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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

November, 1919.

THE MONTH.

The Church Congress.

It was a bold thing to revive the Church Congress before the country has at all settled down after the upheaval of the Great War, but it must at once be admitted that the venture has been fully justified. The members attending the Congress, held at Leicester, October 14–17, were smaller than those which usually foregathered in pre-war days for what was then an annual event, but not for many years has there been a deeper realization of the spirit of fellowship and brotherhood than was manifested at Leicester. It is easy, of course, to exaggerate the indications; the personality of the President, the enthusiasm of members and the uniqueness of the occasion, all combined to stimulate and sustain ideals of unity; but, when every allowance is made for these adventitious circumstances, there remains the fact, solid and unmistakable, that not only was there no jarring note heard throughout the whole Congress, but that there was a most obvious desire to recognize in the fullest degree the "one-ness" of the assembly.

The New Spirit.

What does it all mean? It is, we believe, a sign of the times. It shows that with the new age is coming a new spirit of which it will be necessary to take serious count in all future discussions of Church questions. It does *not* mean that the old lines of demarcation are being blotted out, or that the old differences have ceased to be, but it does involve in the consideration of those questions which divide Churchmen a greater readiness to understand each other's point of view, to lay

emphasis upon points of unity rather than upon points of disagreement Now, if this be a true analysis of the position, it is a very important change for the Church Congress to have effected, and it is one for which we cannot be sufficiently thankful if so be it may result in drawing more closely together all who are sincerely loyal to the principles and practice of the Church of England. But the development of this new spirit which has just began to show itself, will not be without its difficulties and it must be watched with care. It would, of course, be idle to suppose that the differences among Churchmen are any less real than they were, and to move forward as if they had ceased to exist or were not as important as they were would be to court disaster. Nothing is gained by a policy of "make-believe" in regard to the relationships which exist between Churchmen and Churchmen, any more than in regard to those between the Church and Nonconformity. The differences are fundamental and vital, and it is still as necessary as it ever was to bear witness to the Truth and to uphold in their full integrity the principles of the Church of England—Catholic, Apostolic, Reformed, Protestant. But in our witness and in our controversies there must ever be the recognition that the things we contend for are the things of Christ and that, therefore, we must be controlled by the Christ-like spirit. It will be said that this is no new principle; of course, it is not; but it has not always been acted upon. There have too often been grave breaches of charity on all sides, but we can at least endeavour to mend our ways in this matter, and we may well be thankful that the Church Congress has so markedly laid emphasis upon the need for a deeper recognition and acceptance of the Spirit of Christian unity.

The Present Call.

Many subjects of outstanding importance were discussed at Leicester, and we may recur to some of these in future issues; for the moment we must confine our attention to two. One relates to "Christian Ideals in World Politics." Interesting papers on "The League of Nations and Imperial Politics" were contributed by men so dissimilar in their views as Lord Eustace Percy and Mr. George Lansbury; and Bishop King outlined "The Present Need and Opportunities of the Mission Field." But in this section the paper which made the strongest appeal to the meeting and also interests us most was that of the

Rev. W. E. S. Holland, who gave a most powerful presentation of "The Present Call to the Church." That call is nothing less than the winning of the world for Christ. Most eloquently and impressivey did Mr. Holland make his plea :—

We need (he said) a challenge that shall require that every family lives the simple life, and trains its sons and daughters for world-service. At present we are living as though winning the world for Christ were a task that the Church could take casually in its stride.

"Business as usual" will never see the world won for Christ. It will mean extraordinary measures; a radical change in the everyday living of each family, such as the war demanded. Have we yet reached the level when our missionary giving means actual privations in our family life? It cost Christ the Cross. What has it actually cost you in sacrifice? Brother clergy, can you go on any longer with glib phrases about the supreme duty of Foreign Missions, when you spend more on quite alienable additions to Church worship, which yet judged by world-needs are luxuries, than you send abroad? Is not such talking sheer hypocrisy?

Is the whole of our Church life at home definitely co-ordinated to the one objective—the winning of all life everywhere for God. Do you see how the Church's failure to make the missionary purposes the great unselfish end which everything subserves has paralysed all our parochial life? The whole thing at present appears selfish. Folk go to church to get good. That is the universal impression we have created. How we have betrayed the ideal Jesus taught and lived! And there is no way out of the vicious circle until each parish priest sees himself as a company officer, whose supreme business it is to make his congregation efficient as a unit in world-service. There is the great unselfish end that will redeem and ennoble everything. Are we going to make the needed changes? Fathers in God, brothers and sisters, are we going to *do* this thing? It means that we organize the Church at home on a war footing. The whole of Africa and Asia and Europe has to be won for Christ. The supreme business of the Church is to keep its overseas battalions at full strength. Each Bishop will call on his ordinands and younger clergy for the needed drafts. Is it to be, or are we just going to go on as before, with a few more ringing phrases in our ears? It is you who settle. . . .

What is the task to which we are called? The saving of a whole world from ruin; the saving of the world for human life and brotherhood and God. It is to Saviourhood we are called, to share in the Saviourhood of God. What honour, what a challenge! What will you respond? Saviourhood costs. Its cuts right down to the raw quick. It means wounds, blood, suffering, death. The cross always means agony. Are we going to pay the price? A world's fate depends upon your answer. Christ waits to know if we are going to see Calvary through!

Is there anything within us that responds to this appeal? It takes us to the very heart of the problem before the Church. We may busy ourselves with many things here and there, but this is the supreme test of our spiritual vitality. Unless we are prepared to deny ourselves and lay our all upon the altar that God may take and use it and us for the extension of His Kingdom we are not realizing the fulness of the privilege of our high calling.

Reunion at Home.

The other matter to which we refer was the remarkable discussion on Reunion. The papers read on Relations with the Roman and the Eastern Church do not interest us much, but Canon Temple's paper on the Protestant Churches at Home proved a most valuable contribution to the Reunion question. He has a scheme of his own which may thus be outlined:—

They ought from the Anglican side to make it quite clear that unity need not and should not mean uniformity.

The historic episcopate must be preserved in the united Church, and all ordinations to the ministry of that Church must be episcopal. For this some at least of the Free Church leaders were prepared; some even desired it; it was a point on which there could be no wavering on their side. The Church of England should corporately and officially acknowledge that, as the separated bodies could not be charged with the whole guilt of schism, so they were not entirely cut off from the benefits of membership in Christ's Church. He would desire to recognize their Sacraments as operative and efficacious, although he believed the commission by which they were administered was defective. Their Sacraments were guaranteed, it seemed to him, by the very character of God.

If the episcopate must be preserved, it was necessary that in the matter of order there should be more movement on the Free Church side towards them than on their side towards the Free Churches. But he wanted to make an advance to meet the members of the Free Churches in the matter of definite Church order if possible. If the Church of England had already recognized explicitly that their Sacraments were real and effective Sacraments, then he proposed that the Archbishop who was to confer the priesthood and episcopate on chosen representatives of those bodies should, before doing so, be formally received into their fellowship and receive the Holy Communion as a member of such body from the minister commissioned to administer it in that body.

This scheme represents a piece of constructive work which far outbalances the Canon's rather strange objection to the interchange of pulpits. How far it will appeal to Nonconformists on the one hand and Churchmen on the other, remains to be seen. It might be thought to be an ominous sign that the scheme was barely referred to in the discussion which followed, but impromptu criticism would have been a mistake. Full and careful consideration is needed, but we can at least be thankful that so clear an issue has been so definitely raised.

THE GREAT PRAYER.

SHORT CHAPTERS ON JOHN XVII.

BY THE BISHOP OF DURHAM.

VI.

OUR study passes on from the Lord's intercession for His first chosen ones, His apostles, the favoured group who stood around Him that night and heard His words on their behalf. We come now, as last month we undertook to do, to that far wider circle, so wide that one bright day it shall prove to be a multitude that no man can number, those who should "believe on Him through their word."

For them He goes on (ver. 20) to offer explicit petition. Let us approach what He says with the tender solemnity of the recollection that we, writer and reader, are personally included here. We by the great grace of God have believed on His Son. To us, by the Holy Ghost, who takes of the things of the Son and shews them to men, has been given that spirit-sight of Christ Jesus the Lord which brings with it, in a sequence profoundly natural while supernaturally made possible, that saying faith which means the man's committal of himself to his Redeemer, his welcome to his Lord to enter in and have His own way in the inner world, his new life in a trusted Christ. And this we have received, this simple but infinitely significant act of believing we have been led to do, "through the word" of the first messengers of our Master. Through them has come to us all that we know of the unique Person to whom we have entrusted ourselves. Whatever hand actually wrote each of the four Gospels, they are all most assuredly apostolic, in the sense that none of the four could have found its early and decisive acceptance in the Church without apostolic warrant, even where it had not (as in the case of the second and third Gospels certainly) direct apostolic authorship. Every detail of the narrative of the Incarnate Life, and Death, and immortal Victory, every lineament of the Character, every record of the supreme Prophet's words, comes to us from those who walked with Him here below in the unspeakable privilege of companionship. And when we recount to ourselves the truths that we believe, the grounds of our assurance of blessing in and

through the Christ, the offices and attributes of Him on whom we rely, the blessing to us and within us which each office and attribute brings as we translate it into experience—all this is still "through their word." The precious Epistles are the treasury out of which we draw, always anew and as if for the first time, our articulate certainties about all that our Christ "is given to us to be," so far as it is not drawn from the apostolic record of His own utterances (as this utterance, for a supreme example) upon earth. Not our "best thinking," but their word; not all the accumulated "best thinking" of even the finest human minds other than theirs, but their word; not even the best thinking of the Church of which they were the first ministers, but their word; this is the "vessel" which to us "bore the Name," and which alone bears it still, in its authentic glory.

