

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

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

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

# THE CHURCHMAN

April, 1913.

## The Month.

**Easter.** OUR present issue coincides with the season of the Easter Festival. The Easter message of life and immortality through the Risen Christ is ever present with us, but it is at this time that our thoughts turn more particularly to the Fact on which the Easter message is based, the Resurrection on the morning of the first Easter Day. Christian thought is still profoundly exercised about the proper interpretation of the fact. Most of us are familiar enough now with the cleavage between miraculous and naturalistic explanations of the empty tomb, and the subsequent appearances of the Risen Lord. Purely naturalistic explanations, involving suppositions that the body was removed by friends or by foes, are hopelessly discredited, and may well be discarded as utterly inadequate to meet the case. But we are now face to face with another hypothesis, which seems to find favour with many, and which has recently been presented with force and ability by Mr. Streeter in his essay on "The Historic Christ" in "Foundations." We have already spoken of this book as a whole, but a further word may be permitted as to its treatment of this particular topic.

**A Recent Theory.** It is admitted freely that our Lord triumphed over death and that His Spirit survived in the power of an endless life. It is also admitted that our Lord "appeared" to His followers, and that these "appear-

ances" were due to no mere subjective condition of the disciples, but were actual "objective" appearances of His Spirit to theirs in recognizable form. To admit all this is to go very far, but we still have left unsolved the empty grave. What happened to our Lord's crucified body? Did it remain in the grave? And if not, what happened to it? That the Apostles and the early witnesses *believed* that the grave was empty is indubitable. It was not only to a Risen Christ but to an empty grave that their testimony was borne. The point is one that cannot be evaded, and Mr. Streeter appears to leave it as a mystery at present unsolved. The truth is that either view is beset by difficulties. The traditional view is attended by difficulties of a philosophic kind. It tells of a new, a unique phenomenon, for which no analogies could be found in human experience, and it is wrapped in mystery. It makes demands on the faith of those who accept it. All this one may well admit. But the more modern view is beset by difficulties, not philosophical, but historical. It has no tenable view to proffer as to the empty grave and the fate of the crucified body. To us the whole body of evidence seems inexplicable on any other hypothesis than that the grave was empty because the body of the Lord was no longer there.

St. Luke's  
Narrative.

The difficulty to many minds lies in the anti-thesis between the "spiritual body" spoken of by St. Paul, and the account in St. Luke of our Lord's claim to have a body of "flesh and bones" coupled with the incident of eating "a piece of broiled fish," followed afterwards by St. Peter's words (Acts x. 31) "us, who did eat and drink with Him after He rose from the dead." With regard to this even Professor Denney—than whom there is no more stalwart defender of the historical fact of the Resurrection—is prepared to admit "that Luke everywhere betrays a tendency to materialize the supernatural," and that "it is not too much to suppose that this tendency has left traces on his Resurrection narrative also" ("Jesus and the Gospel," p. 146). Would it not be safer, and indeed more philosophic, at this stage of our thought, to sus-

pend judgment and to accept St. Luke's narrative till we have more convincing grounds for rejection? We may well accept St. Paul's description of the Resurrection body that it is "spiritual." But what may be the capacities and the limitations of a "spiritual" body, we are not, in our present stage of knowledge, in a position to assert. If we believe that the Crucified Body was so "spiritualized" that it could transcend the conditions of time and space in the manner implied in the Resurrection narratives, we may well pause before making dogmatic statements as to limitations of the capacities it possessed.

Shortly after the publication of our present issue,  
 Convocation at Oxford will give its decision on  
 the vexed question of the Divinity Degrees.

Divinity  
 Degrees  
 at Oxford.

During the present month of March a constant interchange of opinion is taking place in the Press, chiefly in the columns of the *Times*. We are therefore only following the fashion in attempting once again to express our own hopes and wishes. Putting the matter broadly, we feel that the Degrees should be the mark of ability on the part of professedly Christian men to discuss points of Christian Theology. We should also agree with the wise and cautious letter of the Dean of Canterbury in the *Record* for February 21, in which he makes it clear that the bestowal of the Degrees should have a distinct relation to fitness for teaching. The B.D. or the D.D. must be a man whom the University would be prepared to commission as a "teacher" in the Faculty of Theology. In other words, the Degrees should connote, not only intellectual ability, but a certain moral responsibility. The point of reform for which we press is that membership in the Church of England should not be regarded as a final limitation. We feel that professedly Christian men of other communions should be regarded as possible candidates. Why should not Dr. Peake, Professor Bartlett, Dr. Horton—Oxford men of whom Oxford may well be proud—be enabled to proceed to the Degrees in Divinity of their own University?

Possible Dangers. We note gladly that the Dean of Canterbury is well aware of the fairness of this demand. He says : " Members of Presbyterian and other confessions, and laymen in the Church of England, may be as fully qualified by belief in the fundamental truths of Christianity to be admitted to a Divinity degree as clergymen ; and many who are opposed to the statute now at issue *would gladly consider reasonable amendments in the present system which would recognize this fact.*" We emphasize these last words because they embody the point for which we ourselves wish to contend. It has been admitted by the defenders of the statute that in *theory* it will be *possible* for a Hindu or Mohammedan to submit a thesis attacking some point of Christian teaching, and that an agnostic *may* offer a thesis attacking the Divinity of our Lord. But to suppose all this, the Regius Professor of Divinity says, is simply " to let the imagination run riot." He thinks that no such person will ever present himself, and, if he were to, " the Board of the Faculty will be completely in command of the subject which he offers for his thesis." For ourselves, we still think that something more definite in the way of safeguard should be provided, and we now give *in extenso* a letter from the Headmaster of Shrewsbury, published in the *Times* of March 10, which seems to put our own position with great force and clearness :

The Headmaster of Shrewsbury's View. " SIR,—Will you allow me to state the difficulty which presents itself, I think, to many members of the University of Oxford with regard to the question of Divinity degrees ?

" On the one hand, we desire to claim no privilege for the Established Church which could be thought unfair to any religious body. It may be said that this attitude is adopted somewhat late, but it is at any rate sincere. Again, we have the strongest dislike to endeavouring to override the expressed opinion of the resident members of the University. We do not relish our position as backwoodsmen, and we are cordially out of sympathy with many of our allies. Thirdly, and in an imper-

fect world this is perhaps the most important consideration, we are honestly afraid of the outcry which may be aroused against Oxford by what would seem an illiberal and reactionary vote.

“On the other hand, the statute which we are asked to support seems to us fundamentally absurd. That a man should be able to earn the title of Doctor of Divinity by a reasoned disproof of the Divinity of Christ seems to introduce needless confusion into a term which is at present well understood; and the absurdity is heightened by the fact that an equally learned treatise on Buddhism or Hinduism could not be similarly honoured. The objection that an anti-Christian treatise would not, as a matter of fact, be submitted may at the present moment be well founded, but legislators are surely bound to consider the future, and wise drafting of the present statute might prevent difficult personal questions from arising in the future.

“Surely there is nothing illiberal or absurd in suggesting that the degree of Doctor of Divinity should only be awarded to those who feel able to sign a statement that they profess and call themselves Christians, while a new degree, with a new title not open to misconception, might be offered to other students of theology in the widest sense of the term.

“I hope, sir, that in the interests of clear thinking you will use your influence to prevent the University from being driven into a contest in which the success or failure of either side might well prove disastrous.”

The last two months have produced some interesting contributions to the discussion of the Vestments question. In the *Nineteenth Century* for February, Dr. Wickham Legg has written an article maintaining that the surplice as much as the chasuble is a “Mass vestment,” and that in the earliest days the chasuble “did not connote sacrifice” at all. And he maintains that the judges in the Ridsdale Judgment in taking the line that the chasuble and the surplice are two mutually exclusive things, were committing themselves to an erroneous and indefensible proposition. We

The Vestments  
Controversy.

have no space here to indicate and comment on his facts and arguments in detail ; and it is the less necessary to attempt the task, because it has been carried out by Mr. Tomlinson with abundant learning and incisive, not to say mordant, style, in the March number of the *Church Intelligencer*. Mr. Tomlinson traverses Dr. Legg's instances and maintains that when the surplice was worn at the Medieval Mass it was not one of the distinctive Mass vestments, but was simply worn as a sort of intervening garment to separate the Mass vestments from the ordinary clothes. He also points out that, whatever may have been the case in the earliest days, for nearly a thousand years in the Western Church the chasuble has been regarded as the peculiar badge of the offerer of the sacrifice of the Mass.

The Bishop  
of  
Manchester's  
Letter.

A new turn has been given to the discussion by the publication of the Bishop of Manchester's "Open Letter" to the Archbishop of Canterbury, putting the question whether the Ornaments Rubric necessarily refers to the Eucharistic vestments at all. The position put forward by the Bishop is briefly this: The rubric is the very words of the Act of Uniformity of 1559. The words form part of a proviso, and a proviso must be interpreted consistently with the whole Act, and therefore should be taken as indicating such ornaments as can be used consistently with the Act. The surplice is an ornament of the minister worn at the time of Communion even under the First Prayer-Book of Edward VI., and the use of it is prescribed by the Second Prayer-Book of Edward VI. The Bishop holds that the rubric of 1552, *taken along with* the concluding notes at the end of the 1549 Prayer-Book, make it reasonably clear that the surplice is the garment intended by the Act of Uniformity. And if asked why a reference to 1552 would not have sufficed without any reference to 1549, he thinks that the reason is that the 1552 Book limited the Bishop's dress to a rochet only, and that Queen Elizabeth was anxious to leave a loophole by which the Bishop's robes as prescribed in the 1549 Prayer-Book might be

retained. Hence the apparent ambiguity and much of our subsequent discussions. The Bishop's argument and the detailed reasons for it are worthy of most careful study.

With its wonted tenacity and courage the *Spectator* is continuing to wage uncompromising warfare against the condition of slavery which exists in Portuguese West Africa. There are still some forty thousand slaves at work on the cocoa plantations of San Thomé and Príncipe, and we have the British Foreign Office practically apologizing for, and hence, in effect, supporting the existence of the system. One part of the defence appears to be that the condition of these workers is not to be described as "slavery," but "contract labour." Unfortunately a change of name does not alter the grim reality of the thing indicated. The *Spectator* does not take up a merely furious and aggressive line. It simply asks that the correspondence on the subject in the recently issued White Book be impartially studied, and that readers should ask themselves whether the reply of the Foreign Office to the efforts of the Anti-Slavery Society is really an adequate one. It also presses home the further question: "Ought England to continue her protective alliance with Portugal, when by continuing that alliance she makes herself virtually not merely the apologist for, but the actual upholder of, a system which, stripped of all misleading descriptions, is simply one of slavery?"

In the lectures on "Four Stages of Greek Religion," recently delivered by Professor Gilbert Murray, there is a great amount of truth expressed, we need hardly say, with extraordinary felicity and grace. One passage, however, seems to call for a word of criticism. The words in question are these:

"It always appears to me that, historically speaking, the character of Christianity in these early centuries is to be sought not so much in the doctrines which it professed, nearly all of which had their roots and their

close parallels in older Hellenistic or Hebrew thought, but in the organization on which it rested. For my own part, when I try to understand Christianity as a mass of doctrines, Gnostic, Trinitarian, Monophysite, Arian, and the rest, I get no further. When I try to realize it as a sort of semi-secret society for mutual help with a mystical religious basis, resting first on the proletariates of Antioch and the great commercial and manufacturing towns of the Levant, then spreading by instinctive sympathy to similar classes in Rome and the West, and rising in influence, like certain other mystical cults, by the special appeal it made to women, the various historical puzzles begin to fall into place."

An  
Inadequate  
Presentment.

To the Christian reader the view expressed in these words can hardly fail to appear as an external and therefore very inadequate one. What it appears to leave out is the central figure of Christ. Surely He supplied much that was other than either "older Hellenistic or Hebrew thought." A sympathetic appreciation of the efforts of great theologians and teachers to understand and formulate the teaching of the Bible about God and Christ might supply one with a clue to the great controversies, whether Trinitarian or Monophysite. And surely to find the secret of Christianity in its organization as a semi-secret society, akin to other mystical cults in its appeal to women, is to do less than justice to the whole content of Christian experience, the new moral life made possible by the indwelling Christ. To an external and disinterested spectator much theological controversy may seem to have been very barren, and Christianity itself to have been one mystical cult among others. But the view which regards Christianity either as a philosophy or an organization, and forgets that it was primarily a "power" and a "life," can hardly be said to have made any approach to a true understanding of its secret and its real essence.

Central  
Churchman-  
ship.

We learn with satisfaction that a third issue of the Bishop of Sodor and Man's book on "Central Churchmanship" is being prepared, and that it is to be published, not only in its original form, but in a cheap edition as well. We welcomed the book when it first came out, because it removed many misapprehensions. It defined the position of

the Evangelical school of thought as that position is understood by the Bishop and by many others who think with him. It showed, in a way not always formerly made clear, how it is possible to be both a convinced Evangelical and a strong Churchman. It displayed the loyalty of Evangelicals at once to the fundamental truths of the faith and to the distinctive positions of the Church of England. With regard to matters of history and criticism it indicated, wisely, as we think, the limits within which variety of opinion may well be permitted. The loyalty to the authority of Scripture was firm and unwavering. It set forth, too, the message which Churchmanship, so construed, has for the difficulties, speculative and practical, of the present age. We trust that the good work it has already accomplished may, by this reissue, be extended to ever-enlarging circles.



## The Teaching of Jesus on Divorce.

BY THE REV. G. ESTWICK FORD, B.A.

(Concluded from page 177.)

LET us now consider these points in detail :

1. We need not here discuss the conclusion as to the origin of the first Gospel at which critics have arrived. Even if we admit that the author had St. Mark's Gospel before him, it is difficult to see how St. Matthew's mention of the exception can render St. Mark's mention of the general rule less intelligible. As the Bishop does not explain how this result follows, we can only assume that he, too, finds here the kind of inconsistency which we have already considered and seen to be non-existent.

2. Nor does the expression of astonishment on the part of the disciples, which St. Matthew records, lead us of necessity to infer that the words of the exception were not spoken by our Lord. Dr. Gore declares that nothing short of the abolition of divorce would be sufficient to account for the dismay of the disciples ; but surely, if this were so, we may assume that the author of the Gospel would have had sufficient sense to perceive that, by inserting this item of information, he was making it impossible for his readers to accept as genuine the clause which, according to the critics, he had deliberately fabricated and put into the mouth of Jesus. St. Mark does not record the dismay of the disciples, even though he omits the exception : it is the author of St. Matthew alone who notices it ; and it would have been an incredibly stupid thing of him, under the circumstances assumed by the critics, to have invited attention in this wholly gratuitous fashion to the unwarrantable liberty which he had dared to take in so seriously misrepresenting the teaching of Jesus Christ on a topic of such vital importance. Is it not far more reasonable to suppose that the words of the exception, and also the astonishment of the disciples, have been recorded here because the writer was only concerned about giving a full and faithful account of what actually transpired ?

But is the astonishment of the disciples at all remarkable even if the exception is retained? Assuredly not, if we only bear in mind the amazing slightness of the marriage-bond and the extraordinary facilities for divorce which then prevailed in Palestine, and that with the full approval of the most eminent Rabbis. To commit a breach of the laws of tithing or of setting apart the first of the dough, to go in public with uncovered head, to be seen spinning in the street, to enter into talk with men, to be childless, to burn or over-salt the dinner, to be quarrelsome or troublesome, or even to speak disrespectfully of one's mother-in-law, was quite sufficient ground for the divorce of a wife; and even though she could be charged with none of the host of trivial things that served as excuses for divorce, her husband could nevertheless put her away all the same merely because he had happened to fancy a more attractive woman.<sup>1</sup> It must be obvious that to the average Jew, accustomed as he was to this practically unlimited licence, the rigid limitation of divorce to the case of marital unchastity would be hardly less novel and startling than its complete prohibition. We can well understand that the words of Jesus would astonish the disciples. Even to-day, as many of the witnesses before the Divorce Commission have shown, this limitation of facilities for divorce appears to many to be intolerably narrow.

3. We need not dwell upon the apparent discrepancy between St. Matt. v. 32 and St. Luke xvi. 18. In the first place it is impossible to prove that the two records refer to one and the same saying of our Lord, the probability being rather the other way. The words are very much to the point in St. Luke's context: they are the sharp personal rebuke of the Pharisees who derided Jesus, His disciples and His teaching, whilst outwardly professing to be the sole guardians and vindicators of the law of God, which law they were nevertheless habitually violating, and notoriously so in the matter of the sanctity of marriage. It is clear that in a reference under such circumstances to the law of divorce it would have been altogether out

<sup>1</sup> Edersheim, book iv., chapter xxii.

of place to have specified the exception to the general rule, seeing that these Pharisees were well aware of the exception to the indissolubility of marriage which Deut. xxiv. allowed, and that the very point of our Lord's accusation was that, through their rabbinical interpretations, they were violating, not an ideal marriage-law, but the law of Moses which they themselves acknowledged.

