.), where Lutheranism is condemned. It is true that the "Reformatio Legum" is not a formulary of the Church, but it happens to be a most valuable historical document, representing Cranmer's views in the last years of his life, and the chapter mentioned should be carefully compared with the twenty-eighth and twenty-ninth of the Thirty-nine Articles. Some of the phrases in the twenty-eighth Article are directly taken from it, and the bearing of its second part on the twenty-ninth can be seen at a glance. "The Lord's Supper in Current Teaching" is the title of Mr. Thomas's concluding sections, the growth and development of new doctrines that have sprung up amongst us during the last sixty years being summarized in a concise manner, with extracts from recent writers and criticisms (always fair and temperate) upon them. The book

forms a valuable contribution to theological literature. We may add that it is dedicated to the Dean of Canterbury by "one of his old students" at King's College.

The Household of the Lafayettes. By EDITH SICHEL, author of "Women and Men of the French Renaissance." London: Archibald Constable and Co. Pp. 356. Price 3s. 6d.

The interest of Miss Sichel's book compensates for the inappropriateness of her historical parallels. It is difficult to trace any resemblance between the French Revolution and the Exodus, and few people would think of comparing Lafayette with John Hampden. No two men could have been more dissimilar in point of temperament, while there was a wide difference in their respective aims and objects. But the picture drawn in these pages of Madame Lafayette introduces us to a truly noble Frenchwoman, religious and heroic, whose memory is in every way worthy of preservation. Adrienne de Noailles was one of five sisters, daughters of the Duc and Duchesse d'Ayers, and was barely fifteen at the time of her marriage in 1773. After three years of wedded life her husband betook himself to America, where he played a more or less prominent part in the War of Independence. Except for a couple of flying visits home, he remained in America until 1783, returning with his head full of republican notions, and plunging at once into a whirlpool of political agitation. Of the qualifications which go to make a statesman he was entirely destitute, pushing his way to notoriety by his inordinate vanity and fluent tongue. Burke, who considered him the creature of more determined conspirators, was not far wrong in his view. It was fortunate for Lafayette that in the autumn of 1792 he fell into the hands of the Allies, and was imprisoned in a Prussian fortress, this seeming "misfortune" undoubtedly saving his life, since a faction more advanced than his own had already marked him out for destruction. His wife's experiences during the Reign of Terror form a thrilling episode in Miss Sichel's volume. She was arrested by order of the Revolutionary Committee, thrown into prison in the small town of Brioude, then transferred to Paris, and lived for months in daily expectation of death. Her sister, mother, and grandmother were guillotined together on one day. Nothing could be more pathetic than the story of the courage and Christian behaviour of these sufferers, but it is not surprising that Madame Lafayette, when at last she obtained her release, "felt as if she were dead." Before long she made her way to Vienna, and gained permission from the Austrian Emperor for herself and her two daughters to share her husband's imprisonment. He was set at liberty in 1797, ten years of peace and repose following, and Miss Sichel gives a pleasing description of the domestic life of the family during this period. Lafayette's devotion to his wife was, in our opinion, the redeeming feature of his character. After her death, on the Christmas Eve of 1807, he became in some respects an altered man, under the influence of "a

deep and enduring sorrow"; neither was the example of her faith without effect upon him. It will serve, as mirrored here, to inspire others still.

The Day of Days, Vol. XXXIII. Edited by CHARLES BULLOCK, B.D. London: *Home Words* Publishing Office. Pp. 284. Price 2s.

Few men have done so much as Mr. Bullock for the spread of pure literature among the people. He firmly believes the press to be "a second pulpit," and for years has kept going a weekly newspaper and three monthly periodicals, all of which enjoy a deserved popularity. The writer of this notice once stayed in a remote village, where there were few books except those in the parochial library, and beguiled the time with a dozen well-thumbed volumes of Mr. Bullock's magazines. Very interesting they proved. The annual volume of the *Day of Days* is well up to the mark, containing an abundance of excellent matter for Sunday reading. We heartily wish for this and the veteran editor's other enterprises an increased measure of success.

The School of Faith. Sermons Preached in Westminster Abbey. By the Right Rev. Bishop WELLDON, D.D. London: Bemrose and Sons. Pp. 210. Price 3s. 6d.

Bishop Welldon's sermons can always be read with profit. Though the twelve contained in this series were delivered in the Abbey, nearly all of them could be preached with equal acceptance in a little village church. They are simplicity itself in form and language, but direct and forcible, and occasionally touching. It is a distinct advantage that an educated congregation should have the opportunity of hearing preaching of this kind. There are two sermons on the Resurrection. Two others are on conversion and sanctification, and we would particularly note one entitled "The Words of Jesus Christ." An extract from the Preface may be quoted here, in which Bishop Welldon says: "The pulpit, as it seems to me, is not the place for rudely thrusting the last and most questionable results of Biblical criticism upon the consciences of a mixed body of men and women and children. Even if I believed them all, I would not put them forward there. But I have studied them, and it is my firm conviction that under the shelter of criticism a good deal is advanced which is not scientific or literary or historical truth, and I think it will have its day and will run its course, and will then be forgotten." It is a pity that these sentiments are not shared by certain other members of the Chapter of Westminster, who seem to take a delight in airing their own theories. We are glad to see that the Bishop follows the good old practice, which has almost become extinct in many pulpits, of quoting Holy Scripture largely. His illustrations, drawn from history and biography, are also very effective. People will find the sermons most useful for private reading.