It is hardly necessary here, but it may not be useless, to say in passing that such recollections will not be in the least disturbed by the obvious fact that the "word" of the Epistles is, for its largest part, given through Paul, the man who not only was not with the Lord on the betrayal night but was soon to develop into His chief antagonist. Paul was indeed "born out of due time" into faith and into apostleship. But indeed he was born, and indeed he was grouped with the first apostles for ever by the same supreme call; "a chosen vessel to bear my Name." Not physically, not locally, but in spiritual fact, he was there, on that night of the Great Prayer. His "word" was present to the Lord's mind there quite as truly that of Peter, or of John.

And it may not waste our time to note just further that the one great Epistle which is, *as to certainty*, anonymous, the Hebrews, claims in highest reason our reliance as a part of "their word." I do not press here what I, for one, hold to be more than probable, that at the back of it, so to speak, was Paul; that Paul originated its creation, as the pre-eminent "*scribe* instructed unto the Kingdom," but for grave reasons committed the writing not only to another pen but to another mind, other, while in contact with his own. Whether this were so or not, I take it as assured that the Christian "prophet" who actually framed and wrote the Epistle worked in fullest fellowship with the apostolic leading, and was recognized by the apostles as scattering "their word," given to him also by the one Inspirer.

Once more, in brief, we believers of to-day, for all our certainties of faith, come back, directly or indirectly, to "their word" as our rock of refuge, repose, and life; their word, vivified and glorified indeed to us by the Spirit who inspired them, but not the less their word. So we, believing through that word, are explicitly embraced in the Lord's petition here. "I pray for them also."

What now does He ask for us, for all "the blessed company of" the sons of faith through the word, all the long generations of the faithful, even to "the consummation of the age"?

First, and with repetition, He makes request that we may "be one"; "as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee; that they also may be [one][1] in us." And this He asks with the special aim of providing a host of witnesses who shall arrest and win "the world" "that the world may believe that Thou didst send Me;" "that the world may know that Thou didst send Me, and lovedst them even as Thou lovest Me."

We note further, in closest connexion, those other words (ver. 22, 23): "The glory which Thou hast given Me I have given unto them, that they may be one even as We are one; I in them and Thou in Me; that they may be perfected into one; that the world may know that Thou didst send Me, and lovedst them even as Thou lovedst Me."

What Christian, living by faith in the Son of God, walking with Him in worshipping sympathy of will and aims, has not pondered reverently that great utterance of his Lord upon unity? And who, after such pondering, has not mourned the "divisions of Christendom," the almost innumerable rifts of organization and order, Eastern and Western, Reformed and Unreformed, Episcopal and non-Episcopal? Who has not indulged a dream of what the scene would be; what a calm, what a strength, would fill the life of Christendom; if co-operative unity—no metallic and mechanical uniformity, but federated co-operation, in the large light of truth—could emerge from the chaos? Shall I make a confession which will seem paradoxical from a man whose convictions are not only with the Reformation but largely with its Puritan side? Gazing, some dozen years ago, one bright winter day at Rome, from the Pincian Hill, at the dome-crowned majesty of St. Peter's, the dream

[1] The word "one" (ἕν) in this clause is probably to be omitted. But the context would seem to supply it to the mind.

I have indicated above seemed to rise in and around me. I put aside for the moment all the historical perplexities, to say the least, which attend the claim of Rome to have had Peter for her bishop, and also her vast exaggeration of his "primacy" into a much more than imperial supremacy in the human world. I thought only of the lofty historical importance and significance of that city in the story of civilization, and I imagined to myself a Western, if not a worldwide, Christendom, moving and working in all its manifold national and other developments, in free and constitutional connexion with the Church of that wonderful metropolis—assuming (alas! for the facts on the other side) that Church to have kept unsullied and altogether living the faith (and the law) of the Epistle to the Romans! The dream assumed a noble and beautiful colour, with its vision of liberty and ordered dignity, amidst all my sad certainties that in *that* form a better age of the Church of God was not to be looked for.

The thought is certainly uplifting, hallowing, inspiring—a Christendom actuated all over by the spirit of the Great Prayer and manifesting its inner unity by outward harmony. But then it is evident, as we weigh the words of the Intercessor, that the unity of order, the coherence of amalgamation or federation in the sphere of ministry and government, was certainly not in the foreground of His view. The language could hardly direct us more decisively to the region of the spiritual, to the unity which means a fellowship of souls at once animated and held together by a common life born, in each and all, "of the Spirit," and whose sphere is union of spirit with the Father and the Son. What can be "the glory which Thou gavest Me and which I have given them," but that mysterious and blissful *sonship* which goes immeasurably deeper than the sonship by creation, or the sonship by sacramental rite, and means nothing short of the actual new life of holy and serving love lived in the adored and trusted Son of God Himself? That results in a *family likeness* transcending all ecclesiastical delimitations. And I do not think it too much to say that, in order to make the world savingly aware that the Father has sent the Son for its salvation, the supreme means, infinitely more powerful than any community of order, would be a vast multiplication of those family likenesses in all the provinces, all the fragments, of Christendom to-day.

That spiritual development would most surely work (as nothing

else would) for a harmony great and precious in the externals of Christianity, in its methods of ministering and labour. But it would be the way to such harmony, not the harmony the way to the "oneness." And that sort of oneness, moral and spiritual, is that which would make the world pause, and look, and listen, and believe.

So let us humbly attach our prayers to the Great Prayer of the Intercessor. The grand prerequisite to a regenerated world is a regenerated Church. We will pray that, before the æon ends, the Eternal Spirit may so move in our broken Christendom that Christians, for the world's mercy, may spiritually coalesce in the life of the Family of God.

HANDLEY DUNELM.

(*To be concluded.*)

STUDIES IN TEXTS.

Suggestions for Sermons from Current Literature.

By the Rev. Harrington C. Lees, M.A.

XI. THE WORKINGS OF PROVIDENCE.

Text.—"This is the Finger of God." Exodus viii. 19.

[Book of the Month: "From the Garden of Eden to the Crossing of Jordan," by Sir William Willcocks.[1]=W. Other reff. Hastings' Dict. Bible.=HDB. Naville's "Archaeology and the Bible."=B. "Flinders Petrie's Egypt and Israel."=P. Brugsch's "Egypt under the Pharaohs."=E.]

God's voice is often not listened to, because men regard it as simply the echo of the sounds of nature. Men expect the "Finger of God" to be as plain as the hand that wrote upon the plaster in Belshazzar's palace (Dan. v. 5). Christ Himself called the Holy Spirit the Finger of God (cp. St. Luke xi. 20. St. Matt. xii. 28). Once before in these notes we studied Professor Naville's interpretation of the "finger of God" in Exodus xxxii. 16, xxxi. 18, as the "sacred script." This month Sir William Willcocks' book offers some hints on Providence and Miracle. We trace the Exodus on its human side to four causes, and suggest the way in which the hand of God, nevertheless, was at work unseen. Miracle is not always merely the marvel of an occurrence, but the timing of it.

1. The Spiritual Uplifting of the Heart of Moses.—This came from the unfolding of the name and character of the God he had already learned something of from his mother. The name Jehovah and its meaning came to him in the desert, at the burning bush, in contrast with "the worship of Egypt's bleating gods" (W. 55). "To Moses the discovery of this name, known to Abraham, as we can see in Genesis, was a revelation indeed; in its strength he hurried from Horeb to the court of Pharaoh. A weak and diffident man had been changed into a real hero" (W. 56). This is God's finger.

2. The Determination created by Hardship in the Israelites.—"Israel was chafing and restive under its long bondage. The taskmasters were severe but not absolutely unreasonable

[1] Published by E. & F. N. Spon, 57 Haymarket, 5*s*. A series of connected notes by the distinguished engineer. Interesting, suggestive, sensible: will not satisfy all, but worth studying.

in their so-called demand for bricks without straw, as the records have represented. I have picked out of old ruins in the Delta scores of bricks which contained nothing but straw daubed round with mud. These had undoubtedly been made by captives who were contemplating revolt. The taskmasters had furnished a sufficiency of straw for a certain tale of bricks. The captives had hurriedly wasted the straw and delivered a totally inadequate number of bricks. They were beaten and forced to collect stubble and complete their tasks. Captives who acted in this way had begun to feel that they were not utterly helpless" (W. 56). Naville bears out the same thought. Egypt was exasperating her dangerous settlers. Much lies hidden "in the words 'which knew not Joseph.' In Egyptian 'ignore' (khem) has often a hostile sense" (N. 90). "Evidently the persecution consisted in a complete change in their way of living. Instead of the easy-going life of cattle-drivers, they were to become bricklayers, builders, navvies, condemned to a labour unknown to them, and which clashed with all their traditions and their abilities" (N. 91). "One can understand that kind of life being very distasteful to shepherds. They do not know what real work is" (N. 92). Then also "a shepherd would resent having a taskmaster who is absolutely necessary to workmen" (N. 92). "Straw was mixed with the clay to increase its adhesive quality. Naville says that some of the corners of some of the buildings at Pithom were actually built of *bricks without straw*" (B. 36). "Finely chopped straw is very useful to dip the hand in to prevent mud sticking to it, and to coat each lump of mud before dropping it in the mould, so as to prevent it sticking. Hence without straw the work would be slower and more difficult" (P. 33). So we see a distinctly confident tone in the mutineers. Little touches in the story prove it. "The Israelites went up out of Egypt harnessed or carrying arms. Moses went out with a high hand. They borrowed from the Egyptians and at the same time spoiled them. This has always appeared to me a plundering of the Egyptians grimly described as payment for years of work without remuneration" (W. 56). This popular movement too was God's finger.