4. In order to illustrate the alleged tendency of the writer of the first Gospel to alter, for purposes of his own, the original record of our Lord's words and the events attending His ministry, and thus to exhibit the alleged unreliability of this Gospel where it differs from St. Mark or St. Luke, Dr. Gore refers us to St. Matt. xii. 40, xxi. 2, xxvi. 15, and xxvii. 34, in all of which cases he suggests that the writer has altered the original narrative in order to set up a correspondence between the words, or the event, recorded and some Old Testament story or prophecy. The Bishop, indeed, does no more than mention these passages, and we have to turn to Archdeacon Allen's "St. Matthew" for the argument in each case. With regard to the first of these passages, the point is to show that this Gospel puts into the mouth of Jesus the words which are recorded here, but are omitted in the corresponding section of St. Luke, in order to institute an exact correspondence between the words of Jesus and the experience of Jonah, as recorded in the book which bears his name. The Archdeacon concludes his note as follows: "Matthew has, of course, rather forced his analogy. Putting aside the fact that, according to Christian tradition, Christ lay in the grave only one whole day and parts of two others, he has tried to increase the parallelism by adding three nights, when at the most there were only two." But here again we may fairly ask, Was the writer of this Gospel so foolish as not to see for himself, and to realize that all his readers also would see, what Mr. Allen has here pointed out? If the Lord had said no more than St. Luke has recorded, is it reasonable to suppose that a Gospel writer would have added words which the facts of the case, as universally acknowledged, would at once

have branded as spurious? Is it a matter "of course" that the writer of the first Gospel must inevitably do some silly thing if the least chance of doing so presents itself? It is but natural to suppose that our Lord would not leave His hearers in the dark as to the sense in which the sign of Jonah should be a sign to His own generation; and, if so, why should He not have expressed Himself as this Gospel represents Him as doing, especially when we consider that in Jewish computation of time a day and a night together made up a *νυχθήμερον*, and that any part of such a period might be spoken of as a whole?<sup>1</sup> It is interesting in this connection to note that St. Matthew mentions our Lord as saying "on the third day" where St. Mark says "after three days."<sup>2</sup> In point of fact, St. Mark's "after three days" is as really out of literal accord with the facts of the case as St. Matthew's "three days and three nights," but is there anyone who on that account would deny the possibility of our Lord having used those words?

In the case of St. Matt. xxi. 2-8, the allegation is that the Evangelist has drawn upon his own imagination for the ass in order to make the incident an exact fulfilment of Zechariah's prophecy; and here, once more, Archdeacon Allen finds occasion to show up the writer's lack of ordinary intelligence. "Matthew, in modifying the passage," says he, "is not quite careful to make the details harmonious. The Lord could not ride on both animals, and there was no need, therefore, to place clothes on both." And again: "If the editor had not just said that they placed clothing upon *them*, we might take *ἐπάνω αὐτῶν* here to refer to the *ἵμάτια*. But he may have meant it to refer to the animals, regardless of the impossibility of riding more than one at a time." It does not seem to occur to this critic that, as the disciples did not know which animal the Lord would use, they would quite naturally cast their garments upon both, so that He might at once mount whichever He chose. There was, however, no need whatever for the Evangelist to invent

<sup>1</sup> See Alford's note on St. Matt. xxi. 40.

<sup>2</sup> St. Matt. xvi. 21; St. Mark viii. 31.

the ass, if she had not been there, in order to find in this incident a fulfilment of prophecy. Indeed, the mention of the colt alone would have produced a still closer correspondence with the prophet's language :

“ Lowly, and riding upon an ass ;  
Even upon a colt, the foal of an ass.”<sup>1</sup>

Here it is evident that Zechariah was not thinking of two animals, but only of one—viz., the colt, which in the first line is described as to the nature of the animal—an ass ; and in the second as to its youth—a colt. Persons, however, who are acquainted with countries where the ass is generally used as a beast of burden, and where it is a very common thing to see the colt loosely fastened alongside its mother in order to begin the process of being broken in, will recognize in St. Matthew's account a touch of naturalness which speaks much for the minute accuracy of the narrative, and renders it most probable that the man who wrote this account was himself an eyewitness of the events which he records.

The reference to Judas (xxvi. 15, xxvii. 3-10) need not detain us long. The suggestion is that the Evangelist invented the thirty pieces of silver in order to produce a correspondence with Zech. xi. 12, 13. But why should he be considered inaccurate in specifying the amount received by Judas merely because St. Mark and St. Luke do not specify it? For what was there in the transaction to have suggested to the Evangelist the otherwise most unlikely reference to Zech. xi., if he had not been struck with the similarity in the amount actually paid, and the use to which the money was actually put? Nor is the story at all improbable, for the amount specified was the price of a slave, and one can well understand that the rulers who paid it would delight to inflict this petty insult upon Him whom they so hated.

The last passage to which Dr. Gore refers is xxvii. 34, in comparison with St. Mark xv. 23. Here it is suggested that St. Matthew introduces the word “gall” in order to effect a

<sup>1</sup> Zech. ix. 9 (R.V.).

correspondence with Ps. lxi. 21. It must, however, be observed that the more probable text of St. Matthew reads "*wine mingled with gall*,"<sup>1</sup> which very much lessens the supposed correspondence; and, further, that the Evangelist himself makes no reference to the Psalm, as he would certainly have done if he had wilfully altered the original text to make it correspond with the prophetic Psalm. Moreover, a careful examination of the case renders it extremely probable that the writer of this Gospel, in using the words he has employed, is simply stating the actual facts with strict accuracy. St. Mark uses a general expression, *ἔσμυρμισμένος*, corresponding to our word "drugged." It is evident that he does not mean that the draught was a mixture of wine and myrrh, for myrrh is not an opiate, and a draught of that sort would have been quite useless. But the word in the first Gospel is *χολή*, the word by which the LXX translates the Hebrew *שׁוֹן*, which means "hemlock," "poppy," poison in general.<sup>2</sup> A draught composed of wine mixed with a powerful opiate such as St. Matthew specifies would be the very thing needed for the purpose for which this last cup was mercifully given to persons about to be crucified.

5. Let us now see to what conclusion all these alleged inaccuracies are supposed to lead us. We are asked to believe that in some Jewish-Christian community, somewhere in Palestine, there arose a man who, with St. Mark's Gospel, a collection of sayings of Jesus by St. Matthew, and sundry other documents or traditions to work upon, compiled the Gospel according to St. Matthew; and that in deference to the old Jewish feeling prevalent in his community, or owing to "the exigencies of ethical necessity in the Christian Church," as Archdeacon Allen puts it, this anonymous compiler, who habitually altered the narrative of his original authorities to suit his own purposes, took it upon himself to alter the words of Jesus on this vitally important subject of marriage, and in such a manner that the law of Jesus as it left this writer's hands was

<sup>1</sup> *οἶνος* instead of *ὄξος*, vinegar.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Deut. xxix. 18 (R.V. marg.), Deut. xxxii. 32, Hos. x. 4, etc.

a totally different thing from that law as it fell from the Master's lips. Further, that, in order to lend probability to his fabrication, he deliberately put into the mouth of our Lord's questioners a phrase that they never used, thus showing that his act was wilful and of set purpose. This of itself would be sufficiently amazing ; but we are further confronted with what, under the alleged circumstances, would be the astounding fact that this anonymous compilation, marred, as is alleged, by such a gross perversion of the teaching of the Son of God, and disfigured by so many wilful and palpable inaccuracies, was accepted without the least question by the whole of the primitive Church, was assigned the highest place in the list of the four Gospels, and was universally and unhesitatingly ascribed to no less a person than the Apostle, St. Matthew.<sup>1</sup> Is it at all conceivable, we may well ask, that a work of such an origin and of such a character could so rapidly and so completely have attained the position in the Christian Church which this Gospel occupied, and that, with regard to the passages with which we are now specially concerned, not even a single various reading in any manuscript should betray the faintest suspicion, on the part of the primitive Church, of the alleged misrepresentation of the words of Jesus? Surely we should demand the strongest and fullest evidence, both external and internal, to make us accept such a conclusion. And what is the evidence that the critics have to offer us? Of external evidence not a syllable. Of internal evidence, such arguments from passages in the Gospel as we have just now been considering, coupled with the fact that a considerable portion of the Gospel narrative is common to St. Matthew and St. Mark—a fact which has been accounted for by various suggestions, for it has been evident to all thoughtful Christians from the very beginning, but which nevertheless has not interfered with the settled belief of the Church that St. Matthew wrote this Gospel.

<sup>1</sup> The suggestion that the Church was at a loss for a title for this Gospel, and instead of giving it the name of its author, as in the case of the other three, ascribed it to St. Matthew because his *λόγια* were used in its compilation, is not one that readily commends itself.

6. Although the Church has retained the disputed passages as an integral part of St. Matthew's Gospel, yet it is contended by Dr. Gore that she has practically nullified this fact by ignoring the natural force of the disputed clauses, and thus "criticism and authority converge upon one result." This is a very remarkable assertion, for it amounts to saying that the Christian Church, whilst faithfully and unhesitatingly preserving the teaching of Jesus on so important a subject, has nevertheless deliberately set her own judgment above that of her Lord by ignoring the natural force of His words. It is very difficult to believe in such presumption so long as there exists the possibility of supposing that the Church's action may rather have been due to a misunderstanding of the words of Jesus—the meaning of *πορνεία*, for instance. The Bishop adduces one other example of such ecclesiastical action—viz., the retaining of Heb. vi. 4-8 in the canon of Holy Scripture, whilst denying it its natural force. This passage tells of the impossibility of renewing to repentance those who have fallen away after the full and conscious sharing in the privileges of the Christian body. But it can scarcely be claimed that this is a case in point, even though the Church may never have presumed to say of any particular sinner that he had reached the point of having utterly fallen away beyond all hope or possibility of rescue. It is obvious that the writer of this epistle does not mean that every lapse into sin constitutes the falling away of which he speaks so solemnly; and, if it is a matter of the degree of sinfulness, who but God can tell whether the border-line of possible recovery has been crossed? The truth conveyed in these words is one that is woven throughout into the very texture of this epistle,<sup>1</sup> and is only an echo of the words of Christ Himself.<sup>2</sup> It is the declaration that persistent sinning against the light must inevitably result in moral blindness, and that habitual and wilful violation of the conditions of eternal life must of necessity involve eternal death. This truth the Church

<sup>1</sup> Cf. ii. 1-3, iii. 12-19, iv. 11, x. 26-31, xii. 15-17, xii. 25.

<sup>2</sup> John xv. 2, 6.

is bound to teach, and has constantly taught; but she has not the spiritual insight to enable her to assert of any particular person that in him the last spark of life has faded away into the ashes of spiritual death, and that for him, therefore, no hope of renewal remains. Is not this a more accurate presentation of the Church's attitude towards this passage of Scripture than to say that she has denied it its natural force?

We have now examined all the evidence adduced by the representative writers to whom we have referred; and it will probably be felt that we have discovered nothing in it to justify us in departing from the belief which, until quite recent days, the Church has always held—viz., that the Apostle St. Matthew wrote the words containing the exception to the indissolubility of marriage, and that these words are the words of Jesus Christ.

A very brief examination will suffice to show that the argument for indissolubility based upon the idea that *πορνεία* can only mean pre-nuptial sin is equally invalid.

It is argued that *πορνεία* is not the specific word for adultery, and that if our Lord had meant sin after marriage He would have used the word *μοιχεία*. As a matter of fact, the word *πορνεία*, with the general meaning of "unchastity," is constantly used in the Old Testament and the New to denote the sin both of the unmarried and also of the married. In Ezek. xvi. the unfaithfulness of Israel to her Divine Husband is described by this word, and whilst this sin is stigmatized as *μοιχεία* in ver. 32,<sup>1</sup> it is immediately afterwards described as *πορνεία* in ver. 33.<sup>2</sup> Similarly in Hos. ii. 2 the same offence of the same woman—viz., the prophet's wife—is described, in the same verse, both as *μοιχεία* and also as *πορνεία*,<sup>3</sup> simply for variety of expression.

In the New Testament *πορνεία* is used to denote the peculiarly gross case of adultery in the Church at Corinth with which St. Paul had to deal.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> ἡ γυνὴ ἢ μοιχωμένη.

<sup>2</sup> ἐν τῇ πορνείᾳ σου.

<sup>3</sup> ἔξαρῶ τὴν πορνείαν αὐτῆς ἐκ προσώπου μου, καὶ τὴν μοιχείαν αὐτῆς ἐκ μέσου μαστῶν αὐτῆς.

<sup>4</sup> 1 Cor. v. 1 compared with 2 Cor. vii. 12, where the words "him that suffered the wrong" show that the woman was not a widow, but a wife.

That our Lord should have employed in the same context the general term and also the specific term to denote the sin of a married person is evidently in strict accord with Old Testament usage. In this case, moreover, the attendant circumstances make it practically certain that sin before marriage is not what is meant. It was concerning divorce, not nullity of marriage for pre-nuptial sin, that our Lord was questioned. It is also evident, from the mention of the bill of divorcement, that He is dealing with the law of divorce as set forth in Deut. xxiv. Now, Deut. xxiv. deals with offences arising after marriage, as appears from ver. 3, where it is provided that if a man has married a divorced woman, obviously with the knowledge of her past, he may in his turn divorce her if he finds in her conduct ground of aversion.

Finally, to turn our opponents' argument against themselves, it may surely be said that, in view of the fact that the penalty of death imposed by the Mosaic law for pre-nuptial and also for post-nuptial unchastity had become obsolete, if our Lord sanctioned the annulling of marriage on account of the former because of the confusion and mischief that such sin involved in the matter of the family, He surely would sanction for the very same reason the dissolution of a marriage on the ground of post-nuptial sin, seeing that the possibilities of confusion and mischief in the latter case are infinitely greater than in the former.

We may now feel satisfied that Jesus Christ has undoubtedly given His sanction to the dissolution of marriage on the ground of adultery. In this exception to the general rule of the indissolubility of marriage many of us will recognize with profound thankfulness the Divine wisdom and mercy which characterizes all that He has done. Knowing as He did the possibilities of unspeakable misery which indissoluble marriage with an utterly licentious person would entail upon a virtuous man or woman, He has left open a door of release.

In doing this our Lord has recognized no inequality as between man and woman, none as between rich and poor. In St. Mark x. 12 the case of the wife putting away her husband

is parallel with that of the husband putting away his wife ; and, knowing the care of Jesus for the poor, we can easily realize how repugnant would be to Him the idea that the mere fact of a man's inability to pay legal or travelling expenses should debar him from availing himself of the way of escape which God's goodness had provided for him. It stands to reason, therefore, that the disability now inflicted by the laws of this country upon women and upon the poor in the matter of divorce ought to be removed if our laws are to correspond with the teaching of Jesus.

The possibility of the remarriage of divorced persons is distinctly contemplated by our Lord. His decision is that the subsequent marriage is adulterous unless the divorce has been for the cause of unchastity. If there has been this sin, and divorce has resulted, the marriage is regarded by Him as having been wholly dissolved, so that both of the parties are free to marry again.<sup>1</sup> He makes no distinction between the guilty and the innocent in this respect, nor does He even forbid the guilty party to marry his or her partner in sin. He leaves all that alone, and we shall be wise if we follow His example. Such persons can contract a valid marriage without a religious service. It is a matter for serious consideration whether any evil arising out of allowing the sinful pair to marry would not be infinitely less than the undoubted evil of turning loose upon society two vicious persons, whom union with each other might probably have rendered less likely to do mischief to other people.

The last point that remains to be considered is how far, if at all, the principle recognized by Christ may properly be extended in its application. If He concedes that marriage is not essentially indissoluble, but that on account of human sinfulness a case may arise in which divorce is lawful, may it not be argued that there may be other causes, bred of our present social conditions, which are capable of rendering the marriage-bond as unrighteous and intolerable as it is rendered by unchastity itself, and should therefore be admissible, on grounds of morality and justice, as

<sup>1</sup> The law of Deut. xxiv. 3 expressly gave this permission.

valid reasons for divorce? To this question the Report of the majority of the Royal Commission on Divorce gives an affirmative answer. The Commissioners who are responsible for this Report justify their recommendations on the ground that the latitude which they advocate "is necessary in the interest of morality, as well as in the interest of justice; and in the general interests of society and the State." Their Report is framed on the basis "that the State should not regard the marriage tie as necessarily indissoluble in its nature, *or as dissoluble only on the ground of adultery*, and they recommend that the State should grant divorce for the following causes in addition to adultery—viz., desertion, cruelty, insanity, drunkenness, and imprisonment under commuted death-sentence. Now, if these incidents of human life were peculiar to our modern social conditions, and if we could reasonably infer that had they been known to Christ, He would have regarded them as rendering the marriage-bond as intolerable and unjust as it was rendered by adultery, then, indeed, it would be possible for Christian men and women, without disloyalty to Christ, to advocate the widening of the grounds of divorce so as to include these things. But, as a matter of fact, these evils are none of them peculiar to modern society; our Lord was quite familiar with them all, and was doubtless fully alive to the hardships incidental to the marriage bond arising out of these causes; yet did He not consider them to be sufficient justification for divorce, but drew the line clearly and sharply at the one cause of unchastity. Even the living death of leprosy was not, in His judgment, an adequate ground of divorce. Again, if the Lord Jesus had taken up the position that divorce was not permissible under any circumstances whatsoever, it might have been possible to suppose that He was not intending to legislate for existing social conditions, but only setting forth the true ideal to which His followers should, as far as was practicable, conform their actual legislation. But the very fact that He did, for a definite reason, make one exception to the general rule of the indissolubility of marriage shows that He was not legislating for ideal but for actual social conditions. With

a perfect knowledge of all the circumstances which might render the marriage-tie a cause of extreme hardship, He singled out the sin of unchastity, and set it quite alone by itself as the only ground on which He could permit divorce ; nor is it difficult to imagine why. If, in view of this, we decide to extend the grounds of divorce beyond the one cause which He has specified, we practically set up our own judgment as superior to His, and not to His only, but also to that of the Father whose words the Lord Jesus claimed to speak.<sup>1</sup>

It is interesting to observe that whilst the Majority Report recommends an extension of the grounds of divorce in the interests of morality, the Minority Report emphasizes the fact that not one single witness of all the 246 who were examined was able to point to any country where, as the result of greater facilities for divorce, public morality has been promoted, the ties of family strengthened, or home life rendered purer or more settled. It would certainly appear to be the fact that human experience has at all events failed as yet to discredit the wisdom with which Jesus spoke ; and it is not too much to ask of our rulers in this Christian State that, in the legislation which may be enacted as a result of the work of the Commission, they will not ignore His teaching so as to extend the grounds of divorce beyond the limits which He has laid down, whatever protection or relief they may otherwise afford to those who have found their married life to be a source of hardship and unhappiness.