3. The Weak Internal Power of Pharaoh's Throne. "The change of king had given the Israelites some hope" (N. 94). "Moses was nearly a match for Pharaoh" (W. 56). "The very long reign of Rameses II (Ex. i. 8) was the beginning of decay for the Egyptian

empire" (N. 94). "There were enemies in the immediate neighbourhood, sufficiently strong to be able to invade some day the Valley of the Nile" (N. 96). "Also the cities Pithom and Raamses were at the same time fortresses" (N. 97). "They guarded the southern road from Palestine and were a very effective protection. No wonder that Pharaoh used the native population settled in the valley. It was natural, however, that the Hebrews should resent the treatment" (N. 98). "This king must have had to endure serious disturbances of all kinds during his reign:—in the west the Libyans, in the east the Hebrews, and in the south a spirit of rebellion" (EP. 309). This too was the finger of God.

4. THE OCCURRENCE OF A SERIES OF NATIONAL DISASTERS.—"There was no necessity for miracle upon miracle. One very low flood in the field of Zoan, with all that it involved, secured the deliverance of the captives, whose afflictions God had seen. Heaven exercises as much economy in the use of its resources as the best-regulated household in this world" (W. 66). "In some of the series, and possibly in all, it is to be noted that the Divine power used the ordinary seasonal phenomena in a miraculously intensified form as the instrument of judgment" (HDB. 892). "The ten plagues, with the exception of the eighth and the ninth, could only have followed one another on the north-east of Lower Egypt, described as the field of Zoan. The first and second plagues, which the magicians are said to have imitated, were not infrequent, while the others only accompanied extraordinarily low Niles, which might have come once in a century or in a succession of centuries" (W. 57). "I shall not dwell on the ten plagues, which in a weaker degree, can many of them be found in Egypt at the present day" (B. 100). Stagnant Nile (August), Frogs avoiding bad water (August), Sand-Flies (September), Flies (October,) Murrain of Cattle (November), Boils (December), Hail (January), Locusts (February), Darkness (March), Infant Mortality (April). For details see W. pp. 60–66. This is the finger of God.

God meant His people to be released. His Holy Spirit worked through the currents of popular happenings. The personal inspiration of Moses, the culminating discontent of the people, the insecurity of the throne, and a disastrous season, and "God within the shadow, keeping watch above His own." This is Providence. This is really Miracle. This is ground for a faith unshakable.

THE SOURCE THEORY AND ITS DUPLICATE NARRATIVES.

By the Rev. F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock, D.D., Rector of Kinnity, Ireland.

THE Higher Critics of the Old Testament lay great stress upon the differences, contradictions and impossibilities they assert they have discovered in the Scriptures. Driver in his *Introduction* (p. 149 and elsewhere) speaks of the "phraseological variations," "the many and cogent indications which the different codes of the Pentateuch contain, that they took shape at different periods of history," "the very great difficulties which both the historical and legal parts of Deuteronomy present," etc., etc.

When considering these alleged "phraseological variations," one fact must be taken into account—the difference of age. According to the dates assigned to the sources J E D and P by Wellhausen and Driver this work, including its complicated compilations and ingenious inventions, was spread over at least 500 years. The earliest of them was J and E, "two narratives of the patriarchal and Mosaic ages, independent, yet largely resembling each other" (Driver, *Introduction*, p. 116). J is the work of a writer in the Southern Kingdom about 850 B.C.; E the work of a writer in the Northern Kingdom about 750 B.C. The first is about one thousand years after Abraham's time, five hundred years after Moses. These writers gave the popular conception of the patriarchal and Mosaic age. Their works were in existence for some 500 years when P was compiled. P's aim was to give "a systematic view, from a priestly standpoint, of the origin and chief institutions of the Israelitish theocracy" (Driver, p. 118). There were many compilers of P, but P in its complete form is post-exilic (Driver, p. 146). P, then, was completed at least a thousand years after Moses and the Exodus. In the meantime, D, or Deuteronomy, was written, "not later than the reign of Manasseh, prior to the 19th year of Josiah" (621 B.C.) (see Driver, p. 82), six or seven hundred years after Moses. Now let us disregard for a moment the many centuries that separated these works from the events and persons they describe, and consider only the time over which their own

composition was spread—500 years. During that 500 years this wonderful literature was created. It professedly relates events and institutions that reach back to the Exodus at least. Accordingly, on their own showing, it must represent the history of 1,000 years. During that time, no doubt, discrepancies did arise in the records, principally due to the work of copying and the transcription into newer forms of Hebrew letters, etc. This was only to be expected. At the same time we have in the Pentateuch, on the whole, a vivid, dramatic, progressive, and connected history of law and social, national, and religious life. Throughout the Pentateuch Aaron is represented as the brother of Moses and Joshua as his successor. The narratives in their broad lines and principles are consistent.

Now let us look at the history of J E P D. P is placed last in the order of time by Driver. But he tells us that "formerly this was assumed tacitly to be the earliest of the Pentateuchal sources; and there are still scholars who assign at least the main stock of it to 9–8 century B.C." (p. 128). De Wette in 1805 declared that Deuteronomy was the most recent stratum of the Pentateuch—not, as had been previously supposed, the eldest.[1] On De Wette's work was founded the theory that "the Elohist had written the 'Grundschrift' or primary narrative that lay before the Jehovist."[2] Accordingly, the first order was D P J E; the second order was P E J D. Then Graf in 1866 suggested that the priestly code was the latest, and gave the new order, J E D P, which has been followed, more or less, for the last fifty years. And during the hundred years of its existence this theory has passed through many vicissitudes—more vicissitudes than have taken place with regard to the Pentateuch or Hexateuch itself during the 2,600 years before they set to work upon it. Its principal dates and the order of its strata have been changed over and over again, and it is very certain that it will see more changes yet, as no scholar is satisfied unless he makes some new discovery. Dr. Kennett in 1906 proposed the theory that D, which other Higher Critics assigned to Josiah's reign, is exilic in date, about 520 B.C.[3] It is very likely that D

[1] Wellhausen art. "Pentateuch," *Enc. Brit.*

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] See a criticism of this view by the late Dr. Henry Redpath in the *Churchman* (Feb. 1907). Dr. Kennett argues against the Josian date of Deuteronomy, and incidentally throws us back on the traditional date of this book.

will take its place behind P soon, and we shall have the order J E P D. As these dates in the case of J E D P represent principles of criticism, the alteration of the order represents a reversal of principles. We can affirm, therefore, that, while the broad lines and principles of the Pentateuch or Hexateuch have not been altered by any internal or external evidence, this cannot be said of the theory that has attempted to analyse it into fictitious parts. And with regard to details of criticism, a glance at the myriad conflicting suggestions and divergent theories put forward by scholars of every country about the various events, laws, personages, etc., mentioned in this volume and recorded in the *Encyclopædia Biblica* will prove that hardly one Higher Critic is satisfied with the work of another. It is a case of "quot homines tot sententiae," every man being a law to himself. It was only to be expected that there would be no harmony or consistency in this work of the Higher Critics—that is, in J E D P. It was originally based on a very precarious foundation, the different appellations of Deity, Elohim, Jehovah (Yahweh), and Jehovah Elohim, in the books concerned. The Jews always avoided, and still avoid, using their sacred Tetragrammaton (J H V H). See a learned essay by the late Dr. Abbott on the pre-Massoretic text,[1] and the various means the Massoretic scribes employed to avoid using the name Jehovah. In two hundred places the Septuagint translators of the Hebrew Pentateuch into Greek wrote down a different appellation of Deity from that in the Massoretic text, on which the Higher Critics work.

The Higher Critics of the Pentateuch have now been working for say 100 years. They have already exhibited a great variety of principles and details—a regular "labyrinth of fanciful theories and a chaos of clashing opinions." In what condition of perplexity, self-contradiction and confusion will J E D P be in 500 years? Even at present we are asked to discard our Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, and Joshua, not in favour of J E D P, for none of these elements are "simple" or "homogeneous," according to the Critics. We have to take into account the various redactors or editors, who combined J and E, and edited P and D. Accordingly, we have at least three sources

One of the "assured results" of this school, namely that Deuteronomy belongs to Josiah's reign, is rejected now by one of their leaders.

[1] *Essays chiefly on the Original Texts of the Old and New Testaments.*

in J, at least three in E and P, and at least two in D, and a number of editors (R).[1] So the correct formula we have to accept at present is :—

J1 J2 J3 E1 E2 E3 P1 P2 P3 D1 D2 R1 R2 R3 !

We wonder what this interesting formula will become in the course of another century. Perhaps by that time this critical hypothesis will be completely exploded. Much is to be expected from the spade. Already archæological finds in Egypt, Palestine, and Assyria have established the historical character of the books in question.

The Rev. Johannes Dahse in his article, " Is a Revolution in Penteuchal Criticism at Hand," translated by Rev. E. McClure, stated that " this source theory has more tender spots than is supposed. The first of these is the assumption that the names for God as we see them in the existing Hebrew text were also to be found in the copy which the last alleged Redactor of the Hexateuch had arranged." He refers to an article he published in the *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, in which he had pointed out that Swete's edition of the Septuagint furnished in the books Genesis to Numbers alone 180 departures from the existing Hebrew text in the use of names for God. He says, " The number of departures which I noted in 1903, of the Septuagint and its recensions from the existing Hebrew, has been considerably increased by my use of the great edition of the Septuagint edited by Holmes and Brooke-Maclean. So numerous are the indications of revisions of the names of God that in future no investigator who employs the oldest texts would dare to make use of the names of God as a means of distinguishing the sources of the documents " (p. 11). Dr. Toy, the editor of the Book of Proverbs in the *International Critical Commentary*, agreed that " the Septuagint and other ancient versions differ considerably from the received Hebrew text (the Massoretic) in the use of Divine names." He says, " The Septuagint translators, it is commonly supposed, followed the Hebrew text faithfully, and this text is equally authoritative with the Massoretic (in both cases internal evidence must decide the value of readings). . . . As is well known, critics generally hold that our Hebrews text has suffered greatly

[1] R^{JE} is the Redactor who combined J and E. R^{P} the Redactor who combined J E D and P. Then there is the Deuteronomist Redactor R^{D}, and a number of others.

from scribes and editors in the process of translation. It is agreed that Divine names have been changed in Chronicles, Psalms, and elsewhere—why not in the Pentateuch?" (*Christian Register*, April 28, 1910). Dahse quotes Dr. H. P. Smith (editor of Samuel in the *Int. Crit. Com.*) as saying that "the works of Eerdmans, Schlögl and Wiener necessitate a careful re-examination of the whole field of textual and literary criticism" (p. 14).

One might add that another critical test of sources is equally uncertain—the names of the third Patriarch, Jacob and Israel. Driver says, "J has a preference for the name Israel and E for Jacob" (*Introduction*, p. 17). This distinction, Professor König states, is still to be regarded as an "undeniably distinctive mark of the documentary sources." If this holds good, what explanation is to be given of the fact that in the E passage, Genesis xlv.–xlvi. 5, Israel occurs three times; that in the E passage, Genesis xlviii. 26, xi. 21, Israel occurs three times; that Jacob occurs in the J passage, Genesis xxxvii. 34; that in the E passage, Genesis xxxv. 5, the LXX has Israel, while it has Israel in the J passage, Genesis xxxvii. 3; and in the E passage, Genesis xlii. 5, both Hebrew and LXX have Israel; and that the name Jacob is inserted by the LXX in xlvi. 8, xlviii. 1, xxxv. 16, and Israel in xxxv. 5, an E passage. These divergencies in the LXX and the failure of the test in other passages prove its unreliable nature. The use of these names seem patent of another explanation, Israel being sometimes used in a grander sense, e.g. in Genesis xlviii. 14; and sometimes as purely alternative, e.g. in Genesis xlviii., where we have Jacob—Israel, Jacob—Israel, Jacob—Israel. One is not supprised that the critics have differed so much about the sources to which these names should be referred. De Wette regarded Israel as the peculiarity of the first Elohist. Hupfield treated Jacob as the feature of that work; Ilgen regarded Israel as the characteristic of the second Elohist, and Jacob of the Yahvist and the first Elohist (J and E). See Dahse's pamphlet. A brief review of the *Duplicate Narratives* will show how these tests have been employed.

As regards the "duplicate narratives" in Genesis, of which too much has been made, it is not at all proved that there are two documents of the same event, by different writers, patched together by a later editor. It is quite possible that they are accounts of similar events which may not be identical. Dr. Driver mentions

six instances of such double records. The second account of the Creation concerns the immediate environment of man, and has naturally a greater human interest, and is described in a more flowing narrative than the brief summary of the creation of the universe in c. I. Much is made of the omission of the verb *bara'*, to create, and *toldoth*, "generations." But these words occur in ii. 4, and it is an artificial division of the same verse that cuts them out of the second account. Besides, the Hebrew words to create and form occur side by side in Amos iv. 13, "He that formeth (*yotser*) the heavens and createth (*bore'*) the wind." If we are to follow the Higher Critics, we must assign the first part of this saying to J and the second to P. The Critics build upon the fact that "beasts of the earth" occurs in Genesis i. and "beasts of the field" in Genesis ii. The first is assigned to P and the second to J. Now in Job v. 22, 23, we have the two expressions: "Neither shalt thou be afraid of the beasts of the earth. . . . And the beasts of the field shall be at peace with thee." Does not the first belong to P and the second to J? Are not the words in Job a commentary upon the story of the Creation? "The beasts of the field" are the beasts within the sphere and range of human life. The difference too of the appellation of God does not prove a difference of source. "It is true," admitted Driver,[1] that Elohim (God) and Yahweh (Jehovah, 'Lord') represent the Divine nature under different aspects, viz. as the God of nature and the God of revelation respectively." This distinction of name is in keeping with what has been already said, that in the first chapter the great principles of the creation of the vast universe are stated; in the second the creation of human surroundings and human life is described in fuller detail. That name of God which suggests most His relation to human life is appropriate here. Is not the table of contents, or the summary of contents, or the preface in which the argument of any book is summed up, always in a balder, briefer style than the ensuing narrative? Does this prove difference of authorship? The name Jehovah—the Covenant name of God—is also used as distinguished from Elohim (God) in narratives about the chosen people of God, e.g. in passages where Abraham's wife was concerned, Genesis xii. 17, xx. 18. But it is Elohim (God) Who appeared to Abimelech. In Genesis xxvi. it is Jehovah Who

[1] *Book of Genesis*, xi., note.

appears to Isaac. Elohim is used through nearly all the Egyptian history in Genesis, but in c. xxxix., where the story of Joseph is given, Jehovah occurs eight times, and Elohim only once where Joseph speaks to one outside the covenant about "sin against God" (xxxix. 9).

Again, with regard to the name Isaac, of which Driver said there were three explanations given, there are, indeed, three references, containing different details, to his birth, but there is only one passage (Gen. xvii. 19) in which the name Isaac is connected with laughter. With regard to the two explanations of Bethel, it is to be noted that "Jacob's second visit is but the complement of the first, fulfilling its conditions" (Gen. xxviii. 22). Why should not Jacob when he was strong and prosperous confirm the oath and covenant he had made when a poor fugitive from his own home? Does this second act prove the existence of a different author, or of an author who was human?

As the narrative of the Flood is considered the masterpiece of the Higher Criticism, one might examine it first. In Genesis i. and ii. the compiler is said to have kept his sources distinct, but he is said to have woven together P and J here into a single narrative (Driver, *Genesis*, p. 85). The critic divides this narrative in the following manner: vi. 5–8 (J); vi. 9–13 (P); vi. 17–22 (P); vii. 1–5 (J); vii. 6, 11, 13–16a, 17a (P); vii. 7–10, 12, 16b, 22, 23 (J); viii. 2b–3a, 6–12, 13b, 20–22 (J), the rest of viii. (P). First note that these allocations are made according to the Divine appellations, J having Jehovah (Yahweh), and P, Elohim. Now the LXX versions of this narrative has different names in eleven places from the Massoretic Hebrew text. The LXX is regarded by critics [1] as "our oldest authority for the text of the Old Testament." We are, therefore, justified in appealing to it. In vi. 5, the Hebrew has "Lord," the LXX "Lord God," the Vulg. "God." In vi. 8 the Hebrew has "Lord," the LXX "Lord God." This is a J passage. In its supposed duplicate vi. 9–13, the LXX has "Lord God" in vv. 12 and 13, where the Hebrew has "God." In vii. 1–5, a J passage, the LXX has "Lord God" in vv. 1 and 5. The Samaritan has "God" in v. 1. In vi. 17–22, P, its supposed duplicate, "God" occurs once in the Hebrew (v. 22), where the LXX reads "Lord God." The critics assign vii. 9 "as God commanded Noah"

[1] Chapman, *Introduction to the Pentateuch*, p. 273.

to J in spite of the Hebrew "God" (so LXX). Driver mentions that "the Sam., Targ., Vulg. have *Jehovah* no doubt rightly" (*Genesis*, p. 90). He recognizes the possibility of the Massoretic text, upon which his theory is built, being wrong. If the same principle be extended to the above passage, it will show that the Hebrew text was wrong and the LXX right in many places.