<sup>1</sup> St. John xii. 47-50 ; St. Luke x. 16.



## The Church and the Poor.

### A SERIES OF HISTORICAL SKETCHES.

By W. EDWARD CHADWICK, D.D., B.Sc.

#### IV.

##### THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES.

###### I. *The Conditions.*

THE great Empire founded by Charlemagne did not long outlive him. After the death of his son, Louis the Pious, in A.D. 840, it rapidly fell to pieces; and by the Treaty of Verdun, in A.D. 843, was made that division of Western Europe which in essence still exists to-day.<sup>1</sup> With the fall of the Empire of Charlemagne, there also came to an end what we may term the unity of the Church's social work; in fact, since the days of Charlemagne, the Church as a whole has issued no binding decrees upon the relief of the poor.<sup>2</sup> From that time onwards we cannot speak of this part of the Church's task in general terms. Henceforward, to a certain extent, the way in which she did her charitable work varied in different countries. Yet amid these differences there were in each age certain common features, at any rate down to the time of the Reformation. These common features were due to certain prevailing ideas which permeated the doctrinal and social teaching of the whole Western Church in each particular period.

These facts must govern the treatment of our subject in the present article, in which I propose first, to deal very briefly with the general condition of the ninth and tenth centuries; and secondly, to try to explain the ideas of charity which then inspired and ruled the method of dispensing it.

Speaking generally, the ninth and tenth centuries are among the very darkest periods of the Church's history. This is

<sup>1</sup> Church, "Middle Ages," p. 148 *et seq.* and p. 156 *et seq.*

<sup>2</sup> Ratzinger, "Geschichte der Kirchlichen Armenpflege," p. 236.

especially true of France and Italy, and, if to a somewhat less extent, it is also true of Germany; it is certainly less true of England.<sup>1</sup> During this period were repeated, in many ways, the experiences which followed the break-up of the Western Empire some 300 years before. In both ages we see authority passing out of the hands of a central government into the hands of a multitude of small chieftains, whose time was chiefly spent in quarrelling with each other, and one of whose objects seems to have been to oppress those over whom they ruled. Feudalism<sup>2</sup> grew rapidly in the State, and something extremely like it flourished in the Church; for there were feudal bishops as well as feudal barons, and the conduct of the bishops seems frequently to have been even worse than that of the barons.<sup>3</sup> The care of the poor was forgotten; cleric and noble vied with one another in sucking the life-blood from their wretched dependents.<sup>4</sup> Yet even in this age there were lights in the darkness. "Side by side with the proud and cruel warrior who, without mercy, devastated the fields of the unhappy peasants, and heartlessly squeezed the last penny from his tenants, stood here a monk, there a priest, who burned with indignation and threatened with an everlasting curse when his prayers for pity were of no avail. If there were many bishops who used the great possessions of the Church only to gratify their own lusts, there were still many men who pitied the poor, espoused their cause, and bestowed all they had upon their relief."<sup>5</sup>

In a speech to the bishops assembled at a council near Soissons in A.D. 909, the archbishop of Rheims drew a terribly dark picture of the conditions then existing in France: "All respect for Divine and human law has vanished . . . every man does as he will; the strong oppress the weak; men have become like the fishes in the sea which devour each other. . . . Lawlessness chokes every kind of growth. . . . Everywhere we see oppression of the poor and robbery of the Church. Con-

<sup>1</sup> We must remember the work of Alfred, also of Dunstan.

<sup>2</sup> Upon the effects of feudalism see Ratzinger, p. 236 *et seq.*

<sup>3</sup> Milman, "Latin Christianity," vol. iii., p. 176 *et seq.*

<sup>4</sup> Ratzinger, p. 237.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

sequently the tears of the widows and the sobs of the orphans constantly rise up to heaven."<sup>1</sup> For this state of things the archbishop told the assembled bishops that they were themselves largely to blame.

In Germany, during this period, the same conditions to some extent prevailed, though, as a whole, the Church there never sank to so low a level as it did in France. While it suffered from the evils of feudalism, it still retained the influences bequeathed to it by men like Boniface and Alcuin. The bishops, many of whom had been trained in the schools founded by these great leaders, strove to maintain the regulations which Charlemagne had established for the protection and relief of the poor.<sup>2</sup>

At a council held at Mainz in A.D. 847 it was decreed that the tithe, which every Christian should pay to his parish church, must be divided into four parts, of which one part must be devoted to the relief of the poor. To the bishop was committed the task of the oversight of the administration of relief throughout his diocese; upon him was the responsibility of a firm control laid. Laymen who were guilty of usurpation of the Church's property were to be excommunicated. Also the king was petitioned to interpose against the oppression of poor freemen, and to defend the churches and their possessions as his own property. At a Parliament held at Mainz in A.D. 851 these decrees of the council were promulgated as laws of the realm.<sup>3</sup>

During this period Germany had to face serious troubles upon her borders; the Magyars on the one side, and the Northmen on another side, not only devastated the country, but also burnt the churches and destroyed the monasteries.<sup>4</sup>

In the tenth century, under the firm rule of the Saxon Kings, the true founders of the German Empire,<sup>5</sup> we find a greatly

<sup>1</sup> Ratzinger, pp. 241, 242.

<sup>2</sup> "Es war ein hohes Glück für Deutschland, dass in seinem Episcopate der Geist eines Bonifatius, eines Alcuin noch lange fortwirkte" (Ratzinger, p. 250).

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 251.

<sup>4</sup> Church, "Middle Ages," p. 184.

<sup>5</sup> Church, *ibid.*, p. 195 *et seq.* "Mit den sächsischen Kaisern beginnt die Blüthezeit der deutschen Kirche" (Ratzinger, p. 252).

improved condition of the Church. At this time many of the bishops were men not only of great influence in affairs of State, but also men of real piety, who cared to the utmost of their ability for the poor, saw to their needs, and frequently fed them at their table and maintained them in their own houses. What the bishops did in the large towns they directed the clergy to do in their various parishes. From their income, derived from tithes and oblations, they must support the poor and those unable to work; they must supply the needs of widows and orphans; they must also provide food and shelter for wayfarers. Though the proportion of the income of the Church to be devoted to the poor is not stated, it was probably that ordered by Charlemagne.<sup>1</sup> A survey of this period gives the impression that the bestowal of charity was becoming more and more a matter of personal feeling—indeed, of personal piety—and that, consequently, it was in practice less and less governed by any general regulations.<sup>2</sup> This was almost inevitable, as we shall find when we come to consider the ideas upon which the bestowal of charity in this age—in fact, throughout the Middle Ages—was based.

In order to understand how the poor were relieved in England during this same period we must take a brief retrospect. One of the well-known questions which Augustine addressed to Gregory the Great had reference to the distribution of the Church's revenues.<sup>3</sup> Gregory's reply was that the best scheme for distribution is that recommended by the Roman See—a fourfold partition between the bishop, the clergy, the poor, and the repair of the church.<sup>4</sup> There is not sufficient evidence to show how far this method of distribution was carried out in practice in England; but there is evidence to show that certain differences did exist between the customs of Rome and

<sup>1</sup> Ratzinger, p. 253.

<sup>2</sup> Uhlhorn, "Die Christliche Liebesthätigkeit, im Mittelalter," p. 65; "Es gehört zu den Eigentümlichkeiten des Mittelalters, dass eine geordnete Armenpflege überhaupt nicht kennt."

<sup>3</sup> Bright, "Early English Church History," p. 56.

<sup>4</sup> Greg. M. Epp., xii. 31.

those of the old British Church in reference to the relief of the poor. This was one among several matters upon which Archbishop Theodore had to legislate. He appears to have removed the distribution from the bishops to the parochial clergy<sup>1</sup>—in fact, to have arranged relief in England (as it was in France) upon the parochial system.<sup>2</sup> Later we find that in England practically the principles of Charlemagne were more or less closely followed. The so-called *excerptiones* of Archbishop Egbert are clearly a compilation from French capitularies and from the decrees of French Councils.<sup>3</sup> The English system probably owed much to scholars like Alcuin (the friend and adviser of Charlemagne), who were perfectly familiar with Continental methods. What seems quite clear is that in the ninth and tenth centuries (with one important exception) the system of poor relief associated with the name of Charlemagne was that which was generally in force in our own country. The exception to which I refer is that in England a *third*, and not, as in France, a fourth, of the tithe was devoted to the relief of the poor.<sup>4</sup> In the *Liber legum Ecclesiasticarum* there is an instruction to the priest—namely, that in his leisure-time he shall do some useful work, in order that from the proceeds of this he may be able to help the needy.

In England, as in France, the duty of relieving the poor was not confined to the clergy. By the *Constitutio* of King Athelstan the nobles are enjoined to care for the poor, and especially shall each of these make himself responsible for the maintenance of one poor person, and shall also annually redeem one slave. If they failed to perform these duties they shall pay a fine, which shall be devoted to relief.<sup>5</sup>

In England there existed far into the Middle Ages a very considerable amount of slavery, or, at any rate, conditions which

<sup>1</sup> Ratzinger, p. 174.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 266.

<sup>4</sup> "Canones Ælfrici," 960, c. 24: "Sancti patres constituerunt ut homines tradant decimas suas ecclesiæ Dei et sacerdos veniat et distribuât in tres partes: unam ad reparationem ecclesiæ, secundam egenis, tertiam autem Dei ministris, qui ecclesiæ illius curam gerunt."

<sup>5</sup> Ratzinger, p. 267 (where the passage from the *Constitutio regis Æthelstani* is given at length).

can hardly be distinguished from slavery. Lingard considers that prior to the Norman Conquest "not less than two-thirds of the population existed in a state of slavery . . . the most numerous of these lived on the land of their lord . . . and their respective services were allotted according to the will of their proprietor. . . . Their persons, families, and goods were at his disposal . . . either by gift or sale."<sup>1</sup> For these the householder was held responsible. In the case of men without an owner, and who were unable to provide for themselves, it was enacted by the laws of King Athelstan that "he must reside with some householder, without whose surety he would not be regarded as a member of the community nor be entitled to its protection."<sup>2</sup>

The Church in England, as on the Continent, had during this age its periods of light and darkness,<sup>3</sup> of spiritual influence and of the absence of this. At one time it so did its work as to deserve respect; at another time it sunk into a condition of worldliness. But, at any rate after the reformation of Dunstan, it probably never sank so low as it did elsewhere. Ratzinger asserts that alone did the English Church maintain throughout the Middle Ages the duty of relieving the poor, and it alone held not only in theory, but in practice, that a portion of its wealth should be devoted to this purpose. The possessions of the Church in England during the Middle Ages, including the tithes, never became the prey of a rapacious nobility.<sup>4</sup>

## 2. *The Doctrine of Charity.*

We must now turn to a subject which demands very careful consideration—namely, What were the principles, ideas, or beliefs which underlay and which inspired the charitable work of the period we have been considering, and which, at any rate

<sup>1</sup> Lingard, "History of England," vol. i., pp. 347, 353.

<sup>2</sup> Nicholls, "History of the Poor Law," vol. i., p. 13.

<sup>3</sup> "Die Englische Kirche erlebte ihre Blüthezeit in der zweiten Hälfte der 9 Jahrhunderts. . . . Schrecklich ist die Schilderung, welche König Edgar von der Vewilderung des Clerus entwirft" (Ratzinger, p. 268).

<sup>4</sup> P. 269.

to some extent, persisted until the Reformation? That an immense change had taken place in the principles which governed the charitable work of the Church is clear to every careful student of the subject. This change is to-day attributed to the influence of "syncretism,"<sup>1</sup> by which is meant the absorption into Christianity of elements more or less alien to its original principles or conduct. The principal sources of this influence, at any rate so far as the charitable work of the Church is concerned, were two: first, that of Judaism, which was the earlier influence; secondly, that of ideas and practices generally current in the Græco-Roman world. These ideas and practices the converts from the old religions (who were often very imperfect converts) brought over with them into the Church's system.

When we speak of the influence of Judaism we must not think only of the teaching of the Old Testament; we must be careful to include Jewish ideas current at the time of Christ<sup>2</sup> and during the age preceding this; also, we must remember the ideas at work among the Jews in the period following that of the New Testament. I must not dwell upon the teaching of the Old Testament on the relief of the poor. Even a brief outline of this would require a chapter to itself. But I must insist upon the fact that this side of Jewish life was very strongly developed in later Judaism; actually it has continued to be a marked feature of Judaism down to the present time.<sup>3</sup> We can trace this development in the later books of the Old Testament, and especially in the Apocrypha. The word *ἐλεημοσύνη* in the Greek version of the Old Testament, which originally was used of the practice of works of mercy, had by the time that the books of Sirach and Tobit were written come to be a quite specific description of deeds of compassion to the

<sup>1</sup> On this subject see the Epilogue to Book II. of Harnack's "Mission and Expansion of Christianity," Eng. Trans., vol. i., p. 312 *et seq.*

<sup>2</sup> In a recent lecture Professor Moffatt states that what he terms "attention to the hinterland of rabbinic tradition" probably forms the most fruitful field for further elucidation of the New Testament at the present time.

<sup>3</sup> *E.g.*, the Jewish Board of Guardians in London.

poor.<sup>1</sup> By the second or third century B.C. almsgiving had come to be an acknowledged observance of the religious life, and stood in the same category with prayer and fasting.<sup>2</sup> It is regarded as a means of making atonement for sin,<sup>3</sup> and the merit of it as an unailing possession. In the Talmud the same teaching is even more accentuated; "righteousness" becomes a recognized name for almsgiving, and by almsgiving a man may be accounted righteous in the sight of God. From all this it will be seen that the tendency is to think especially of the effect of almsgiving upon the *giver* of the alms; the effect upon the recipient is secondary. This tendency proceeded so far as to lead the Jews to speak of the poor as the means of the rich man's salvation. The words of our Lord in St. Matt. vi. 2-4, while they may be said to accept the current value of almsgiving as a religious practice or duty, give no countenance to the Jewish doctrine that it effects any remission of sins, that in the ordinary acceptance of the word it has any "propitiatory" power. What our Lord does insist upon is purity of motive, indifference to human praise, and the need of self-forgetfulness. This last requisite is entirely inimical to the idea of propitiation, which is essentially and to a high degree "self-regarding." How strongly and how early the Jewish idea of the propitiatory value of almsgiving entered the Church may be seen from these

<sup>1</sup> See article on "Almsgiving," in Hastings' "Bib. Dict." (by Professor Stanton), vol. i., pp. 68 *et seq.*; also Hatch's "Essays in Biblical Greek," p. 49 *et seq.*—*i.e.*, on *δικαιοσύνη* and *ἐλεημοσύνη*). A curiously far-fetched interpretation is that of Ps. xvii. 15, where the Rabbis interpreted **אֲנִי בְצַדֵּק אֲהִיָּה כְנִיף** by "I shall behold Thy face by almsgiving."

<sup>2</sup> Tobit xii. 8: *ἀγαθὸν προσευχῆ μετὰ νηστείας καὶ ἐλεημοσύνης καὶ δικαιοσύνης.*

<sup>3</sup> Sirach iii. 30:

"Water will quench a flaming fire,  
And almsgiving will make atonement for sin"

(*ἐλεημοσύνη ἐξιλιάσεται ἁμαρτίας.* The Hebrew here has **צדקה**.)

Also Sirach xxix. 9-11:

"Help a poor man for the commandment's sake;

Bestow thy treasure according to the commandments of the Most High;  
And it shall profit thee more than gold."

Also Tobit xii. 9: "Alms doth deliver from death, and it shall purge away all sin."

two sayings: "If there were no poor the greater part of your sins would not be removed";<sup>1</sup> and "By prayer we seek to propitiate God, by fasting we extinguish the lusts of the flesh; by alms we redeem our sins."<sup>2</sup> In contrast to the Jewish self-regarding doctrine which penetrated (and to a large extent vitiated) the mediæval theory of charity we may contrast the wisdom of the teaching of the early Church where the words "Give to him that asketh thee" are followed by "Woe to him that taketh; for if, indeed, anyone having need taketh he shall be guiltless, but he that hath not need shall give account . . . and being in distress shall be examined concerning the things that he did."<sup>3</sup>

When we speak of the influence of the Græco-Roman world upon Christian charity after the conversion of the Empire and during the early Middle Ages, we must be careful to define our meaning, for in those days as in these the practice of the community usually fell far below, and so was widely different from, the principles of its clearest thinkers. If we go to teachers like Aristotle among the Greeks, or to Cicero, Seneca, or Epictetus among the Romans, we shall find excellent and extremely wise principles enunciated upon a man's treatment of his poorer neighbours. We shall find many a valuable axiom which would come under the head not only of justice, but of charity, or what the Latin would term *de beneficiis*.<sup>4</sup> But this would be in the realms of ideal ethics and philosophy. When, however, we come to the sphere of actual practice we find something very different. We find in Rome and other great cities an immense, and to a great extent an indiscriminate, and therefore unwise, distribution of free food,<sup>5</sup> just as there were free amusements. When, as in the time of Gregory the Great, the Church had become possessed of very considerable means, when, also, the

<sup>1</sup> "St. Chrysostom," Homily xv.