Again, the duplicate passages are not duplicates at all. When read side by side, the various accounts are in regular sequence, e.g. v. 8 (J) is logically followed by v. 9 (P). V. 8 says that "Noah found grace in the eyes of the Lord" ("Lord God" LXX). V. 9 tells us why. He was a righteous man, perfect, and walked with God. Vi. 5–8 (J) says the "Lord" ("Lord God" LXX, "God" Vulg.) saw the wickedness of *man*, repented of having made *man*, said, "I will blot out the man (Adam) from the face of the ground (adamah), and then used a phrase, "beast, creeping thing, and fowl of the air," closely resembling i. 26, a P passage, and concludes with Noah finding favour with the Lord ("Lord God" LXX). This is followed by a passage (assigned to P) which explains why Noah found such favour, gives the names of his sons, says the earth (not merely man) was corrupt, and that God ("Lord God" LXX) seeing this informed Noah of His purpose to destroy all flesh *with the earth*. These passages are not duplicates. The latter explains and expands the former. Again, vi. 17–22 (P), following the order to make the ark, contains the announcement of the flood, the promise of the covenant with Noah and his sons, and the order to bring in "two of every sort" and "food for thee and them." In vii. 1–8 (J) we have the order to enter the ark now completed, to bring in seven pairs of the clean and one pair of the unclean animals, and the announcement that the flood is coming in seven days. The latter passage is not a repetition, but an amplification of the former. The chief reason why vii. 1–5 is assigned to J is that "P omits designedly" (Chapman, *Introduction*, 80) "all reference to clean and unclean before the Sinaitic legislation"! In vii. 7–10 (J) we have five P peculiarities and only two J features, and yet the passage is assigned to J in spite of the fact that the Hebrew text has "God." Again, in the narrative called P we jump from vii. 6 to vii. 11, from the 600th year of Noah to the 600th year, 2nd month and 17th day without any explanation as to how the interval was spent. This is, however, given by J in verses 7–10.

P says nothing about closing the ark. This is mentioned in J (v. 16b). Can these passages which dovetail so into one another and supplement each other be called "duplicate"? The theory requires it to be so, of course; but the facts certainly do not.

Driver argues that in P the waters prevail for 150 days, remaining on the earth one year and eleven days (vii. 11 comp. with viii. 14), while in J the entire duration of the flood is sixty-one days (*Genesis*, p. 85). This result is obtained by assigning all the dates to P, and only the numbers forty and seven (three times) to J. This is arbitrary, and even so there is a gap of at least ninety days between the first day of the tenth month (viii. 5) and the first day of the first month (viii. 13) in P, which can only be explained by the intervening passage assigned to J, which says that Noah waited forty days before sending out the raven, and that after two periods of seven days the dove returned with an olive leaf. At least three more days would be required for the waters to subside from the top of the olive tree to the surface of the ground. Thus J fills up the gap of ninety days in P. The passages are to be read, therefore, consecutively, not as duplicates. It is also to be observed that there is a rhythmical and corresponding order in the manner in which the waters rise and fall. The waters increase and float the ark (vii. 17b, J.). The waters prevail and increase greatly (vii. 18, P); the ark moves on the waters; the waters prevail exceedingly and the high mountains are covered (vii. 19, P). These stages of increase are followed by corresponding stages of decrease. The waters return continually (J). The waters decrease so that the ark can rest (P), and then the mountain tops are uncovered (P). Does not the literary climax prove that critical analysis wrong? It is not chance but design that produces such artistic effects.

Indirect external evidence in favour of the unity of the narrative in Genesis is borne by the Babylonian account which Strack[1] says is "not merely parallel to the passages ascribed to P and J, but also to the whole narrative contained in Genesis." We also must take into account the fact that vii. 23 contains an expression which Driver[2] said "as it stands, is unexampled, being a combination of the phrase of J (ii. 7) with that of P (vi. 17, vii. 15)." It is "the breath of the spirit of life"; "the breath of life" being a J, and

[1] *Kurzgefasster Commentar zur Genesis.* [2] *Genesis*, p. 92.

" the spirit of life " being a P phrase. He said the word " spirit " is here " probably a marginal gloss," for he saw that its presence conflicted with his analytical theory. This treatment of obstacles to " the theory " recalls the artificial separation of Genesis ii. 4a from 4b in order to keep the words *bara'* (create) and *toldoth* (generations) out of the J narrative that follows, which causes the J extract to begin in Hebrew with an adverbial clause, " in the day the Lord made," hanging, so to speak, " in the air," and the LXX to begin with a relative pronoun, " on which day, etc."—literary solecisms.

With regard to these extracts, Genesis i.–ii. 4a (P) and Genesis ii. 4b–iii. 24 (J), Driver described the former as " stereotyped, measured, precise," and shows " clear marks of study," the latter as " fresh, spontaneous, and at least in a relative sense primitive."[1] The first chapter has often been quoted as an example of the sublime. There is a dignity and a simplicity about it rarely equalled. Is not such the suitable style for the preordium of the epic of creation? The " recurring formulae[2] which Driver disliked are needed to indicate the stages in the great process of the developing creation. They are absent from the second chapter because not required. But here there is more to interest humanity, and the style is more human. The omission of such words as " kind," " swarm," " creep " from the second chapter, where they are not needed, is no greater proof of c. ii. 4b–iii. 24 being a different extract and a duplicate than the omission of " firmament " which occurs six times in c. i. It is also to be noted that in this extract from J the LXX has " Lord God " four times, and " God " eight times, the Hebrew having " Lord God " throughout. This proves that no argument can be built upon the Divine appellations on these chapters as the LXX is allowed by the critics to represent an older text than the Massoretic. Driver[3] also urged that there is " a difference of representation " between c. i. and c. ii, e.g. " the earth instead of emerging from the waters (as in i. 9) is represented as being at first dry (ii. 5), too dry in fact to support vegetation." It is difficult to find this idea in ii. 5. The lack of vegetation is represented as due to want of rain. In i. 9, 10, the earth is called " dry land " (*yabashah*). Again, he said,[4] " in ii. 4b ff. the order of creation is 1, man (v. 7); 2, vegetation (v. 9 cf. v. 5); 3, animals (v. 19); 4, woman (v. 21 f.)."

[1] *Genesis*, p. 35.
[2] *Ibid.*
[3] *Genesis*, p. 35.
[4] *Introduction*, p. 8.

Vegetation is not, however, represented as created after man, for vv. 8, 9, " refer only to the planting of the garden, and the making of every tree " pleasant to the sight and good for food " to sprout from the ground therein. Vv. 5 and 6 imply that, as a result of the mist, plants and herbs sprang up. The creation of man is related in the next verse. The main interest in c. ii. is the creation of man and woman. It is impossible to argue with Driver from ii. 19 that animals were created after man. Driver here says the rend " *had* formed " is against idiom, but in his *Hebrew Tenses*, p. 76, he said, " It is a moot and delicate question how far the imperfect verb with *V'ya* denotes a pluperfect." It would be, therefore, according to Driver, a difficult matter to decide whether the rend. " had formed " was against idiom. The stress of the passage is not on the creation, but the naming of the animals.

As to the argument that " in ii. 4b ff. the conception of God is much more anthropomorphic than it is in c. i.,[1] we answer that the list of actions ascribed in the former portion, e.g. " plants," " places," " builds," " walks," " makes," etc., attributed to J are not more anthropomorphic than the " said," " divides," " makes," " forms " of c. i. assigned to P. I. 26, " Let us make man after our image " (*tselem*) taken in conjunction with the other P, passage v. 3, " Adam begat a son in his own likeness after his image " (*tselem*), appears to be equally anthropomorphic as anything in c. ii.—arguing from Driver's premisses, as the word *tselem* has a materialistic sense in other places.[2] The present writer does not take Genesis i. 26 in a materialistic sense, but mentions it as a clear instance of the self-destructiveness of Driver's own argument. The subsequent anthropomorphisms of J [3] may surely be due to the writer's conception of the nearer relation of Jehovah, the covenant God, with man.

We have finally to deal with Driver's assertion, made also by all the Higher Critics, that the name Jehovah (Yahweh) " was not known till the age of Moses." [4] In Genesis xvii. 1–2, " the Lord (Jehovah) appeared unto Abraham and said, I am God Almighty (*El Shaddai*). In Exodus vi. 3, God (Elohim) said to Moses, " I am the Lord " (Jehovah). Both passages are assigned to P, who should have avoided the name Jehovah, as he must have known it was not in use until Moses' day (!). Therefore it is suggested

[1] *Genesis*, p. 35.
[2] E.g. 2 Kings xi. 18.
[3] Driver's *Genesis*, p. 36.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 185.

that in the Genesis passage Jehovah was "accidentally substituted" for God, but the LXX has *Kurios* (Lord) and the alternations. "The Lord said, I am God" and "God said, I am the Lord," seem deliberate. The phrase, "by my name Jehovah I was not known unto them" (Ex. vi. 3) cannot mean, of necessity, that the patriarchs had never heard of the name Jehovah, and never used it, although they were more familiar with the title *El Shaddai*. The word "know" is ambiguous, meaning both mere acquaintance and realization or full understanding, e.g. John viii. 55, "Whom ye say He is your God, yet ye have not known Him" (ἐγνώκατε); John xiv. 9, "Have I been so long time with you and yet hast thou not known me, Philip?" (ἔγνωκας); John xx. 9, "for as yet they know not (ᾔδεισαν) the scripture that He must rise from the dead." There can be no doubt that the Jews knew something of God, that Philip was acquainted with Christ and His disciples with the scripture the Lord had quoted; but the point in Exodus is that there was not hitherto sufficiently full understanding or realization of the meaning of the name Jehovah. It is apparent then that the Higher Critical theory is largely built upon a verbal ambiguity,

F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK, D.D.

THE MUSIC OF THE CHURCH.

By Albert Mitchell, Member of House of Laymen for Province of Canterbury.