<sup>2</sup> "Leo the Great," Sermon xv. 4.

<sup>3</sup> "The Teaching of the Twelve," cap. i. 5.

<sup>4</sup> On this subject much which will be found useful may be learnt from Professor Lock's "Charity and Social Life," especially chaps. iv., ix., xii., and xv.

<sup>5</sup> *E.g.*, The *Annona Civica*.

number of professing Christians had enormously increased, and the poverty of the vast majority of the population had become far more acute, can it be wondered that the Church took over a great part of this free distribution of food from the State? Christianity is the religion of love. Could the Church see these people starve? Doubtless where there were men with the organizing power of Gregory the Great, efforts would be made to distribute charity as judiciously as was possible under the circumstances; but we can well understand that frequently this distribution would be far from wise. Two effects inevitably supervened: First, the Church felt a responsibility towards the poor; secondly, the poor learnt to look to the Church for support; and so, ultimately, the care of the poorer classes became the charge of the Church. By its teaching the Church strengthened the feeling of pity for those in need. But the work at its best was simply one of palliation; the Church relieved poverty, but made no attempt to abolish it by attacking its causes. Still, on the whole, good was done; for even indiscriminate almsgiving, if it created pauperism, was probably better than dependence founded on a civic right to relief. For the pauper stood higher than the slave; the first was at least free to support himself, which the second was not.<sup>1</sup> Rather by its teaching, which made slave-holding by Christians impossible—though this reform was only very gradually carried out—than by any sound theory of charity and its distribution, the Church prepared the way for better social conditions under which men might learn the duty of doing all in their power to support themselves and their families in independency of external help whether civic or eleemosynary.

To understand the work of the Church for the poor, not only during the Middle Ages, but indeed from its earliest days, it is essential to gain at least some conception of the principles upon which it was based—that is, of the ideas which inspired it. These principles have been grouped under the term “The Theory of

<sup>1</sup> Lock, p. 234 *et seq.*

Charity," and the title is a useful, if not altogether a satisfactory, one.

This "theory," or these principles, changed in process of time, chiefly because Christian doctrine itself changed. I do not imply that the practice of charity was always in strict agreement with these principles, but undoubtedly the principles did very greatly influence the practice. From time to time a change of circumstances also demanded a change of practice. It would not be quite true to speak of a "development" of this theory, or even of "revisions" of it. By development we generally mean a change from the less to the more perfect, from an inferior to a superior condition. But this is not true either of the change of Christian doctrine generally, or of the theory of charity in particular, during the long period which stretches from the Conversion of the Empire to the Reformation. In many ways and at various times during this period Christian doctrine departed further and further from the truth; so also did the principles of charity, which were commonly held, from those which we believe to be correct.

The subject of changes in the principles underlying the distribution of charity is an extensive one, and I must confine myself to the examination of two points: First, the growth within the Church of the idea that almsgiving procured remission of sins; secondly, the greatly increased proportion of "institutional" relief through the hospitals and monasteries of various kinds.

Traces of the idea that sins could be remitted by almsgiving are found very early. By Origen it is held to be a means of covering slighter transgressions; but by Cyprian the doctrine is clearly taught.<sup>1</sup> As Archbishop Benson says, "There can be no better illustration than this teaching (in which a distinct propitiatory value is assigned to our own action) of the combined results in the development of doctrine, of resorting to the Jewish Apocrypha, relying on a version, and constructing a theory from a word. When this thread of erroneous, or at least

<sup>1</sup> Uhlhorn, "Christian Charity in the Ancient Church," p. 211 *et seq.*

ambiguous, theory was presently woven in with Tertullian's new forensic language on satisfaction being made to God by penance, a commencement of much mediæval trouble was at hand."<sup>1</sup>

This teaching of the propitiatory value of almsgiving spread rapidly. In the East we find it insisted upon by Chrysostom,<sup>2</sup> while in the West Ambrose,<sup>3</sup> Augustine,<sup>4</sup> and Gregory the Great dwell strongly upon it. It became, in fact, an established doctrine of the Church, and continued to be so throughout the Middle Ages. Indeed, something not very different from it goes far to vitiate much of our almsgiving at the present day. I do not assert that English Church people give alms with the same intention as that recommended by Chrysostom or Gregory the Great; but far too often, from mental indolence—*i.e.*, from a want of clear thinking, the duty or satisfaction of the giver rather than the needs or the condition or the worthiness of the recipient, is the deciding factor in an act of charity. Too often we give simply because we "feel it our duty," or because we do not like to refuse, or because public opinion demands it, or in order to stifle the qualms of conscience. We do not give because we have made a thorough investigation into the circumstances and character and needs of those who appeal for help, and because we feel we can and ought to give really useful and substantial help in a particular way. To this extent much of our giving to-day resembles that of the Middle Ages—it is rather "self-regarding"; instead of being like the giving inculcated in the New Testament and practised in the earliest age of the Church—"other-regarding."

<sup>1</sup> Archbishop Benson's footnote is as follows: "Such are distinctly the sources of the idea: Sicut *aqua* (*i.e.*, Baptism) *extinguet ignem* (*i.e.*, gehenna) sic *eleemosyna* *extinguet peccatum* (Sirach iii. 30), and again, Prov. xvi. 6: 'Misericordia et veritate redimitur iniquitas' (xv. 27: 'per misericordiam et fidem purgantur peccata'), which, in the African version, was '*Eleemosynis et fide delicta purgantur*'" (Archbishop Benson's "Cyprian," p. 249).

<sup>2</sup> "With whatsoever sins thou mayest be burdened, thy charity outweighs them all" (Homily on "Penance," iii. 1). "Let us purchase salvation through alms" (Homily on "Penance," vii. 6).

<sup>3</sup> "They who have kindled the flames by sinning, may extinguish them by almsgiving" ("Sermo de Eleemosynis," c. 30, 31).

<sup>4</sup> "Men are cleansed by alms from those sins and transgressions without which life cannot be passed here below." (These are only a few of the quotations given in Uihorn, p. 279 *et seq.*)

Arising in part from this doctrine of the propitiatory value of almsgiving, but also due to one of the many survivals of heathen customs which were taken over or absorbed by the Church, there came into existence another source whence a very considerable amount of money became available to the Church for distribution to the poor. I refer to the idea that almsgiving affects the sufferings of souls in purgatory. By the time of Cyprian it was held that Masses could be offered for the dead to their advantage.<sup>1</sup> Augustine adds the idea that alms could be offered efficaciously for them.<sup>2</sup> Alms were also given at funerals and on the anniversaries of deaths, in order that their merit might avail for the deceased. We must remember the reverence of the ancient world for the dead. Frequently, among the heathen, money was bequeathed in order that the grave might be decorated on the birthday of the one buried in it, and in order that a feast might be held at it.<sup>3</sup> At such times money was often distributed to the members of the *collegium* to which the deceased had belonged or to his fellow citizens. The Church so far changed this system as to substitute for the banquet a celebration of the Mass, and directed that the money should now be given to the poor. Hence the origin of endowments for Masses for the dead, and of the custom of distributing alms on the anniversary of a death. It is true that teachers like Augustine and Gregory<sup>4</sup> are careful to maintain that only those will be benefited who on earth have not been guilty of great, but only of trivial, sins. But it will easily be understood that in practice it was difficult to maintain this distinction. When we say that these propitiatory means were not to be used for those whose lives had plunged them into perdition,

<sup>1</sup> Uhlhorn, p. 288.

<sup>2</sup> "Neque negandum est defunctorum animas pietate suorum viventium relevari, cum pro illis sacrificium Mediatoris offertur, vel eleemosynæ in Ecclesia fiunt." But Augustine is careful to add: "Sed eis hæc prosunt, qui cum viverent, ut hæc sibi postea possint prodesse, meruerunt" ("Enchiridion," c. 110).

<sup>3</sup> Uhlhorn, p. 290 *et seq.*

<sup>4</sup> Who adduces 1 Cor. iii. 11 in support of this. Uhlhorn refers to Greg. M. dialog., iv. 39, 57.

but had only sent them to purgatory, we can see how easy it was to decide charitably, especially when money was much needed both for the clergy and the poor. Salvian, in fact, admits that almsgiving *may* help even the quite wicked, and Augustine allows the possibility of a *mitigation* of perdition.<sup>1</sup>

I have shown enough to prove how strong was the temptation to the Church (especially in such an hour of need as the beginning of the Middle Ages) to succumb to the use of more and more doubtful means for obtaining the resources which she believed she needed. To that temptation she did, unfortunately, succumb. And it was a case that, when once the principle had been admitted, the applications became constantly wider and more numerous. The results, so far as the moral life and moral influence of the Church were concerned, were nothing less than disastrous, and these results persisted to the time of the Reformation.

[The effects of the doctrinal teaching of the early Middle Ages upon institutional relief I must defer to my next article.]

<sup>1</sup> Augustine's words are curious: "Pro valde malis, etiamsi nulla sunt adjuncta mortuorum, qualescunque vivorum consolationes sunt. Quibus autem prosunt, aut ad hoc prosunt, ut sit plena remissio, aut certe ut tolerabilior fiat ipsa damnatio" ("Enchirid.," c. 110).



## The Higher Criticism and the Hexateuch.

BY THE REV. W. R. LETT, B.A.

**H**IGHER CRITICISM is the fashion nowadays. Books and articles in encyclopedias almost assume that the results of the critics are unquestionable without offering us any very clear evidence at all, or even attempting to state fairly what may be said on the conservative side. The higher critics, indeed, are very much inclined to look on their opponents with a lofty scorn as prejudiced and old-fashioned. They will therefore consider that I am making a bold and ignorant assertion when I say that they are only leading people into a dense fog and finally into a quagmire!

However, I hope to show that this assertion is true largely from the admissions of the critics themselves. But of course in one article I cannot deal with the Hexateuch with anything like the fulness that it really deserves.

By way of preface I would point out one fault which the critics themselves ought to admit. They do not group their supposed results into one view so that the reader can properly estimate what it all comes to. Are they a little afraid to state their results too plainly, lest they should seem to a man of ordinary common-sense a little ridiculous? I hope to do this myself at the end of the paper as correctly as I can. If I am at all wrong, then the fog has affected me as well as other people.

Now Dr. Driver's "Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament" is universally admitted to be the ablest and most learned exposition of the Higher Criticism in the English language. No one will question that he is a great scholar; it is his work therefore, so far as the Hexateuch is concerned, that I propose to discuss to-day.

Well, in the Hexateuch Dr. Driver says there are, in the first place, three documents: two nearly contemporaneous, called

JE ; another of the age of the Babylonish captivity, P. We will confine ourselves for the present to JE. E is supposed to have been composed in the northern kingdom of Israel, J in the southern. Then there is a compiler who united both documents together with some additions of his own who is called R, but I think he ought to be called R<sup>1</sup> to distinguish him from other redactors. In algebraical formulas this whole document may be called (JE) R.<sup>1</sup>

Then a second compiler or redactor worked over the document (JE) R adding and correcting, so that we have at last a document which we may call {(JE) R<sup>1</sup>}R<sup>2</sup>.

When did J and E live? Three critics put E at 900-850 B.C., J at 850 or 830-800 B.C.—*i.e.*, E before J. Three other critics put J at 850-800 B.C., and E at 750 B.C.—*i.e.*, J before E. Why should the critics differ as to the date? Well, the argument, as far as I can understand it on p. 123 of Dr. Driver's work, is something like this: Wellhausen, because of anthropomorphisms in J, gives it an earlier date; but then there are passages in it which approximate to Deuteronomy, therefore they are by a compiler. Dillman denies the compiler in this case and says these very passages prove the later date of J. On the other hand, Dillman has difficulties for his own date in archaic elements: these he ascribes to another compiler, who uses a special source, perhaps the document E. Thus both critics make use of a compiler when they are in difficulties. What a very useful man the compiler must be, you will say. Yes, indeed, the critics could not get on at all without him. For every document in the Hexateuch has its anomalies, and these can only be explained by means of a compiler. Hence there are at least as many compilers as documents.

However, we want to know what is the real evidence for the existence of J and E. One argument which Dr. Driver advances is that in Gen. xx. 1-7, xxi. 6-31, xxii. 1-13, xl.-xlii., and xlv., the term "God" is used, whereas in chapters xviii., xix., and xii., 10-20, the term "Lord" is used. However, Gen. i. to ii. 4<sup>a</sup>, v. 1-32, vi. 9-22, vii. 6, 18-21, etc., are supposed

to belong to the document P. But in these passages "God" is used throughout. Therefore if the argument from the use of "God" and "Lord" is worth anything, they ought to belong to E. In fact, Dr. Driver allows that P is still sometimes called the Elohist narrative. Why, then, is not P identical with E? Dr. Driver says that for the "variation in similar consecutive chapters no plausible explanation can be assigned but diversity of authorship." Did it ever occur to him that variety in the use of words might occur from the author loving a little variety? Would not the Professor be rather indignant if some future critic dealt with his sermons in the same way, and found there at least two documents as well as a compiler? But perhaps he has been very careful to guard against such a contingency!

At all events, the argument from the use of "God" and "Lord" proves nothing unless it does away with P altogether.

But let us come to Dr. Driver's admissions. On p. 14 he says: "In the details of the analysis of JE there is sometimes uncertainty owing to the criteria being indecisive, and capable consequently of divergent interpretation." This is rather a peculiar statement. Does it mean that when you look at Genesis cursorily and, as it were, from a distance, you seem to discern signs of different documents, but when you look more closely for these signs they vanish? I confess that this has been my own experience. Again, on p. 15 Dr. Driver says: "Chapter xv. [of Genesis] shows signs of composition, but the criteria are indecisive, and no generally accepted analysis has been effected." That is, we must assume that a particular passage in Genesis is composite, but the proof that it is so cannot be produced. Again, on p. 17, when discussing chapter xxxiv.: "Marks of P's style appear unmistakably in some parts. . . . But it is not impossible that P is here based upon elements derived from E." Was there ever such uncertainty?

Once more, on p. 116 Dr. Driver says he always "rises from the study of JE with the conviction that it *is* composite." Why?

"It is no doubt possible," the Professor answers, "that some scholars have sought to analyze JE with too great minuteness, but the admission of this fact does not neutralize inferences drawn from broader and more obvious marks of composition." But I reply, this discussion *does* neutralize the argument from broader and more obvious marks. You talk about obvious marks of composition, and I bring you to book at a particular verse or sentence—ask, "Is it by J or E?" If you cannot answer decidedly then all your criteria are uncertain. They utterly fail when applied practically to any given passage. In fact, Dr. Driver almost admits this, for on p. 126 he writes: "Space forbids here an examination of the styles of J and E. Careful and instructive synopsis will be found in Holzinger. They have much in common; indeed, stylistic criteria alone would not generally suffice to distinguish J and E, though when the distinction has been effected *by other means*, slight differences of style appear to disclose themselves." I have certainly very much wondered what the Professor intends by "other means." At any rate, he practically confesses that the stylistic criteria prove nothing, and that therefore a great deal of his book is useless. But possibly by "other means" he intends internal contradictions and inconsistencies, of which he certainly tries to make a great deal as signs of different documents. One attempt of this kind I hope to deal with further on.

For myself, I think that these inconsistencies and contradictions are imaginary and can be solved by more careful and prayerful study of the text. But this I would say: "How is it that the redactors and compilers when they were editing and combining the various documents did not remove these contradictions which, if they are real, are certainly very glaring? Yet how can there be any real contradictions in two documents which "have much in common"? The Professor often refers us to the German critics. A sample of the sort of help we shall receive from them is found in a note on p. 14: "The Book of Genesis has been published [in German] in a convenient form, with the different sources distinguished typographically by

Kautzch and Socin. Great pains have been bestowed on this work, but the details, so far as the lines of demarcation between J and E and the parts assigned to the redactors are concerned, can in many cases not claim more than a *relative* probability,<sup>1</sup> as the editors themselves allow." "Relative probability!" That is all the critics can offer us! Are we not therefore in a fog?

But here we meet again that useful creature the redactor. He is the fairy Puck of the higher critics. One critic traces his hand in one verse, because it suits his idea of the length and date of supposed documents; another denies his existence for the same reason. The compiler acts in the most capricious way, as all fairy Pucks ought to do. Sometimes he puts a bit of P into E; sometimes he incorporates long sections of a document intact; sometimes he fuses parallel accounts into a single narrative; sometimes he sees contradictions and tries to smooth them away; sometimes he leaves them as they are. In fact, he is a most troublesome fairy, because the critics are not always certain whether they have caught him—he sometimes seems to appear, and then vanishes away in the fog to the great disappointment of the critics. Nevertheless, in spite of his troublesome habits, the redactor or compiler is a very useful fairy, because if anyone objects "Here is an expression which does not suit your theory," you can always answer, "Ah! that is the work of a redactor."

We all know that Gen. ii. and iii. has "Lord God," while Gen. i. used "God" alone; this fact tells apparently against chapters ii. and iii. being by a different author from chapter i., because, whoever he was, he knew the word "God." Oh, well, of course a redactor of JE added "God" to "Lord," and so the objection is answered!