THE Report of the Archbishop's Second Commission of Inquiry (on the Public Worship of the Church) contained a chapter devoted to "Church Music," which had to be passed over in treatment of the rest of the Report on March last. But the subject is of too much importance to be ignored; and it will not suffer by having separate treatment.

It appears from the Report that a large number of the replies received by the Archbishop's Committee to their inquiries related to the use of music. And the Committee are of opinion that "much confusion prevails" upon the subject.

I

The Committee lay down a principle that "No treatment of the question of Church Music will be of the slightest use unless it accepts . . . as fundamental the 'distinction between' music in which the part of the congregation is only to listen" and "music in which the congregation should be expected to take a vocal part."

Perhaps this may be so, but to an old-fashioned churchman the suggestion that any music in the Church services is simply to be listened to is sufficiently startling to suggest a doubt as to whether the Committee have faced the previous question of the function of Music in Church, or have themselves succeeded in escaping from the "confusion" to which they refer. If music is worship, then it is addressed to God; if music is addressed to the congregation, then it is not worship. It cannot seriously be suggested that the congregation is to "listen" to worship by the choir. Yet it is difficult to escape from the feeling that throughout that part of the Report which is headed "*Music in which the congregation takes part by listening only*," the writers are hampered by an unwillingness to admit, even to themselves, that the real purpose of much of the music of this class is not worship at all, but the giving of pleasure to the congregation or the singers, or at least some of them. Is this right or wrong? If it is right, then all talk of the congregation "taking

part by listening" is unnecessary; if it is wrong, then such talk is puerile. If on the other hand such music is an act of worship, or praise to God, then the part of the congregation is very much more than mere listening. But then, such a conception straightway rules out the greater part of the musical actions sought to be included under this head. The Committee suggest that great musical works should be produced at special services, not at those in the regular course, and that choral societies should be formed to help. This is admirable, and there is no doubt that such musical work would be of tremendous value to the Church on its social side and would be a valuable training ground, the results of which would be felt in time in the worship of the Church. Only—it is not itself worship. Let us once get clear in our minds the distinction between music used for the edification and the pleasure of the singers, and those who are to listen to them; and music deliberately offered as a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving to God; and then it is quite easy to see when and where the place of each falls. But "confusion" will continue so long as musicians and music lovers persist in pretending that they are offering service to God when they are simply "enjoying themselves." We do not pretend that we are worshipping if we sit through the whole of "The Messiah" at the Handel Festival. Why should we call it worship when we sit through "Selections from St. Paul" in St. Paul's Cathedral, on the Festival of the Conversion of St. Paul? On the other hand we may quite well be worshipping when we stand reverently while the Cathedral choir sings "Unto us a Child is Born" on Christmas Day; but, if so, we are doing something more than listening. Subject to these protests, we can heartily concur in the Committee's plea for a higher standard in the use of such music at special gatherings or festivals; but we object to such gatherings being treated as Church services, or made a substitute for direct worship.

II.

We pass with pleasure to the second part of the Report, "*Congregational music, in which the congregation takes an active part.*" The Committee definitely take their stand in favour of the "splendid tunes of healthier type" than the "prevailing type of music represented by the names Barnby and Dykes," although they admit that the latter is not "all bad." But they note "that the number

of well-known tunes and the range of musical knowledge of congregations are rapidly contracting," and "it becomes increasingly difficult to find hymn tunes which an average congregation will know." We wonder how much of this is due to the crowding out of home hymn-singing, at family worship, and on Sunday evenings! May it not be that the decay of family worship has not a little to do with the growing "tameness" of public worship? After all, there must be some answering sympathy between the home and the Church, if there is to be life at Church. One of the surest and truest methods of bringing new life into Church music would be to encourage the people to practise chants and tunes at home. But this requires, first, that the people should be guided and encouraged to provide themselves with chant books and tune books; secondly, that organists and choirmasters should resist the mischeivous temptation to take their chants and tunes from other books than those that are in the hands of the people; and, thirdly, that the reference to the chants and tunes should be as carefully announced and advertised as the numbers of the psalms and hymns. When we consider the contemptuous indifference shown towards the congregations in the matter of helping them to follow the music, the wonder is that our Church music is not worse than it is. The new movement to revive family worship should certainly take cognizance of the value of family praise.

The Committee recommend congregational "hymn sing-songs" of the army type. That is worth thinking about; but the parson must not be too much in evidence. Get the right conductor, and leave him in control. The clergyman will be best occupied in singing somewhere in a back row. Such "sing-songs" (but with a more permanently respectable name) should be worked with a double aim: to assist family praise as well as Church praise. A judicious and tactful conductor will easily manage that by suggesting "Try that over again at home before next week." The Committee are quite right in suggesting that there is no difficulty in using such gatherings to teach new tunes of a higher standard and quality. Anyone with a decent voice, and some love of music, will soon under expert guidance learn to appreciate a good tune. It is often to be remarked that the congregation catches on to a new tune more quickly than the choir. We are inclined to regard this idea of the Committee as one of the most valuable parts of the chapter.

III.

The Report then passes to the question of the position of the organist, which it suggests to be at present in a very unsatisfactory state. "In many places he is an untrained musician with a taste for music, who takes an organist's place on general principles of philanthropy or as a private hobby. Such a man is very often quite unfitted to guide the musical policy of a church. But the Committee urge that where the place is filled by a trained musician, he is "much more likely to deal rightly with the problem of Church music than the clergyman, unless he also is a trained musician." They suggest (surely the hand of the writer is evident!) that the clergy "without any adequate knowledge" are much worse than "incompetent organists." Of course, to the onlooker it is evident that there is a previous question. What is the relation, as regards spiritual sympathy, of parson, people, and organist. There are points of principle that emerge. The Committee lack the courage, or the will, to say what an Evangelical critic must say. In no matter more than that of Church music is it of greater importance to apply the principle "Spiritual men for Spiritual work." Better a devout, Evangelical, second-class organist than a non-spiritual genius. But get the Evangelical genius if you can.

The next point taken is the value and present state of choirs. The Committee manifest an uneasy feeling that growth of congregational effectiveness in musical matters might throw choirs out of work! But they deprecate such a trend; and think that "a choir of men and boys properly trained and looked after by clergymen and organists" (and, of course, "surpliced"!) is "an instrument which ought not to be neglected or hastily thrown aside": but here it leaves the matter in somewhat indeterminate condition with a reiteration that "The cure for present inefficiency seems to the Committee to lie rather in the quickening of the musical energies of the congregation." The fact of course is that discipline and reverence are the first requisites for a good choir; and these qualities do not seem to be promoted by the position of privileged isolation in the chancel. Perhaps if the choir were taught to regard themselves as belonging to the congregation, the difficulty might be surmounted. And if the choir were large enough to admit of half the members taking their turn

to sit in the ordinary seats there would be some gain. But no true music lover will dispute the value of a good choir; and if a definition of a good choir is wanted we will cite the organist of Westminster Abbey (Mr. S. H. Nicholson, *Church Music*, Faith Press, p. 50). "With the best choirs and organists . . . their aim lies not so much in the direction of performing a great deal of music, as of concentrating their attention on doing a little very well. . . . A choir can find all its legitimate aspirations realized in the effort to give a perfect rendering of simple things; and the truest criterion of a good choir is not how it sings an anthem, but how it sings the psalms, and the plain parts of the service which are repeated every Sunday."

The Report goes on to recommend a Church Music Committee, of office holders and elected members, to secure to the congregation "more practical control of and responsibility for the music!"

But we fear such a remedy *might* be worse than the disease! The Committee indeed considers it "possible that, at first, especially in the present chaotic condition of musical taste, such a committee would not work smoothly." Admirably phrased! Still the Committee are sanguine enough to believe that eventually it would "secure co-operation in a definite musical policy."

The next point of the Report is best stated verbatim: "The third point is not perhaps exclusively musical and concerns the clergy. It is felt that intoning and the singing of the *preces* is often undertaken indiscreetly and unsuccessfully by many clergy, who seem quite unable to do more than make a curious, unnatural, throaty sound upon notes of uncertain pitch. Here it can only be repeated that every religious utterance should be natural, reverent and entirely audible throughout the church; and it is clearly better to use the speaking voice naturally than to sing defectively and unnaturally." *Verbum sapientis!*

IV.

The Committee regard the question of the chanting of the psalms as "a problem," "chiefly because it is so hard to sing them well, whether to Anglican or Gregorian chants." But they express the opinion that "whether they be sung or said . . . far greater attention should be paid to the words themselves," and they rightly

protest against "the finely varied speech-rhythms in the Prayer Book version" being "hustled or attenuated or otherwise distorted." We should like here to call attention to the virtues of the Paragraph Psalter, originally compiled by Bishop Westcott (the later edition is by Dr. Mann, of King's), which is a great help to the intelligent rendering of the psalms, with its pointing and interpretative headings. Another valuable book is *The Psalter of the Church*, by Canon Carleton, of St. Patrick's; but this has no pointing, and is for help in reading and study only. But to revert to our Report: we are not quite clear whether the deprecation of "the mumbling habit of congregational response" is directed to the semi-monotone reply verse to verse, when the psalms are read, or refers to the timid attempts to keep up with break-neck singing. Both clergymen and choirs are over-prone to "gabble," in the people's parts, at a pace that no ordinary person has breath to equal; and this is noticeable equally in recitation on a note and in the natural voice. The people's parts should always be taken, whether in reading or in singing, more slowly than the priest's parts. We cordially agree with the view that it is better to "speak" the psalms "heartily" ... "than to sing them badly." But nevertheless the chanting of the psalms is very popular in town churches. The suggestion that the "revival of the responsorial manner . . . would greatly help to make the psalms vital" is valuable; but we wholly demur to a suggestion to substitute a metrical psalm "where sung psalms are too difficult." Far better to *read* the proper psalms.