You may ask, How many redactors are there altogether? Well, it is rather difficult to discover. I do not wish to exaggerate, but after a careful examination of Dr. Driver's work I do not think there were less than six at work on the Hexateuch—viz., the two (?) final redactors of the Pentateuch, the com-

<sup>1</sup> The italics are the Professor's own.

piler of JE, the compiler who joined JE and P together, the two compilers of H, Lev. xvii. to xxvi., the compiler of Num. xvi. and xvii. But I admit that I am a little in a fog as to their number. Possibly the Professor might enlighten us upon the subject.

Now you would like me to go on to the third document, P, in the Hexateuch. In it there are two strata—but I spare you!

Let us proceed to Deuteronomy. "The structure of Deuteronomy," says Dr. Driver, "is relatively simple." But do not be deceived, good reader, this must be one of the Professor's little jokes! "The main part of the book," he says, "is pervaded throughout by a single purpose, and bears the mark of a single writer who has taken for the basis of his discourses partly the narratives and laws of JE as they exist in the previous books of the Pentateuch, partly laws derived from other sources. Towards the end of the book, the same author or writer imbued with the same spirit has incorporated extracts from other sources. One of the final redactors of the Pentateuch has brought the whole thus constituted into relation with the literary framework of the Hexateuch by excerpts from P."

Now on Dr. Driver's own showing is the structure of Deuteronomy so simple? He seems to think there are two writers in the book. Well, let us call the first writer Y. Y made use of JE and "other sources." How many sources? These must plainly be denoted by X. The second writer we will call Z, so that the whole structure of Deuteronomy may be denoted thus: Y + JE + X + Z + JE + X all edited by R' + P, R' being one of the final redactors of the Pentateuch, which final redactor Dr. Driver does not tell us—apparently there were at least two. Well, this structure of Deuteronomy may be very wonderful, but is it "relatively simple"? "Oh, but," perhaps the Professor will say, "X is not an unknown quantity." Turn on to the next page (p. 72): "Certain parts of D, while displaying the general D<sup>1</sup> style connect imperfectly with the context or present differences of representation [this last sentence seems a little foggy], which make it probable that they are the work of a later Deuteronomic hand (or hands)." Mark the word!

How many hands? Dr. Driver denotes "the hand" or "hands" by D<sup>2</sup>. Therefore D<sup>2</sup>, because "hands" is vague and indeterminate, may be fairly denoted by X. The structure of Deuteronomy is thus made up from an unknown number of sources, and yet it is "relatively simple"!

The book of Joshua does not call for much notice here because it is supposed to be made up from the same documents as the Pentateuch. By all means let us get out of the fog and tumble into the quagmire!

You have heard even to weariness of these different documents. Let us try to simplify matters by trying to compare JE and P. P, you say, has a different style from JE. But, my dear man, you also say that JE is made up of two authors. Is P unlike J or unlike E? On your own showing the criteria for distinguishing J from E are indecisive, except by the mysterious "other means." Therefore in any given passage of JE you cannot distinguish P from J or E because you do not know which is which! You fall deeper and deeper into the quagmire when you assert that P itself has two strata in it. It is quite possible that while you think you are comparing P with J, you are really comparing one of the strata of P with some part of E and his redactor, because the criteria are indecisive! Thus the very foundations of the higher criticism are shaky since the critics themselves admit that they are not certain which is which of the earliest documents J and E.

However, let us suppose that JE is one document and P another. We will take Gen. i. to ii. 4<sup>a</sup> (the first part of verse 4) to be by P, Gen. ii. 4<sup>b</sup> to iii. 9 to be by E, or thirty-four verses in each passage, and compare them together. This will be a fair test. Dr. Driver says that JE is anthropomorphic: "The actions of God are described with some fulness of detail instead of speaking, saying, creating, He fashions, breathes, plants, places, builds, etc." Well, let us make out a full list of all the so-called anthropomorphic or picturesque expressions in each passage. It is not fair to pick out a few from one passage and shut your eyes to the picturesque expressions in the other.

## GEN. i. to ii. 4.

Ver. 2, spirit or breath.  
 moved, literally brooded  
 over.  
 Ver. 3, covered over like a bird.  
 Ver. 4, saw.  
 Ver. 10, called to.  
 Ver. 22, blessed.  
 Ver. 26, Let us make.  
 Image and likeness of God.  
 Chap. ii., ver. 1, Ended.  
 Ver. 2, rested.

GEN. ii. 4<sup>a</sup> to iii. 9.

Ver. 7, formed.  
 breathed.  
 Ver. 8, planted.  
 Ver. 15, put.  
 Ver. 18, said.  
 Ver. 19, brought to see.  
 Ver. 21, closed up.  
 Chap. iii., ver. 8, walking.  
 Ver. 9, called.

Not only have the two passages practically the same number of anthropomorphisms, but every description of God's actions in Gen. i. to ii. 4<sup>a</sup> is anthropomorphic, and could not help being so.

Where, then, is the difference of style? Dr. Driver's next test is, that P is "circumstantial, formal, and precise: a subject is developed systematically, and completeness of detail even at the cost of some repetition is regularly observed. Sentences are cast in the same mould, and particular formulæ are constantly repeated." Apparently the Professor has some grudge against P, because he repeats this accusation several times on pp. 8, 12, and 129. JE is his favourite—"he is free, flowing, and picturesque." Well, I have read Gen. i., etc., in the original carefully, and I cannot help thinking that the passage about the creation of man is quite as free flowing as any of the two following chapters. But is JE quite free from the peculiarity of repetition? Once more let us make out an impartial list on both sides.

## P.

And it was evening, etc. (vers. 5, 8,  
 13, 19, 23).  
 And it was so (vers. 7, 9, 11, 24).  
 Living soul (v. 19, 20).

## JE.

Living soul (ver. 7, 9).  
 Every beast of the field and every  
 fowl of the air.  
 To all cattle and to all fowls of the  
 air, and to every beast of the field  
 (vers. 19, 20).  
 The whole land of Havilah where  
 there is gold, and the gold of that  
 land is good (vers. 11, 12).

P.

J.E.

Whatsoever Adam called every living creature that was the name thereof. Adam gave names, etc. (vers. 19, 20).

The Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden, and there He put the man whom He had formed (ver. 8).

The Lord God took the man and put him in the Garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it (ver. 15).

Here I submit there is no real difference as to recurring phrases between P and J.E.

Then as to P being circumstantial, formal, precise. Is not J.E. circumstantial, formal, and precise in his account of the planting of the Garden of Eden, and of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, and of the tree of life, and the river that flowed through the garden dividing afterwards into four heads, and the lands they flowed through, and the creation of woman? Is not all this, I ask, circumstantial, formal, and precise?

Dr. Driver's next argument is that we have in Gen. ii. 4<sup>a</sup>, etc., an account of a different order in the appearance of life from that in Gen. i. to ii. 4. This argument has been trumped up again and again, and to me it seems rather absurd. Dr. Driver, on p. 8, wishes us to take Gen. i. 4<sup>a</sup>, etc., as giving an exact succession of life—viz., (1) man, (2) vegetables, (3) animals, (4) woman; very well, if we must keep to the literally exact account of the succession of events at all, we must keep to it thoroughly. Thus: Before any plant or herb of the field was formed man was created. Poor Adam! he wandered about in a desert, having nothing to eat! Then God planted a garden and put him in it where were all kinds of trees, pleasant to the eyes and good for food, but he was not given leave to eat anything—that permission came later on. As for the rest of the earth nothing grew on it; it was uninhabited. Apparently because Adam had wandered out of the garden, God placed him in there again, and this time gave him permission to eat of the fruits of

the garden, and also gave him a commandment which He did not certainly give him before, not to eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. Then God promised a helpmeet for Adam, and formed all cattle and fowl of the air and brought them to Adam to be named; but unless they all were created in the garden and remained in it, there was nothing for them to eat outside, for no vegetables were created except those in the garden. Last of all God formed the woman. Now that such could have been the meaning of the author of Gen. ii. is, of course, absurd, but I contend that if it is to be taken as a literal account of successive events at all, this must be the author's meaning.

Literally understood, Adam was twice placed in the garden and only given leave to eat the second time. If you allow that verses 15 to 17 are explanatory of verses 7 to 9, then the whole argument for a contradiction between the two chapters breaks down. Indeed, the natural explanation of the chapter is that, as verses 15 to 17 are explanatory of verses 7 to 9, so the whole of chapter ii. 4, etc., is an enlargement of chapter i. 26-31.

However, Dr. Driver is compelled to interpret Gen. ii. 4 literally as he denies the existence in Hebrew of a pluperfect. But here I am afraid I must accuse the Professor of arguing in a circle. One line of defence of the unity of Gen. i. and ii. is that "formed" means "had formed." This he tells us peremptorily in a note is contrary to idiom and refers us to his "Hebrew tenses." On p. 88 of that work he writes: "Some of these apparent instances (of a pluperfect) have arisen doubtless from the manner in which the Hebrew historical books were evidently constructed, distinct sections often written by different hands being joined together without regard to formal unity."

That is, assume that there is no pluperfect, and you can explain away an argument against the composition of Genesis, and assume the composition of Genesis, and you can explain away an apparent instance of a pluperfect! Is this logic?

Now, I humbly submit that the evidence, fairly and impartially considered, is in favour of the unity of authorship

of chapters i., ii., and iii. Anthropomorphic expressions and recurring phrases occur quite as much in one chapter as in the other. The second chapter cannot be explained at all properly by itself; it seems to demand a chapter before it, and by the same author. I would not be afraid to follow out this subject, and to prove the unity of the whole of Genesis passage by passage. Professor Green has already done this once, and perhaps it would be rather hard to do so satisfactorily, as the critics vary so much about the length of their documents. Still, I must keep my promise of giving you as accurately as I can the construction of the Hexateuch according to Dr. Driver. In algebraical formula it is this:

$$[(J + E)R^1 + P^1 + P^2] R^2 + H(R^1 + R^p) + PR^3 \\ + \{(Y + JE + X) + (Z + JE + X)\} R^4 + P.]$$

I admit that I may have made out too many redactors and documents. I should certainly be obliged if Dr. Driver would tell us how many there are. Perhaps he will kindly revise this formula.

Now, what is the aim of all this Higher Criticism? The German critics have an avowed object. They want to establish, by breaking up the Hexateuch into fragments, that it was composed long after the events they record, and so are only legends, myths, and traditions of which you cannot tell how much is true and how much is false. Therefore the Hexateuch is not inspired. The English critics accept the premises, but try to escape the conclusion. But they are surely in an illogical position. To assert that the God of truth could inspire and approve of a collection of myths, legends, and traditions, partly true and partly false, seems to be almost a contradiction in terms. I have tried to be impartial, but I must confess that the more I study Dr. Driver's book and compare it with the Bible, the more convinced I have become of the absurdity of the conclusions of the Higher critics. They are fond of telling us about the practical agreement of all competent scholars as to

their results. Well, they all agree the Pentateuch was not written by Moses. Nobody will deny that. But when you ask them, Who *did* write it? When was it written? you will find that hardly more than two or three agree together. Dr. Driver's own work shows this. They almost confess that, as to any positive results, they are in a fog and uncertainty. It is absurd, therefore, for them to say that they agree amongst themselves, for most emphatically they do *not*.



## The Proposed Parochial Assessment.

BY THE REV. S. C. LOWRY, M.A.,

*Rector of Wonston, Hants.*

ON September 15, 1911, after an exhaustive inquiry extending over two years, the Archbishop's Committee on Church Finance issued its Report. The Committee was representative of the Clergy and Laity of both provinces and included several financial experts. The Report was unanimous, all the members agreeing on the broad principles recommended therein, though they differed on minor details.

It asserts at some length, what indeed is obvious, that the Church of England in spite of the great wealth of its members is crippled in its work for lack of funds; that there are no adequate resources for the supply and training of young men for the ministry; that the clergy are in many instances sadly underpaid; that many of them continue in office when incapacitated by age or infirmity, because no provision is made for their retirement; that the ancient endowments and the present voluntary subscriptions are quite insufficient; that there is a lack of corporate responsibility in these matters; and that individual members have not learnt, as they ought, the duty of each to contribute to the rectification of these defects.

The truth of these assertions will be readily admitted by all who have any knowledge of the facts. The *practical* part of the Report consists in the suggestions for an improved state of affairs. The Committee maintain that there are "certain requirements which are essential to the very life of the Church, and that they must no longer be left to uncertain and precarious support, but must take their place as integral departments of Church organization demanding the support of every Churchman as a primary condition of membership." These objects the Committee, with a true ecclesiastical instinct, have defined as seven. (Possibly in after years they may be known as "The Seven *Corporate* Works of Mercy.") They are briefly :

1. Training for the Ministry.
2. Maintenance of the Ministry.
3. Clergy Pensions.
4. Provision for widows and orphans of Clergy.
5. Church Building and Building Loan Fund.
6. Religious Education.
7. The necessary expenses of Central and Diocesan Organization.

It is beyond the purport of this paper to dwell on these seven important departments of Church organization or to touch on the delicate subject of adjustment with already existing charities. Nor need we here pause to consider whether the Committee is right or wrong in concentrating its attention on these seven objects, and leaving aside to be otherwise dealt with those other objects—Foreign Missions, the support of the poor and sick, etc.—which have an equal claim on the generosity of Christian people. Anyone who wishes to study the whole subject more fully can obtain the Report for 1s. from any bookseller, and also a large volume of facts and statistics (3s. 6d.) on which the Report is based. The matter to which we invite the attention of our readers, and on which there seems to be the greatest diversity of opinion among the critics of the Report, is the *Proposed Parochial Assessment*.

It is, of course, obvious that the seven subjects mentioned above cannot be met without an adequate income. The crucial question is : How is the necessary sum to be raised ? Hitherto we have relied mainly on voluntary effort, and some maintain that, if only there be a more widespread knowledge of the great and overwhelming need, voluntary effort will still in the future be sufficient for all the claims that may be made. The Committee, however, think otherwise. They are of opinion that purely voluntary contributions, though they have the merit of spontaneity and the blessing which attaches to willing gifts, have proved entirely inadequate in the past, and may do so in the future, that such contributions have too often come from a minority, and that it is essential to the well-being of a Church

that, as far as possible, *every* Churchman should take his share in this necessary burden. Of course this last is a counsel of perfection. The Committee, not being composed of unpractical idealists or infatuated optimists, are not so foolish as to think that *every* Churchman is ready to assess himself or to be assessed for this purpose; so they propose that, instead of an assessment on the individual, there should be a system of assessment, levy, contribution, or apportionment (the name really matters very little) on each parish (which may be called the Parochial Quota), and that this should be from time to time fixed by a Diocesan Board of Finance, and the proceeds bestowed with the Diocese. The whole system, it is to be observed, is to be on Diocesan lines. We may readily admit that it will contribute to convenience and local enthusiasm if it be so, though a good deal of the talk in the Report about the Diocese being the *unit* of Church life may be unconvincing. "Unit," indeed, seems to us to be one of the cant phrases of the hour much affected by up-to-date speakers, which may really be anything you like—the Family, the Parish, the Diocese, the Church, the Nation, according to the object you wish to advocate. We wonder whether those wise heads who speak so sententiously about the Diocese being the Unit of Church life, reflect on the consequences if every Diocese were to be its own unit in ritual. But we may be tending that way. Mr. Winston Churchill is thought by his critics to advocate Home Rule all round and a return of the English nation to the Heptarchy. Perhaps the English Church may follow suit, and we shall have a different "use" for every Diocese from Newcastle to Truro!

At any rate, it is recommended that the Diocese, through its Board of Finance, should assess the various parishes within its borders, basing such assessment or apportionment on (*a*) the financial conditions of the parish, and (*b*) the number of churchmen and churchwomen in each parish, "to be estimated by the method deemed most desirable by the Diocesan Board of Finance." They also declare that "this Quota be treated as a primary charge on the income of the parish, and that its

punctual payment in full be a condition of representation in the Ruridecanal and Diocesan Conferences, and of the receipt of any assistance from Diocesan funds."

It is here, if we may judge by the discussions of Diocesan conferences and private conversations, that many whose opinions we respect are inclined to disagree. Englishmen, it is said, kick at anything which looks like compulsion, or, to change the metaphor, "get their backs up" if they are told what they ought to give and to what objects. It will not only be difficult to assess fairly what each parish can afford to contribute, but it will be impossible to enforce the payment of the sum assessed. Nor, it is maintained, will the threat of deprivation from participation in Diocesan conferences act as any great stimulus to slack and niggard parishes. How much interest, they ask, is at present taken by ordinary laymen in such assemblies? Will the inhabitants of Slocup Pogis care one jot whether they be excluded or not?

There is, unfortunately, a large element of truth in these assertions; and yet, if we are not to go muddling on as hitherto, and if we are to awaken any sense of corporate responsibility, it is reasonable that each parish should receive some guidance, at any rate, as to what is considered its fair share in Diocesan finance. The assessment, of course, cannot be enforced. It will not, and cannot, be a compulsory Church rate. It will not be of the nature of a debt which is *demande*d, but rather of a voluntary offering which is *expected*. Its method must be "peaceful persuasion." Whether the penalization of backward parishes will have much result is doubtful; but rights and duties are closely allied, and if a parish refuses to do its duty, it is but reasonable that it should be deprived of its rights in the corporate life of the Diocese.