The Committee avoid any discussion of the rival merits of Anglican chants and Plain chant (usually called Gregorian, although Plain chant includes pre-Gregorian models). Perhaps they are wise. The Anglican chant is deeply rooted in popular affection, and seems to fit the Prayer Book Psalter. But it is not well adapted to *Te Deum* or to the Gospel canticles; and there is room for a little elasticity at that place in the service. Few that have heard *Magnificat* properly sung to *Tonus Peregrinus* in free rhythm will ever desire another setting, unless, perhaps, it be one of Farrant's, or Walmisley in *D minor*. Certainly it betokens lack alike of historical sense and spiritual insight to sing *Magnificat* in loud major key. To turn on the loud pedal, or boisterous choruses of tenors and basses, in accentuation of the wondering meditations of the gentle Hebrew maiden is something worse than a ludicrous absurdity.

V.

In the concluding lines of the Report there is sensible and useful reminder of the necessity of lower pitch in music. It is well known to all students that sixteenth century music was much lower in pitch than modern music; and the old tunes and music have been raised in pitch for modern use with disastrous result. The Committee rightly warn the reader that "men singers are apt to be discouraged by any note above D." They go on to express regret at "the disuse of women singers in choirs;" but hasten to suggest "that a mixed choir should not sit in the chancel, but in the west end of the church." But, surely, that involves a west gallery; for it would be absurd to place a choir in the back seats on the floor! Regret is also expressed at the "disappearance of local orchestras, especially in villages." And, finally, the Committee recommend a "Diocesan Diploma" for Church music; and commend the subject of Church music to the Royal College of Organists and other institutions. And in their summary the Committee again specially emphasize the need of "a higher standard of musical education in the clergy and of a fuller training for Church choirmasters in the requirements of their profession." Both of these points deserve the emphasis, especially the former. A serious study of the principles of Church music, ability to read music, and some knowledge of the history of the Church chant, ought to be insisted upon, before ordination, in the case of all candidates for the ministry. You cannot give a man the power to sing, but you can teach him the right scaffolding to use; so that if and when a man finds his musical soul he will not be at the mercy of a dumb spirit, but may sing both with the spirit and with the understanding. And if he learns his own limitations he is the more likely to seek competent guidance.

ALBERT MITCHELL.

THE FEEDINGS OF THE THOUSANDS: AN INQUIRY

By the Rev. J. B. McGovern, Rector of St. Stephen's, Chorlton-on-Medlock, Manchester.

PRESUMABLY the last word has not as yet been said on the relationship between the two incidents known under this heading. Will it ever be said or written? Without presumptuously claiming to do either, this present paper is an attempt to move the controversy a step nearer finality. The effort will relatively be less arduous and, in the writer's judgment, certainly more profitable, than a thesis on the Antinomies of St. Paul, the Atonement of Christ, or the Eschatology of the New Testament. Exegetes will probably continue to discuss those matters with, as in the cases of the Revs. G. W. Wade,[1] J. M. Wilson,[2] and J. R. Cohn,[3] more or less unsatisfactory results, whereas the theme it is here proposed to deal with furnishes conclusions which are neither indefinite nor unsettling. Moreover, it essays freshness if not novelty of treatment and eliminates the miraculous element as foreign to its scope.

The old-time and ever-recurring inquiries, therefore, which it is sought to supply with reasonably satisfactory replies, are these: Are the Evangelistic reports of the Feeding of the Five Thousand and Four Thousand respectively duplicates of one and the same fact, or are they separate accounts of two distinct occurrences? And if different are they related, and what is the *rationale* of their divergence and kinship? To these, as to all questions affecting New Testament problems, critics, to the instruction (or confusion) of their readers, differ amongst themselves in their answers. *Tot homines tot sententiæ*. This may be interesting, but it is deplorable; it may be magnificent, but it is not warfare—except in a Balaclava sense. Variety of view may prevent stagnation of thought, but it is precisely this that is needed here. Navigation is less difficult in placid than in tossing waters, and the desired haven is more

[1] "The Death of Christ in relation to Atonement," *The Interpreter*, April, 1912.
[2] *The Gospel of the Atonement.*
[3] *St. Paul in the Light of Modern Research.*

securely gained. Stagnation, therefore, is the *terminus ad quem* of this paper.

Critics, then, are roughly divided into two hostile camps: advocates of the duplicate theory beneath one tent; defenders of the separate accounts under the other. Sheltered within the former are such names, eminent in hermenutics, as Weiss, Neander, de Wette, Holtzmann, Weizsäcker, and others; equally respectable and more weighty are the names of those grouped in the latter—Augustine, Trench, Slater, Salmond, etc. Meyer attaches himself to this group, but with the not very profound qualification that oral transmission had assimilated the two accounts. Even Strauss, through the haze of his Mosaico-prophetic double antitype theory,[1] saw (from Matt. xvi. 9–10 and Mark viii. 19–20) that "in both Gospels, reference is expressly made to the two narratives as relating two different events," and owned that "this indeed can scarcely be an intentional imitation of the double narrative in the Old Testament [quails and manna]," but the haze deepens as his "told twice over" theory blurrs his vision, and he stumbles into the self-contradictory contention that "the author of our first Gospel, as well as the compiler of the Pentateuch, found the same history in two different sources given with somewhat varying details and in a different connection, and took, in consequence, the double narrative of the same history for two histories, and placed them unhesitatingly close to one another." [2]

The opinions, however, of commentators from either side are valuable only as representing their own investigations or particular bias. The Scriptural narratives must, after all, be the final court of appeal: Scripture must be her own interpreter. "Scriptura per Scripturam interpretanda et concilianda" (Bengel). It is a problem of values which the writers of the narratives can best solve; of adjustment of details which they can best provide. The art, as the duty, of the hermeneutist lies solely in a clear presentment of that solution and that provision. Hence fanciful glosses may be commentary, but they are not art. *Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus* is art precisely because it reveals, in this

[1] Edersheim (Vol. I, 677) has a pregnant note on this Precedent Theory: "The appeal to the precedent of Elisha is the more inapt, that in common Jewish thinking he was *not* regarded as specially the type of the Messiah."

[2] *Life of Jesus* (Vol. II, 252).

connection, the mind of the narrators, which modernist theories fail to do, obscuring the way thither by uncritical methods of exegesis. Strauss' paradox as quoted above is a fair sample of these methods. The basal canon of exegetic art or scriptural criticism is at once negative and positive: not to read meanings into the text which are textually foreign to it, but to extract those therefrom most germane to its letter and its spirit. This is to lay bare the mind of the inspired author and make (or let) him be his own interpreter, and this I purpose attempting in the cases of the Feedings of the Multitudes. I pluralise the nouns, be it observed, not to start this inquiry with a *petitio principii*, but on the ground that there are two stories (as all must hold) distinct in number if (as some hold) not in character.

These two stories are, then, our *terminus à quo*, the first of which is supplied by all four Evangelists, the second by two only. Before instituting a parallel between them it will serve for clearness to compare beforehand the several narratives in each instance.

A. The Feeding of the Five Thousand (Matt. xiv. 13–21; Mark vi. 30–44; Luke ix. 10–17; John vi. 1–13). St. Mark's account is at once the longest and most graphic, with touches here and there that reveal the unconscious but supreme craftsman and picture the scene vividly to the reader.[1] Thus he only of his three co-Evangelists observes (39–40) the verdant freshness of the grass (ἐπὶ τῷ χλωρῷ χόρτῳ) and the division of the multitude into companies and ranks,[2] whereas Matthew has simply ἐπὶ τοὺς χόρτους, and John (a trifle more descriptively) χόρτος πολὺς, Luke making no allusion to the latter, though he notes the κλισίας ἀνὰ πεντήκοντα.

The remaining apparent discrepancies of detail and varieties of style, whilst emphasising the independence of each separate record, when dovetailed or harmonised present a complete scene of dramatic vividness and picturesqueness. Take the phases of place and time. Strauss, with his usual jaundiced ingenuity, reads the one backwards into the Mosaic past and projects the other

[1] Merely my own view. Dr. Sanday (*Fourth Gospel*, 121) thinks otherwise: "For the rest, the superiority in distinctness and precision is all on the side of St. John."

[2] "Marc décrit d'une manière dramatique le ravissant spectacle que présentaient ces troupes régulières formées chacune de deux lignes égales et échelonnées sur la pente de la colline. La steppe était alors dans toute sa splendeur printannière, et Jean et Marc se rencontrent de nouveau ici pour fair ressortir la beauté de ce tapis naturel."—Godet.

forward into the Christian future. Both efforts are as futile as they are fanciful. Parallels from or between facts in either Testament are spurious arguments if meant to establish suggested duplicates. Types the older facts may have been, and actually were, in prefiguration, of the newer ones, but not in the sense that the latter are, *mutatis mutandis*, mere consciously concocted duplicates of the former.[1] Such reasoning is a pure *gratis asseritur*, and therefore devoid of either interest or force. Of more profit is it, as a mental exercise, to co-relate or co-ordinate the two phases in their respective fourfold presentment with a view, as with the pieces of a jig-saw puzzle, either to interlace or disintegrate them. If the former (as obtains here) result, a perfect picture will ensue. Thus, as to the *locus in quo* of this incident, the four narrations stand so—placed side by side :—

Matthew xiv. 13.	Mark vi. 32.	Luke ix. 10.	John vi. 13.
εἰς ἔρημον τόπον.	εἰς ἔρημον τόπον.	εἰς τόπον ἔρημον πόλεως καλουμένης βηθσαϊδά.	εἰς τὸ ὄρος.