An apportionment, or assessment, on each parish is, we think, a legitimate method for sharing what should be a common burden. But the main question is, How is this assessment to be made? If it is to win respect and general acceptance it must be made on definite principles, otherwise there will only

be continual bickerings and friction. The Report says that while the apportionment should be based on the financial conditions of the parish and the number of church-people therein, it is to be estimated "by the method deemed most desirable by the Diocesan Board of Finance." Unfortunately, the Report gives no definite guidance in this matter, and it is here that definite guidance is especially needed. The parishes will not be satisfied if their assessment merely rests on an opinion of the Diocesan Finance Committee framed upon a cursory estimate of its contributory powers. Opinions, whether pious or impious, are altogether insufficient. We know how the *Church Times* called the Lambeth judgments "opinions," and printed this word in inverted commas to indicate the contemptuous tone—difficult to express in print—with which it regarded the archiepiscopal pronouncements. Any assessment which will win respect and remain undisputed must be based on definite facts ascertained after long and painstaking inquiry. There must be the same principle for estimating the capabilities of each parish. Possibly the assessment thus made may need some modification owing to exceptional local circumstances; but in the first instance it must be formed, not on mere impressions, but on definite facts and figures.

The Report, it has been already said, fails to give precise guidance as to the principles to be maintained in assessment. It prints, however, in an Appendix, two Memoranda, by Mr. Lyttelton Gell and Mr. A. S. Dixon, advocating two different systems, but expresses no preference between them. The latter of these (Mr. Dixon's) is based on the amount of ordinary and regular parochial expenditure, such as maintenance of clergy and of the Church fabric and services. Most parishes commonly provide an annual balance-sheet, and it is easy to find out how much they spend as clergy stipends and church expenses, and to tax them so much per cent. on the whole. This is a system common in many colonial Dioceses, and Mr. Dixon advocates its adoption in this country. Mr. Dixon, however, recognizes that this system will press hardly on poor

parishes who have done their utmost for the support of their Church and have no margin left, so he proposes that the character of the parish (*i.e.*, a rough estimate of its wealth as indicated by house rent) should also be taken into account, and that there should be a much higher percentage on Church expenses expected from the richer parishes than from the poorer. The method by which he arrives at the graduated scale of percentage is somewhat intricate, and for this we must refer our readers to the Report. The defect of his system, however, is this, that instead of the scriptural principle, "To him that hath shall be given," it establishes the contrary rule, "From those who already give shall more be demanded." It taxes the generous parishes at the expense of the niggardly. Take, for instance, two parishes of the same size and the same standard of wealth, as indicated by house rents. One of them keeps three curates going, and spends on clergy and church expenses £800 a year; the other supports but one curate, and its total is only £400. It seems hard that the more vigorous parish should be assessed at a sum twice as large as the assessment of the slacker parish, and yet this is the result of a computation mainly framed on the basis of parochial expenditure. Such a system is sure to breed discontent. Why, it will be asked by St. Peter's, should we be called to contribute to the Diocese so much more than St. Paul's, when its wealth is quite as great as ours, and we already raise so much more for our own parish?

A fairer system of reckoning the contributory power of each church or parish is the basis of *house rent*. This is the basis advocated in Mr. Lyttelton Gell's memorandum. He recommends that the inhabited house duty be the standard. There will have to be in each parish a Congregational Roll, giving the names of Church households which supply attendants at church. The Parochial Secretary will then have to ascertain the gross valuation of each house represented, and to enter the duty leviable upon each. The total will represent the contributory power of the parish. Mr. Lyttelton Gell's scheme

also provides for an account of lodgers; but these, we may think, would be in most parishes a negligible quantity.

An assessment framed primarily on this basis will be fair and impartial. It is, however, open to this criticism that such a method will press too heavily on the poorer parishes. Imagine two parishes of an equal rental, one mainly composed of houses of £100 rent, the other of houses of £20. Though the total may be equal the contributory power of the former will be greater than the latter, because people who live in small houses generally live up to their means, while tenants of larger houses have often a very considerable margin. Mr. Lyttelton Gell recognizes this fact and suggests that it is met by the basis of inhabited house duty which exempts houses rented below £20 and graduates houses between £20 and £60. It may be questioned, however, whether this graduation is sufficient. In the case of inhabited house duty the graduation only extends to lodging-houses, shops, etc., and does not take small villas and cottages into consideration. A somewhat different graduation might be adopted. Houses of £100 rental and upwards might be assessed on their full value, but houses from £80 to £100 might be assessed with a deduction of 10 per cent.; houses of £60 to £80 with a deduction of 20 per cent.; houses of £40 to £60, 30 per cent.; houses of £20 to £40, 40 per cent.; under £20, 50 per cent.

House rent may not be a true criterion of a person's wealth, especially in the present time when many of the well-to-do classes, on account of the servant difficulty or the necessity of a motor, are taking smaller houses than formerly. But at any rate it is ascertainable, definite, and impartial, and in the absence of income tax returns there are no other figures on which we can rely. Even here, however, some modifications would need to be made by the Diocesan or Ruridecanal Board of Finance owing to exceptional circumstances. The question of endowment, for instance, should be considered. It would be unfair that a Church which raised a considerable sum voluntarily for its clergy sustentation should be on a level with one which is

already richly endowed. Tithe also must be reckoned with. Moreover, in our opinion, the Parochial basis must be modified by the Congregational. In towns large numbers of people attend some other than their parish Church. Their houses should be put down to the Church which they attend; otherwise the result will be in some cases utterly misleading. The writer of these pages has recently been in charge of a Church which stood on the border line of his parish. His chief financial support came from across the border. It is evident that in such a case any assessment of the Church should take these non-parochial members into consideration. These and other details will need adjustment, and in the initial stage the calculations will need much laborious effort. But once the assessment is made it will probably last for five years, and an annual revaluation will not be required. Doubtless house rent, as has already been remarked, is not an infallible basis. It has, however the merit of being ascertainable, definite, and impartial, and for this reason it is to be preferred to any other system.

On the method by which each parish is to raise its Parochial Quota for the Diocese we will not here dwell. The Report leaves it to be determined by the parish itself, but suggests that in addition to offertories every Church member should be induced, if possible, to contribute weekly a sum proportionate to their means, the minimum being a half penny per week, and it commends the "Envelope" of "Freewill Offering" scheme, so common among Nonconformists, for this purpose.

It will not, we may imagine, be difficult to formulate a system for the collection of such offerings. The real difficulty, and it can scarcely be overestimated, will be to inspire enthusiasm in whatever system may be selected. Schemes may readily be drawn out on paper; the problem is how to make them "go." Those who glibly talk of "every parishioner being made to recognize his obligation to contribute to the Diocesan Fund," utterly fail to recognize the immense amount of inertia and apathy which exists at present in these matters. Not only has the Church of England to face the difficulties which confront all

religious bodies—the immense amount of indifference to religion, the growing extravagance of the rich, the suspicion and alienation of the poor, but it has to recognize that as an Established and endowed Church it is hampered by special difficulties of its own. There is, for instance, the absence in many places of any Diocesan spirit, largely owing to the unwieldy size of our overgrown Dioceses. There is the existence of endowments, grossly exaggerated in popular estimation, and the levy of tithes which in country districts does not add to the Church's popularity. There is the impression, true to some extent in the South of England, that many of the clergy have ample private means. There is the feeling that the Church does not make the best use of her present resources; that the Bishops live in palaces and the clergy in rectories and vicarages unduly large and luxurious; that there is a quite unnecessary multiplication of small parishes in rural districts; that in a democratic age the democratic spirit is utterly lacking in the Church; that men are appointed to livings by private patrons often without any regard to the wishes of the parishioners; that working men are unrepresented in the Councils of the Church; and that these Councils are largely debating clubs destitute of any valid executive power. All these considerations make the case of the Church of England entirely different from the case of the Colonial Churches or the Nonconformist bodies, and weaken the force of any analogies between them. Perhaps in time such abuses may be reformed: but reform comes with slow steps, and meanwhile their chilling influence has to be reckoned with.

If the new financial scheme is to be generally operative in every parish, it can only be by energetic, widespread, and persistent efforts to awaken interest and enthusiasm. The needs must be laid before the people again and again; the cause must be advocated, as political causes are advocated, by competent and inspiring speakers; our parishes must be plied with literature on the subject; our district visitors will have to take a leaf out of the book of those energetic young ladies who flood our villages with tracts on "Tariff Reform" or the

“Dearer Loaf.” All this may be distasteful enough, especially, we fear, to the clergy on whom the chief business will fall; but it will be necessary, if the prevailing indifference is to be successfully combated.

One thing, in our opinion, more than anything else would give an impetus and inspiration to the movement, and it is this—that the dignitaries of the Church (Bishops, Deans, Canons, etc.) and the holders of benefices with a net income of, say, more than £400 per annum should voluntarily assess themselves at a certain amount, and thus give a lead to the laity. At present, one of the chief hindrances in the way of support of the clergy is the glaring inequality between the various emoluments. The income of the Bishops is the stock argument of the working man, who contrasts the £5,000 supposed to be enjoyed by the chief shepherd with the miserable pittance received by some of the under-shepherds with flocks numbering many thousands. “If,” they say, “the richer clergy are so rich, and the poorer clergy are so poor, why don’t they divide things more fairly among themselves before they ask the help of the laity?” Of course, it may be replied that endowments are parochial, and that at present it is impossible to effect a redistribution. But this need not prevent a *voluntary* assessment on the part of the richer clergy for the sake of the poorer. The first four of the seven departments of finance dealt with in the Report refer to the support of the clergy. It is reasonable that the clergy should take the lead in what so immediately concerns them. Their contributions should be earmarked for the first four of the seven objects. The difficulty of assessing the larger benefices would be no greater than the difficulty of assessing parishes; indeed, it would be easier, since the yearly returns of Church expenses afford exact *data* in this case which are absent in the other.

The amount forthcoming by such an assessment would not be large; indeed, it would be quite trifling in comparison with the need; but its worth would consist in the moral impetus which it would give to the laity. If the well-to-do clergy, as a

body, were to come forward and say, "We will show our sense of the need and the genuineness of our convictions by taxing ourselves at, say, 5 per cent. on our net incomes, we will do something on our part to rectify the grave anomalies in clerical stipends, we will seek to fulfil the law of Christ by bearing our brethren's burdens," this would, we think, make an impression which, more than anything else, might touch the hearts and unbutton the pockets of the laity. Most, perhaps we may say all, Bishops and many of the wealthier clergy do already give largely for this purpose. But a general and systematic movement is needed on their part if the response of the laity is also to be general and systematic. Example is more than precept. "Our need," the Report says wisely, "is that of inspiration as much as of administration."

It is probable that no movement within recent years will have greater result in proving the efficiency of the Church than the movement advocated by the Archbishop's Committee on Church Finance. But for success it must be taken up with zeal and enthusiasm. The conviction of many will be, that much of this zeal and enthusiasm will be lacking, until some of the reforms above indicated are pressed and obtained. The wealth of Churchmen is great, amply sufficient for our needs, if only average Churchmen would contribute as generously as average Nonconformists. But the existing anomalies produce a feeling of mistrust, and they must be rectified. Meanwhile, in spite of our difficulties and disabilities, we can endeavour to move on, and the recommendations of the Finance Report are, we think, a move in the right direction.



**Hallgrim Petursson.**<sup>1</sup>

BY THE REV. C. VENN PILCHER, B.D.

**N**EARLY two hundred and fifty years ago, in a lonely Icelandic farm-house a leper lay dying. Outside the doors of the cottage Nature was lavish in her gifts of beauty. To the west the waters of the Whalefirth widened towards the Greenland Sea and the sunset. To the east they narrowed into a girdle of hill and fell, forming a land-locked bay, scene of exploits told in one of the Sagas of long ago. But within the cottage all was bare and comfortless. The membrane of the primitive window rattled in the autumn wind, while on the wooden locker-bed, built into the wall of the house, amidst the heart-breaking squalor of his disease, the leper lay dying. But look! his lips are moving, and, as we listen, we hear him pour forth in his beautiful language a hymn bright with the deathless hope of Christ's Gospel, glad with the assurance of a speedy release from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. It was the man's swan-song. Not long afterwards, by the quiet hand of death, he gained his heart's desire.

Such must have been, as in imagination we reconstruct the scene from the knowledge at our disposal, the passing of Hallgrim Petursson, the sacred singer of Iceland. It was a notable example of the victory of the spirit over the flesh, of the triumph of the Christian in his hour of deepest physical need. Small wonder that this was the man who, out of his poverty, left to his countrymen one of the most precious legacies which they have ever received—those Passion-Hymns, which Iceland hearts will cherish, as a poet of their own poets has said, "as long as the sun shines upon the cold Jokull."

Hallgrim Petursson was born in the year 1614. His youth was cast in one of the stirring periods of Icelandic history.

<sup>1</sup> From "The Passion Hymns of Iceland," by the Rev. C. Venn Pilcher, B.D. London: Robert Scott. Cloth, 2s. net.

The breath of the Reformation was breathing upon the dead bones and waking them to life. Odd Gottskalksson had published his Icelandic New Testament in 1540, six years before the death of Luther—a version of which Gudbrand Vigfusson could write: “It is well worthy to stand by the side of that of Tyndal or Luther, and higher praise could hardly be given to it.” Bishop Gudbrand, of Holar, had brought out his complete edition of the Icelandic Bible in 1584, and was issuing hymns and other religious literature from his press. It was in this bracing atmosphere that Hallgrim spent his early years, his father being sexton of the Cathedral at Holar. Here doubtless were sown in the boy’s heart those seeds which later were to bear such abundant fruit.

But the harvest was not yet. Possibly owing to some youthful indiscretion, the young Hallgrim was sent from the school at Holar to Copenhagen. Here, in the great city, the boy’s talents were in imminent danger of being lost. But Divine Providence was watching over him. Brynjolf Sveinsson, later to become one of the most famous of Icelandic Bishops, found him in a blacksmith’s shop, and with quick eye discerning the gold beneath the grime, put him again to school.

His education in Copenhagen was continued until an event occurred which was to cast its influence over his whole life. It was in the year 1627, the year of Bishop Gudbrand’s death, that four ships from North Africa, three of them being corsairs from Algiers, fell upon the defenceless coast of Iceland. The main attack was delivered upon the Island of Heimaey, the chief of the Westman group. The wanton and inhuman atrocities committed by the pirates so burnt themselves into the memory of the unfortunate inhabitants, that Mr. Nelson Annandale relates that during his six weeks’ stay at Heimaey, in the year 1898, he heard almost daily of the raid. Between three and four hundred persons were taken captives, chiefly by the Algerians, and sold as slaves in the market at Algiers. Many suffered great cruelty, largely in the form of persecution for their faith. They were “chained in insupportable positions,

beaten on the hands and faces, exposed naked in public places, and again beaten until they lost the power of speech." At length, however, an Icelander was allowed to carry a petition to the King of Denmark, asking for 1,200 rix-dollars as a ransom price for the surviving captives. A subscription was raised in Iceland, to which the King of Denmark himself largely contributed. This was paid over in due course; and in 1637, ten years after the raid, thirty-four survivors out of the hundreds taken were set at liberty.

Some of these people broke their homeward journey at Copenhagen, and here it is that Hallgrim Petursson again comes into the story. During their enforced sojourn in North Africa, these survivors seem to have become more or less infected with Mohammedanism, or at least to have let a part of their Christian faith slip away into the limbo of forgetfulness. It was necessary to remedy this state of things, and to do so an Icelander, learned in Christian truth, but resident at Copenhagen, was needed. Hallgrim Petursson, now a distinguished theological student, fulfilled these conditions, and was forthwith appointed by the authorities to be the religious instructor of his rescued compatriots.

Among the captives was a lady, Gudrid, by name, who by her beauty had already attracted the attention of the son of the Dey of Algiers. The young prince had even wished to marry her. This, of course, could not be tolerated, and the source of temptation was sent out of the country among the other ransomed slaves. Gudrid thus became a member of the group which was confided to the pastoral care of Hallgrim Petursson. It was perhaps not unnatural that he in his turn should become a captive to those charms which had already proved too potent for the Algerian Prince. Such was the infatuation of the unfortunate man, that although Gudrid had been a married woman in Iceland before the raid, and although, for all that was known to the contrary, her husband was still living there, Hallgrim determined to leave Copenhagen and to sail back to Iceland with Gudrid. Upon their arrival in that country they remained

together, and at length, hearing of the husband's death, were married.

This conduct was the great blot upon Hallgrim's life. He did not go unpunished. The sweet fruit became bitter in his mouth. The Mohammedan leanings of his wife were through long years a pain and grief to his sensitive nature. Nor did his conscience keep silence.

“ Lord, I have sown the seed of sin ;  
Hideous have my transgressions been ”

—so he sings in one of his Passion-Hymns, and it has been thought that the words bear a special reference to this episode of his career. This sin may have been in a sense the *beata culpa*, which, with its attendant remorse, drove him to the Cross for that gift of pardon and renewal, of which he was afterwards to sing so peerlessly to his countrymen.

Hallgrim Petursson was ordained in 1644, and was, in 1650, appointed to the parish of Saurby, on the Whalefirth, in the South-West of Iceland. Here he gave himself largely to the exercise of his poetic gift, writing much religious verse ; and it was here that, inspired by the example of Paul Gerhardt in Germany, and of Kingo in Denmark, he achieved his greatest work in the composition of the immortal Passion-Hymns. They appeared in the year 1659, a first copy of the manuscript being sent to the daughter of that Bishop Brynjolf Sveinsson who had formerly befriended him in Copenhagen. But the singer of Christ's Passion was soon himself to pass through a very furnace of affliction. He contracted the dread disease of leprosy. This he bore with exemplary fortitude, and passed away, after a lingering illness, in the glory of an unclouded hope. He died at Ferstikla, near the parsonage of Saurby, in the year 1674.

The Passion-Hymns are fifty in number. They tell the story of Christ's sufferings from the moment when the Master sang the Pascal Hymn with His disciples in the Upper Room until the military watch was set and the seal made fast upon His tomb. Each hymn consists, as a rule, of from fifteen to

twenty stanzas. The poet begins by paraphrasing the Biblical narrative of that incident in the Passion Story with which he is about to deal. He thus accomplishes what is achieved in oratorio by the recitative. He then passes on to meditation, exhortation, prayer or praise. The hymns were written to be sung, generally speaking, to German chorales of the sixteenth century. With these tunes of stately dignity they naturally blend. To sing them to lighter modern airs would jar on the ear as a kind of sacrilege. In fact, to fully appreciate the hymns it is necessary to hear them sung to these slow and majestic melodies from the times of Luther, which give free play and scope to the beauty of the Icelandic vowel sounds.

In former days it was the custom in the scattered farm-houses of Iceland to sing the Passion-Hymns through during Lent. This custom is still to some extent observed—as, for instance, in the chief Icelandic Church in Winnipeg. Nor can a better preparation for Good Friday, the “Long Fast Day,” as it is called by the Icelanders, be well imagined. The practice, however, is not as universal as it was, partly owing to the indifference which pervades so much of the modern world, and partly through the prevalence of views in recent years which, as an Icelandic clergyman has pointed out, “must make the Passion-Hymns of Hallgrim Petursson die upon the lips.” It is, however, still true to say that this singer of the Cross is the outstanding poet of his people. His hymns have been called “The flower of all Icelandic poetry.” He is still sung and quoted with reverence and with affection. He holds his position, we might almost say, as the Shakespeare or the Milton of his native land.

If we seek the reasons for the spell which the Passion-Hymns have cast over the heart of Iceland for nearly two centuries and a half, we shall not have to look far for an answer. It is true that the range of thought is not wide, that the style is sometimes almost irritatingly didactic, and that the charm of colouring from nature through metaphor or simile is conspicuous only by its absence. The Passion-Hymns possess, however,

one mighty secret. In exquisite Icelandic the poet dwells upon the benefits procured for sinful man by Christ's Passion. He isolates (and surely we may forgive him for doing so) each particular suffering which the Redeemer underwent, and shows the gain wrought for man thereby. Was Christ left alone in His hour of need? It was that we might never be forsaken. Was Christ clothed in a robe of mockery? It was that we might be arrayed in a robe of glory. Was Christ hounded to death with the cry of "Crucify Him"? It was that heaven and earth might over us call "peace." Were Christ's feet pierced? It was that the sins of our wayward feet might be forgiven. Was Christ's side, as Adam's, opened? It was that His Bride, the Church, in that healing stream of Water and of Blood, might be born. The Passion of Christ is the adoring poet's theme. Now in homely teaching, now in pathetic prayer, now in rapturous praise, he "placards" Christ Crucified before his countrymen. He raised, as it were, a mighty crucifix of song over Iceland, and thither, for nearly two centuries and a half, the weary and the heavy-laden have turned their eyes. He sang the theme of the ages, and his song has become immortal.

Matthias Jochumsson, the leading poet of modern Iceland, has written a beautiful ode to commemorate the bicentenary of Hallgrim Petursson's death. He therein speaks of him as "the David of this land of Jokulls." He calls him a light "who lightened two centuries." He tells us that from the time when the child first says his prayers at his mother's knee, until the day when as an old man he turns him to his last sleep, it is Hallgrim's hymns which have power to soothe and to heal. And when Matthias Jochumsson is describing in another poem the passing of Gudbrand Vigfusson, the great Icelander of Oxford, he pictures him lying with the Havamal<sup>1</sup> at his head, Heimskringla at his breast, but the Passion-Hymns at his heart. That is their secret. The Passion-Hymns have spoken to the heart of Iceland.

<sup>1</sup> Readers of Longfellow's "Saga of King Olaf," in the "Tales from a Wayside Inn," will need no explanation of these terms.

## The Missionary World.

THE figures issued in advance from the Official Year Book of the Church of England for 1912, showing the voluntary offerings of that Church for the year ending Easter, 1912, will well repay investigation. There is an increase of £10,000 on the amount contributed to Societies and Institutions for educational work at home, and an increase of about half that amount on the sum raised by parochial machinery for the clergy. On the other hand, there is a total decrease of £400,000, of which more than £50,000 is under the head of Contributions to Foreign Work. A large part of the decrease is accounted for by the exclusion for the first time of the annual interest received by societies on their investments. But even so, the figures give cause for searching of heart. How would the general expenditure of the Church members for 1912 compare with that for 1911? Is it that we are spending less as a whole, or that we are giving less to the work of the Lord because we are diverting more expenditure to ourselves? The figures leave small hope that the spirit of true altruism is yet awake in our midst. Both on the home and on the foreign side the year under review was one of marked opportunity and appeal. It included, for one thing, the Student Conference at Liverpool, with its compelling message on "Christ and Human Need." Men's hearts within our own Church are not responding to the voice of God in history. In the "Missionary Survey of 1912" in the *International Review of Missions*, Mr. Oldham writes of the situation in China:

"To be great a nation must have a faith. That is China's need at this critical hour of its long history. It is strange that this touching and crying need should have failed to move more deeply the heart of the Christian Church, and that this magnificent opportunity should have so faintly kindled its imagination and enthusiasm."

There is, indeed, cause for searching of heart. "He that sleepeth in harvest is a son that causeth shame."



The status of women is such a burning question in the East that it claims the fullest consideration at the hands of those who guide the policy of missionary work just now. The splendid work of the women missionaries in the past needs to be reviewed in the light of new conditions. Radical changes are taking place in many directions; while the old conservatism still leaves Eastern women as the stronghold of anti-Christian influence on the home, there is a rapidly increasing desire to adopt Western customs and to exceed the limits of Western liberty. The place of women in the wider life of Eastern lands, long left empty, is being eagerly claimed by a small but growing group of those who sometimes have little understanding of the perils involved. We hear from India, from China, from Japan, of things which make us tremble lest all that was of beauty in the old ideals should be supplanted by a womanhood which will manifest the worst faults of the West. But the way lies forward, not backward. A larger, freer life, released from paralyzing limitations, is imperative if the women of the East are to play their part in the life of their land. Men cannot be their best when their wives and mothers are kept in secluded ignorance. The Christian Church is one-sided till the service of women has due place. At present the best of awakened Eastern womanhood has not been claimed for the service of Christ. The conditions of our life at home must not be allowed in this respect to repeat themselves abroad. The time for action is still ours. Soon it may be too late.

\* \* \* \* \*

None of the old missionary methods in women's work can be discarded. There will still be need for the patient visitation of zenanas, the loving teaching of girls in school, and all the other forms of devoted service. But we are beginning to realize that a great relationship needs to dominate them all. It is not enough to have girls' schools—they should, in the policy of the Mission, be definitely related to schools for boys. The equal education of a whole district should be aimed at, in order that there may be possibility of true fellowship in home life. Too

often at present the boys are reached in one place, the girls in another, and the mothers of both are not on the list of the zenana missionary. The family is the true unit for Church-building work in the East. Again, far more use needs to be made of the women of the East in the spread of the kingdom. The difficulties are, of course, familiar—early marriage and the like. But much will shortly be possible, as usage is modified by contact with Western women, and it is imperative that fuller facilities for a different type of training for Eastern women workers should be in view. The faithful Bible-woman will always have her place—and only those who have watched her at work in a zenana can know how great that place may be ; but there needs to be a new sisterhood in disciplined service between the educated women of good social standing in the East and the foreign missionary women. Such should work side by side. As in all times of transition, the problems which lie before us are many. But in a new attitude of loving fellowship, free from racial taint, the women of the West and of the East should together be able to find out the way to better things. The real foe to progress lies in the fact that present work is so pressing that those engaged in it are seldom ready to pause in order to think.

\* \* \* \* \*

Westfield College, Hampstead, has long taken a foremost place in the higher education of women on distinctly Christian lines. Its trust deeds secure that its Mistress shall be an Anglican on the lines of Churchmanship with which this paper is identified. Many missionaries have joined the C.M.S. from its students, notably Miss Katherine Tristram, the well-known Principal of the Bishop Poole's Girls' School at Osaka. After long and devoted service, the first Mistress of the College, Miss Maynard, is relinquishing her post, and the Council have appointed Miss A. de Sélincourt as her successor. It is probably the first time that one of the foremost women's colleges has had an actual missionary at its head. On the ground of health, Miss de Sélincourt is kept back from re-

turning to India, where she has given two terms of missionary service, and while we are sure that Westfield will maintain its high standard of general scholarship and send out its students to be powers in the home Church, it should be of great value to the candidates' boards of the various Societies to have an institution of higher learning where future women missionaries can graduate under the care of a missionary of experience. Miss de Sélincourt has been acting as Central Volunteer Secretary of the Student Movement for the past two years, and has thus come into confidential relations with missionary societies. Gradually some of the dreams of the Edinburgh Conference for the more adequate training of missionaries begin to come to pass.

\* \* \* \* \*

It is a matter of common knowledge that the Government, pressed forward by leaders of Hindu opinion, have adopted a policy which will ultimately make education universal in India. There is a demand for the extension of primary education; a growing importance is attached to the education of girls, and there is a steady move forward in the establishment of colleges and universities for the higher branches of education. Last year the Government of Bengal appointed a committee of European and Indian representatives to consider a scheme for the establishment of a University at Dacca on altogether different lines from the examining University which prevails in India at the present time. This committee has recently issued its report. It is proposed to group round the new University eleven colleges or departments, equipped for some 3,000 students and including six arts colleges—one of them being for women—with an educational staff of over 180; the professors and students, it is intended, shall for the most part reside within the limits of the University, the latter in hostels. Physical education is to have an important place in the curriculum, and a gymnasium, playing fields, swimming tanks, etc., will be provided on an adequate scale. This scheme, if successfully carried out, will doubtless be extended, and the serious question is, What place

will be given to religious training? Is the higher education of India's young manhood and womanhood to have any or no concern with the development of that spiritual instinct which is so marked a characteristic of the Indian races? It is instructive in this connection to read an article by Sir Andrew Fraser which appeared in the *International Review of Missions* last July on "The Educational Situation in India and its Bearing on Missionary Policy." In it he quotes the opinion of Swami Baba Bharati, who declares that the English system of education, being essentially materialistic and intellectual, is robbing his people of the jewel of their soul. Sir Andrew Fraser points out that in dealing with the educational problems of India one great need is for co-operation in our missionary enterprise. "The missionary body in every province, and by representatives from the provinces, the missionary body in India ought to be able to speak with a united voice upon all questions affecting the interests of the people in respect of education."

\*             \*             \*             \*             \*

The proposed alteration in the Indian Marriage Law, if carried out, will hasten forward social changes which are more and more desired by the increasing number of enlightened men and women of India. The present Act (passed in 1872) provides for a civil marriage, but it imposes a condition in the form of a religious declaration which has the effect of enforcing caste restrictions upon a section of the community which desires to be released from them. The Indian correspondent of the *Times* informs us that it is now proposed to remove the condition "which was inserted in the Act . . . as a concession to the opposition of the orthodox communities of India, especially the Hindus, who feared that the passing of a general law would undermine their time-honoured institutions."

\*             \*             \*             \*             \*

It has lately been pointed out by the Chairman of the Conference of Federated Missions in Japan that the need for a first-class, comprehensive, Christian University at Tokyo is "an urgent and indispensable factor in the Christian conquest, not

only of Japan, but of the Far East." An important step has been taken during the past year in the formation of a Central Christian University Promoting Committee, and papers on the need and plan of the desired University have been published by the Christian Education Association in Japan; but there is need for earnest and thoughtful energy and prayer that this scheme may be realized. We have only to imagine the Church in our own land robbed of its Universities to realize what a loss the Japanese nation has hitherto sustained. "Is it not clear to every reflecting man that the weal of the whole Christian cause in the Japanese Empire hinges upon Japanese leadership, and that Japanese leadership hinges largely upon adequate higher education? God speed the day when we shall have here, at least, one great Christian University!"

\* \* \* \* \*

The Findings and Papers of the Edinburgh Continuation Committee Conference held at Allahabad last December, under the chairmanship of Dr. John R. Mott, have just been published in the form of a pamphlet, which is a valuable summary of the proceedings and a rich storehouse of missionary policy. It can be procured (price 2d. ; by post, 3d.) from the office of the Continuation Committee, 100, Brewers Street, Edinburgh. The subjects treated of are: The Occupation of the Field; The Indian Church; Indian Christian Leadership; The Training of Missionaries; Christian Education; Christian Literature; Evangelization; The Mass Movement; Co-operation between Missions; Medical Work; Women's Work. It is somewhat startling to find that, whilst the increase of Indian Christians in the last decade has been very large, especially in the villages in the North and West of the United Province, it is a fact that, "beginning at Cawnpore, and running south and east, there are at least sixteen districts, with a population of over 16 millions of people, living in 46,633 towns and villages, who are unreached by missionary effort."

\* \* \* \* \*

Anniversary proceedings begin to find a place in the missionary magazines. The *Home Worker's Gazette* for March contains a full programme of the Anniversary Week of S.P.G. from April 12 to 19; preliminary announcements are also made by the C.M.S., the B.F.B.S., and the Z.B.M.M.; various Summer Schools and Conferences are also announced, notably the United Conference of C.M.S. Committees at Swanwick, May 27 to 31.

Although no statement as to their financial position can as yet be made, more than one Society sounds an urgent note as to the need for sending in all available moneys before the close of March. A noteworthy exception is the C.I.M., and we heartily rejoice with our friends of that Mission over the gift of £10,000 which has delivered them from the strain of anxiety and justified once more their confidence in God.

\* \* \* \* \*

Among many articles of interest in the March magazines we note the following: in the *C.M. Review* one on "Livingstone," by Dr. Stock, and one on "The Presentation of Christ to the Hindu," by the Rev. J. F. Hewitt, which will be found valuable by Missionary Study Circles working on "The Renaissance in India"; and in the *Mission Field*, "A Scripture Message" deals with methods of Intercession. The *Baptist Herald* contains an article on China by the Rev. A. G. Shorrock, entitled "Now or Never," in which he emphasizes the present opportunity, and appeals urgently for reinforcements; and the *Student Movement* has a short article entitled "I was a Stranger and Ye—" which is a strong plea for Oriental students in London. G.



## Notices of Books.

THE APOCALYPSE OF JESUS. By F. W. Worsley, M.A. London: *J. and J. Bennett*. Price 7s. 6d. net.

This is an attempt to present the historical Jesus from the apocalyptic standpoint, and to show His life as it was a self-revelation to His own time. The author emphasizes the importance of understanding the meaning of *The Kingdom of God*, which is spiritual. Concerning this kingdom, Christ taught the principle of development most clearly, and left its realization to be carried out as the kingdom became better understood. Respecting Christ's titles—Son of Man, Son of God—the author concludes that He claimed for Himself a unique relationship with God as "*The Son*." We look to all the leadings of the prophets, we look to all the development of apocalyptic, as guides which light us on our way to a realization of what His title means; but it is in His life, His work, His death, His resurrection, and all His teaching, that we can hope to read aright anything of the depth of meaning that the title holds.

The author, in common with other critics, emphasizes the importance of St. Mark's Gospel, for, he says, it was plain that Mark never intended to write a life of Jesus as such; he sets down simply the facts that were told him chiefly by Peter. And herein is the great value of his work. There is no finished story, and yet we have a wonderful picture of Him, who was not merely the representative Son of Man, but also the Son of God.

On miracles the author is perplexing. He seems to grant too much when he says: "There have been undoubted miracles at the grotto of our Lady of Lourdes, as there were at the first exposition of the Holy Coat of Treves." We agree, however, with his subsequent remark, that "God works by human means, but there must be a set of laws which belong to the spirit world, which affect our complex nature, but which, as yet, we but dimly understand."

J. C. W.

THE MIND OF A MASTER BUILDER. By Rev. H. B. Durrant, M.A. *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 2s. 6d.

We welcome this contribution from the pen of the newly appointed Bishop of Lahore. We are at one with Dr. Horton when he says in his Preface that the book "needs no commendation when it is read. It justifies itself." The writer shows himself a master in the choice of words and the art of illustration, the freshness and forcefulness and variety of the latter being peculiarly striking. These literary qualities, as well as the skilful interweaving of the devotional and the practical, do much to enhance and enforce the spiritual impression and appeal of the book. We have never read before in a book of this scope and size a better appreciation of the mind of St. Paul or a more helpful adaption and application of his message to the needs of the Church and the Christian of to-day. If this work is any indication of the personality of its author—and we believe that it is—we should deduce that Bishop Lefroy's successor is a man of wide reading and real culture, and closely conversant with the tendencies and needs of the Church and world of to-day. Moreover, it is clear that he is keenly sensible that

there is but one creed which will solve the great problems and satisfy the clamant needs of the whole Church, and of India, and of the world, the creed of St. Paul—Christ.

THE BUILDING UP OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By Canon R. B. Girdlestone.  
*Robert Scott.* Price 5s. net.

Coming from a veteran student of the Bible and a Hebrew scholar of some repute, Canon Girdlestone's new book will secure a respectful consideration, even from those who disagree with his already well-known views. Coming from a staunch conservative in matters of Biblical criticism, the book is certain to give satisfaction to those who are intolerant of what the author calls "the labyrinthine methods of modern analysts." We are not so sure that the book is likely to convert the author's opponents (nor, indeed, do we think that the author wrote with any such object), but at any rate there is enough of scholarship and evidence and argument brought forward to convince them that there is something—and a great deal—to be said on the other side. It is a little disappointing that in many cases there is not as much detail as we should like to support the conclusions arrived at, but there is a charm and force of appeal in the simplicity of style and devoutness of spirit in which the book is written.

There are two parts: The first, dealing with the phenomena of the Old Testament generally; the second, treating each book separately. The first part is undoubtedly the more interesting and impressive. The second is crippled by lack of data, and is very disproportionate. As many pages are given to Nehemiah as to Isaiah and Jeremiah together, while no more space is devoted to the whole of the Minor Prophets than is given to Genesis. However, in spite of these weaknesses, the book is a welcome and a worthy contribution to the study of the Old Testament.

THE APOCALYPSE OF ST. JOHN. By James J. L. Ratto, M.D., M.Ch., Q.U.I.,  
Lieutenant-Colonel I.M.S. London: *R. and T. Washbourne, Ltd.* Price  
12s. net.

Colonel Ratto has already published two treatises on the Apocalypse, and the present volume is a careful and thorough commentary of the Greek text based on the version of Frederic Brandscheid, a German Roman Catholic. The author, who is a Roman Catholic layman of considerable ability and scholarship, is well versed in his subject, and has evidently studied the best theologians and historians, both Romanist and Protestant. He prefaces his commentary with a short life of St. John and a useful history of the Apocalypse. This is followed by a valuable historical introduction, in which Colonel Ratto ably summarizes the views and opinions of early medieval and modern scholars and theologians on the authorship, date, and meaning of the book.

Unlike most Roman Catholic writers, Colonel Ratto, from internal evidence, assigns the early date of A.D. 67 to the production of the Apocalypse, and endeavours to prove that the later date at the close of Domitian's reign is irreconcilably at variance with the best traditions concerning the life of St. John.

The author is a convinced disciple of the "historical" school of inter-

pretation of St. John's "Revelation," and regards the "Letters to the Seven Churches" as entirely symbolical of seven successive ages in the history of the Christian Church, and as having little or no reference to the local churches then existing. Thus, Ephesus represents the early Apostolic age; Smyrna the age of the martyrs to the edict of Milan; Pergamos stands for the Roman Church from 313 till the sixth century; Thyatira represents the Church of the Middle Ages from the downfall of pagan Rome till the Reformation, the "millennial" period during which "Satan is bound for 1,000 years;" Sardis covers the period from 1560 to 1850; while the present is the "Philadelphian" age, which will imperceptibly merge into the last or "Laodicean" period. The rest of the book is divided into the "Jewish Theme" (from chaps. iv. to xi.), depicting God's vengeance upon the unbelieving Jews; the "Roman Theme" (chaps. xii. to xix.), dealing with "Cæsar Worship" and the punishment of pagan Rome; the "Millennium," the "General Judgment," the "New Jerusalem," and the "Epilogue."

Colonel Ratton works out this theory with much ingenuity and thoroughness, and in the course of his exegesis "discovers," or rather "assumes," proofs of the novel and erroneous doctrines and theories of the Roman Church on almost every page, and advances them with a naive complacency and entire absence of evidence which, if it lacks originality, at least has the merit of being distinctly entertaining.

Thus, in Rev. i. 1, it is calmly asserted that the title "servants" is intended exclusively to signify men of Apostolic standing—that is, the Bishops—as successors of the Apostles. It is interesting to learn that the reason why no message concerning heresy is mentioned to the Church at Pergamos is because it refers to the Church of Rome, "which has never been guilty of heresy," being the pillar and ground of the truth. With startling ingenuity, Colonel Ratton is able to discover a proof "that the primacy is given by God to Rome" in the prediction in chapter ii. 13. "Thy last works, which are more than the former," in chapter ii. 19, indicates, we are told, the wonderful blessings bestowed on the Church by the Council of Trent! "The synagogue of Satan," in chapter iii. 9, is the figurative description of "the ministers and clergy" of Protestant faiths; while the period after the thousand years of peace for the Church, from the sixth to the sixteenth centuries, when "Satan is loosed to seduce the nations," refers, of course, to the Reformation which inaugurated a revival of "Cæsar-worship," in the acceptance of the Royal Supremacy under Henry VIII. Colonel Ratton makes much of the awful persecution which the "Church" endured at this period, but is eloquently silent about the still more terrible persecution which the "Church" inflicted on the "heretics"!

The author adopts Renan's theory that the number 666 is designedly cryptic, and signifies the Emperor Nero, although he regards the Beast in another aspect as symbolizing the Roman Empire "personified in its seven heads, the Cæsars," while he interprets the "false prophet" of the pagan priesthood.

Apart altogether from the controversial nature of Colonel Ratton's exegesis, students will be able to find much that is both helpful, interesting, and instructive in this commentary. We do not think, however, that it is

right to confine the prophetic visions of this mysterious and wonderful Revelation to any one precise historical interpretation. Its great theme is that of our Lord's Second Coming, and its chief lessons are rather moral and spiritual than historical. Moreover, as Bishop Boyd Carpenter well says: "The predictions of the Bible are not exhausted in one or even many fulfillments. Each prophecy is a single key which unlocks many doors, and the grand and stately drama of the Apocalypse has been played out perchance in one age to be repeated in the next" ("Bible Commentary," vol. iii., p. 529. Cassell's, 1897).

C. SYDNEY CARTER.

THE SYMPATHY OF GOD. By Forbes Robinson. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.*

It was not a large literary legacy which the late Forbes Robinson bequeathed to the world, but it was a valuable one, as those who have read his "Letters to his Friends" can testify. And those who have been spiritually helped by his "Letters" will welcome this little volume of his sermons, and will find in them what they expect to find—that rare simplicity and deep spirituality which are the reflection of the writer's own personality. We are indebted to Canon C. H. Robinson for his labour of love in editing the book.

LESSONS ON THE TEN COMMANDMENTS. By the Rev. N. Hume Campbell, M.A. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 2s.

A course of Sunday-school lessons planned on the lines of modern scientific methods of teaching. The contents cover a wider area than the title would seem to indicate, instruction in the Life of Christ, the Bible, the Church, Prayer, and Sacraments being drawn out and expanded from the Decalogue. The book is thoroughly commendable in aim and outline, and in detail and illustration. We should like to see the writer's "Introduction on the Theory and Method of Moral Education and its Relation to Religious Education" reprinted separately, and placed in the hands of every Sunday-school teacher.

HEREDITY, EVOLUTION, AND VITALISM. By R. C. Macfie, M.A. London: *Simpkin.* Price 6s. net.

The shock which Professor Schäfer gave the intellectual world when he held out the hope that the time is not far distant when a chemical formula will be discovered for the nucleus which is "the quintessence of cell life," has been short-lived. He indicated the elements which composed living substances, and affirmed that "the combination of these elements into a colloidal compound represents the chemical base of life, and when the chemist succeeds in building up this compound, it will, without doubt, be found to exhibit the phenomena which we are in the habit of associating with the term 'life.'" The author of this work does not view the subject from Professor Schäfer's standpoint, and believes that the more carefully we consider the physiological character of even the simplest forms of life, the more we find that they differ from the characters of inanimate things. Indeed, he goes further, and is not disposed to accept unreservedly the varying results of Darwinism, which only disguise the original Creator.

There are some portions of this book that can only be followed by the

specialist—for example, that on the cell and its chemical composition. His chapter on Mendel is particularly interesting, in view of the fact that the principles advocated by this scientist are now being practically applied in horticulture. But when applied to animals, the author fears that Mendelism would imply the possibility of an enormous number of new zygotic combinations, and that it is unlikely the exact original combination would be produced again. But why not?

It will be seen that these subjects open out a vast field for discussion, and therefore cannot be dealt with in a short review. The book is not written in a dogmatic tone: it is suggestive, and will appeal to all who are not extremists.

J. C. W.

SONGS OF GOD AND MAN. By Anna Bunston (Mrs. De Bary). London: *Herbert and Daniel*. Price 3s. 6d. net.

There are some good poems in this volume. They possess a sustained strength which distinguishes the author of "Mingled Wine." Her vision of God lifts her above the commonplace, and she can sing: "With none save God can I be quite at ease." There is, moreover, a lilt about the poems which moves us, and the note of pessimism, so frequently found in our poets of to-day, is wanting. The writer endeavours to interpret life to us through Nature, and two or three little poems are suggestive of Wordsworthian simplicity; we venture to quote one:

THE SNOWDROP.

Close to the sod  
There can be seen,  
A thought of God,  
In white and green.  
Unmarred, unsoiled,  
It cleft the clay;  
Serene, unspoiled,  
It views the day.

It is so holy  
And yet so lowly,  
Would you enjoy  
Its grace and dower,  
And not destroy  
The living power?  
Then you must, please,  
Fall on your knees.

J. C. W.

OPALS FROM SAND. By Mary A. Steer. *Morgan and Scott, Ltd.*

This is an interesting account of the early days of the Ratcliff Highway Refuge. Begun in a very lowly way, the work has progressed so much that the present premises, though situated in an out-of-the-way place, and in one of the most notorious of thoroughfares, is a structure of which the promoters may well be proud.

The book is a full record of the achievements of this settlement, and describes the work of Miss Clara Lowe and Miss Ellice Hopkins. From time to time branches for the various departments that have been taken up have been established, and of these the Children's Cottage Homes are not the least important, and it appears that the larger proportion of the expense of these Cottages is supplied from the general fund of the mission. Her Grace the Duchess of Bedford has written a preliminary note to the book.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE SOCIAL CRISIS. By Walter Rauschenbusch. *Macmillan's Standard Library*. Price 2s. net.

This is a reprint in a cheaper form of a book which claimed a good deal of attention when it was first published six years ago. It may still be read

with profit, though many of the evil conditions for whose amelioration the writer then contended are now in process of being rapidly improved. The social conscience is certainly far more awake than it was. For this reason much in the book, which at that time was perfectly true, can hardly be said to be equally so to-day.

LANDMARKS IN THE HISTORY OF THE WELSH CHURCH. By the Bishop of St. Asaph. London: *John Murray*. Price 6s. net.

A fascinating and timely defence of the Church in Wales. The Bishop first traces the beginnings of Christianity in Britain, then gives us some account of the organization of the early British Church, emphasizing its independence, and showing how Augustine alienated the Bishops by his "tone of superiority and condescension," despite the fact that Gregory had commended them all "to his brotherly feeling." His account of the tithe shows to the impartial mind that none of the property it is now proposed to confiscate ever belonged to the State. But by far the most interesting and, at the moment, most important part of the work is that in which the Bishop gives us some statistics of Church work in his own Diocese of St. Asaph. In 1891 the Sunday-school scholars numbered 28,824, but in 1910 they had gone up to 34,207. On Easter Day, 1890, there were 14,214 Communicants, but in 1910 the number had more than doubled, being, in fact, 31,069. Since 1832, 61 new parishes have been formed, and the resident Incumbents to-day number 209 as against 120 then. To take a few particulars of town parishes in the Diocese: at Colwyn Bay in 1890, there were 375 Communicants on Easter Day, but in 1912, 1,193; at Rhyl, in 1890, 390; in 1912, 1,191; at Wrexham, in 1890, 481; in 1912, 1,509. The same thing is seen in the country parishes—everywhere there is progress. In the face of facts like these, can we question the truth of Lord Selborne's assertion, made the other day in the House of Lords, that "the only driving power behind this (dis-establishment) proposal is sectarian malice," or Lord Kenyon's declaration that it is "unwise, unwarranted, and unjust"?

The book is enriched with numerous illustrations. Among these two are reproduced by permission of the Society of Antiquaries. One is the ground-plan of a Romano-British church unearthed in 1892 at Silchester, and the other a coloured plate showing the position of a Mosaic panel which is some distance away from the East wall of the same church. A casual glance at this will show that here in the centre of the apse stood the Holy Table, and the Bishop admits that the Celebrant stood behind it, facing the congregation. Other illustrations are in accord with the main purpose of the book—they indicate revival. Llandaff Cathedral, for instance, is shown in ruins, in 1787, while on another page it appears in its restored state.

Though it is not distinctly stated, we rather imagine this is the first volume of a series. Dr. Edwards has certainly not left the other Welsh Bishops much to say on the general history of the Church in the Principality, but we still venture to hope that this will not deter them from following with histories and statistics of their Dioceses.

S. R. C.

JOSHUA: AN ANNOTATED HEBREW TEXT. By the Rev. S. Friedeberg, B.A. *William Heinemann*. Price 5s. net.

At last we are promised a series of annotated Hebrew Texts. That is good news, for there is need of such a series. We congratulate Mr. Heine-

mann, the publisher, on his courageous enterprise, and we venture to predict that it will not go unrewarded, especially if the subsequent volumes are up to the standard of the one before us—for Mr. Friedeberg has produced a work of exceptional merit. He knows how to teach. Therefore the notes are simple but always ample, and the essential point has never to be hunted out from a mass of bewildering detail. We should have welcomed more quotations from the actual Greek of the LXX., instead of the English translations of it. It would have been a more useful contribution than the geographical and historical glossary at the end. The choice of Joshua as the first volume of the series is due to the fact that that book has been selected for certain University examinations in 1912 and 1913. We regard those students who are taking this book in these examinations as fortunate in having within their reach so valuable a textbook to guide them.

A BIBLICAL HISTORY FOR JUNIOR FORMS (OLD TESTAMENT). By Dr. Foakes Jackson. *W. Heffer and Sons, Ltd.*

THE HISTORY OF THE PEOPLE OF ISRAEL. By Mary Sarson and Mabel Addison Phillips. London: *Longmans and Co.*

We can offer a welcome to each of these books as an effort to present the history of Israel in such a way as to stir the interest and appeal to the imagination of the young student. The former is designed especially to meet the needs of lower forms; the latter is heartily commended by Dr. David, in his brief preface, for use in upper forms. Dr. Foakes Jackson has based his book on his well-known "Biblical History of the Hebrews." The salient facts are well brought out and clothed in simple language, and re-emphasized in a summary at the end of each chapter. Particularly effective and useful are the two chapters at the close of the book on "The Geography of Palestine" and "Recent Discoveries."

If, as the author says in his preface, "it is a hazardous, and even fatal, experiment to attempt to teach the Old Testament in a hard, literal manner, and deliberately to ignore its many difficulties," then we may justly find fault with the author for treating so scantily the early chapters of Genesis, which bristle with difficulties, and for passing over without comment the problems of the moral and the miraculous which Joshua and Judges and later historical books present.

The other volume under our notice is modelled on very different lines. It takes the form of a running commentary, connecting book with book, and interweaving with the history contemporary and illustrative prophecy and poetry. The structure and the design are admirable. The style is picturesque and pleasing. The scope is wide, carrying the reader to the end of the Persian Period. Doubtless to some the presentation of the history will seem to be too highly flavoured with "advanced criticism." We notice with some misgiving a tendency to blur the personality of the patriarchs, and to regard them as the hazy, mythical ancestors of the race. There is, perhaps, an over-anxiety to wipe out difficulties by rationalizing processes. We are inclined to quarrel with the statement that "it was in all probability to the conquered Canaanites that Israel owed the art of writing." But, putting critical views aside, the book is a remarkable presentation of Hebrew history in the light of modern research. It fills the space which, as Dr

David remarks in the preface, has long existed "for a book providing in reasonable compass a background for the study of the Old Testament." It is a real contribution to the study of the Old Testament history in giving prominence to the contribution to, and influence on, Hebrew history of the geographical conditions of Palestine, the current religions and ethical ideas of surrounding peoples, and the historical association of Israel with its neighbours. Not the least valuable part of the book is the half-dozen tables and the comprehensive index at the end.

A SHORT INTRODUCTION TO THE OLD TESTAMENT. By the Rev. F. Ernest Spencer. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 2s. 6d.

Those who range themselves on the side of conservatism in the matter of Old Testament criticism will find much in this Introduction to confirm and reinforce their views. The writer crosses swords with the exponents of Higher Criticism with considerable skill and vigour, and in doing so reveals himself as a scholar of wide reading and a keen student of archæology in its bearing on Old Testament history and literature. The book itself would seem to presuppose some acquaintance with modern critical investigation and theories on the part of its readers; otherwise many of the author's remarks would lack point and force. Moreover, its brevity is responsible for a number of sweeping statements which involve too important issues to be denied the support of substantial proof.

WHAT IS JUDAISM? By Dr. Abram S. Isaacs. London: *G. P. Putnam's Sons.*

We are grateful for this book. It ought to be widely known and widely read. In a series of clever essays the writer has given us rare glimpses into the mind of Judaism, past and present. He has made it his aim to interpret the history and aspirations of his brethren, and to give us a record of what they have done and are doing, an estimate of what they are capable of doing, and a prophecy of what they are yet destined to do, for the world. What is the secret of the age-long prejudice against the Jew? It is envy. What is the secret of the undeniable influence of the Jew on the history of the past 250 years? It is his spirit of enterprise, his progressive adaptation to each new environment, and his love of education. And so long as Judaism is faithful to its three essential religious principles—belief in God, and in revelation, and in the immortality of the soul in a future world—then the author is convinced that the full glory of its destiny is yet to be. Its influence will be realized and more fully recognized with the advent of the era of human brotherhood and the fulfilment of the prophet's vision of universal peace. It is not easy to uproot prejudices, but Professor Isaacs' book should be successful in removing a few, and in planting in their room a profound sympathy with the past sufferings of Israel and the mission of God's ancient people to the modern world.