As the three Synoptists, independently and without collusion, use the same expression—"a desert place"—in their description of the locality, attention need only be directed to the additions by St. Luke, and the variant phrase of St. John. On these chiefly critics, hostile and friendly, expend much ingenuity, finding a stimulus also, either to destructive or constructive textual criticism, in a collation both of superficially mutually corrosive MS. readings and of the "Textus Receptus" (Elzevir, 1633) with the editions or readings of Stephens (1550), Beza (1598), Griesback (1805) and Scholz (1830),[2] etc. So, too, we are invited to compare the variants of St. Luke's additions thus: "Textus Receptus" (*ut supra*) and fourteen (out of forty-four) greater or Uncial MSS. (*ut supra*), up to the tenth century; ℵ^{ca} (Codex Sinaiticus), B (Codex Vaticanus), L (Codex Paris), X (Munich MS.), Z (Ξ in Tischendorf, Codex Zacynthius): πόλιν καλουμένην βηθσαϊδά; the Peshito, Vetus Itala, and Vulgate (Jerome): τόπον ἔρημον κολουμένον βηθσαιδά; ℵ* (primitive text) and Syr^{cur} (Syriac Curetonian ver-

[1] To search for or institute comparisons or resemblances between the two sets of facts is both inevitable and legitimate, unless it be undertaken either in the spirit of Strauss or in that recorded in John vi. 31—to belittle one in collation with another.

[2] The T.R. is also used in the "Novum Testamentum Græcum juxta Exemplar Wetstamii, Glasguæ impressum, curante Gulielmo Whitfield Dakins, LL.D., 1812."

sion, older than the Peshito): *τόπον ἔρημον* simply. Godet's commentary on these seeming discrepancies is worth reproducing here:—

"La leçon du T. R.: *en un lieu désert de la ville appelée Bethsaïda*, est la plus complète, mais par là même aussi la plus suspect, comme étant probablement composée au moyen des autres. Celle des principaux alex, *dans une ville appelée Bethsaïda*, omet la notion, importante dans ce passage, de *lieu désert*, probablement parce qu'elle paraissait contradictoire avec l'idée d'une *ville*, et spécialment de celle de Bethsaïda, où Jésus était si connu. La leçon de ℵ et de la traduction syriaque de Cureton: *en un lieu désert*, est séduisante par sa brièveté. Mais d'où serait venue, dans toutes les autres variantes, la mention de Bethsaïda? Des deux notions contradictoires, le désert et Bethsaïda, cette leçon a sacrifié le nom propre, comme la précédante avait sacrifié le désert. La vraie leçon me parait donc être celle qui s'est conservée dans la version syriaque de Schaaf et dans l'Itala: dans un endroit désert appelé Bethsaïda. Cette leçon maintient les deux idées dont la contradiction apparente a motivé toutes ces altérations du texte, mais sous une forme plus concise et en même temps plus correcte que celle de la leçon reçue. Elle mentionne comme but non une ville, mais une contrée inhabitée sur les bords du lac, désignée du nom de Bethsaïda. Si, par cette expression, Luc avait voulu désigner la ville de Bethsaïda, entre Capernaüm et Tibériade, sur la rive occidentale du lac, la patrie de Pierre, d'André et de Philippe, il serait en contradiction manifeste avec Matthieu, Marc et Jean, qui place la multiplication des pains sur la côte orientale, puisque, chez tous trois, Jésus repasse la mer le lendemain pour revenir en Galilée (*dans la contrée de Génézareth*, Matt. xiv. 34; *à Bethsaïda*, sur la rive occidentale, Marc vi. 45; *à Capernaüm*, Jean vi. 59). Mais Luc se mettrait, dans ce cas, en contradiction avec lui-même aussi bien qu'avec les autres syn. Car la Bethsaïda, voisine de Capernaüm, étant située au centre du théâtre de l'activité de Jésus, comment le Seigneur pourrait-il s'y rendre dans l'intention d'y trouver une retraite, un lieu désert? Le sens du nom de Bethsaïda (*endroit de pêche* [Anglicè Fisherton]) fait naturellement supposer qu'il existait le long de ce lac poissonneux plusieurs localités de ce nom-là. Le terme Bethsaïda *de Galilée*, Jean xii. 21, confirme cette supposition; car cette épithète devait servir à

distinguer cette Bethsaïda de quelque autre. Enfin Josèphe (*Antiq.* xviii. 2–1 ; *Bell. Jud.* iii. 10, 7) et Pline (v. 15) mentionnent expressément une autre Bethsaïda, située en Gaulonitis, à l'extrémité nord-est de la mer de Galilée, au-delà de l'embouchure du Jourdain. Le tétrarque Philippe avait fait bâtir (probablement dans le voisinage d'un hameau de cette contrée appelé Bethsaïda) une ville qu'il avait nommée, du nom de la fille d'Auguste, Bethsaïda-*Julias*, et dont Pococke croit avoir retrouvé les ruines sur une colline dont le nom (*Telaï*) parait signifier : *montagne de Julia* (*Morgenl.* ii. 106 ; Winer, *Realwörterbuch*). C'était là que Jésus pouvait trouver le plus facilement l'isolement qu'il cherchait."

A veritable piece of clear reasoning, of skilful harmonising of the variants, and of admirable compression of much in little of which, notwithstanding Bishop Westcott's adverse estimate of its author's textual criticism,[1] I share the preference for the *τόπον ἔρημον καλουμένον βηθσαϊδά* as suggesting a desert region or district (rather than a village) designated as Bethsaida, and so reconciling the two expressions and without conflicting with the two Bethsaidas of Mark and Luke. "The coincidence of the two Bethsaidas," notes Dr. Smith ("D. B." *sub voce*) "occurring in the one narrative, and that on the occasion of the only absolutely certain mention of the Eastern one, is extraordinary," but it ceases to be "extraordinary" in the light of the readings of the Peshito, Itala, and Vulgate,[2] and yet more so if we accept Thompson's very plausible utterance (*The Land and the Book*, p. 373) : "I am of opinion that the *invention* of a second Bethsaida is wholly unnecessary. Reland, who first started the idea, confesses that he has no authority for it, but merely resorts to it as an *ultimum refugium* to solve an otherwise invincible topographical difficulty. . . . I believe, therefore, that there was but one Bethsaida at the head of the lake, and that it was at the mouth of the Jordan."

Then, of the divergent accounts of Christ's movement towards the locality of the incident, he says, with the eye of an observant

[1] At least in his *Commentaire sur St. Jean*. "I feel that I owe most to Godet, whose commentary, except on questions of textual criticism, seems to me to be unsurpassed."—*Introduction* to St. John's Gospel, p. xcvi.

[2] The Clementine Vulgate, adopted by Stien in his "Tetraglotton," has : "in locum desertum, qui est Bethsaidæ" ; and Beza : "in locum desertum urbis quæ vocatur Bethsaida." And Dean Stanley (*Sinai and Palestine*, p. 374) : "Bethsaida Julias would give its name to the surrounding desert tract."

traveller: "A vast amount of learning and critical research has been expended in efforts to reconcile the different directions given (or supposed to be given) to the disciples by our Lord, and to make the entire narratives accord with the topography of this region. According to John the disciples went over the sea toward Capernaum, while Mark says Jesus constrained them to get into the ship and go to the other side before into Bethsaida. Looking back from this point at the south-eastern extremity of the Butaiha, I see no difficulty in these statements."

Of the εἰς τὸ ὄρος of John it is sufficient to remark with Lange, "this standing phrase is accounted for by the character of the Palestinian landscape"; and, with Westcott, "the use of the definite article [as in R.V.] implies an instinctive sense of the familiar landscape, the mountain range closing round the lake; and it appears from v. 15 that the Lord came down from the mountain before the miracle was wrought!"

I turn now to the *chronology* of the four narratives which consists of two distinct and complementary phases: the period and the hour. St. John (vi. 4) fixes the former definitely—ἦν δὲ ἐγγὺς τὸ πάσχα, and the statement is singularly corroborated by St. Mark's ἐπὶ τῷ χλωρῷ χόρτῳ which Edersheim was not slow to perceive: "It [the narrative] contains two distinct notices as to time, which enable us to fit it exactly into the framework of this history. For, the statement of the Fourth Gospel that the 'Passover was nigh,' is confirmed by the independent notice of St. Mark (vi. 39), that those whom the Lord miraculously fed were ranged *on the green grass*. In that climate there would have been no 'green grass' soon after the Passover. We must look upon the coincidence of these two notices as one of the undesigned confirmations of this narrative."

Exactly; it is a signal instance of Scripture interpreting itself, in the face of which it is as difficult to account for Dr. McClymont's singular commentary that "the reason for this observation [John's] is not quite clear," as it is to understand the perversity of, in Bishop Westcott's words, "Irenæus (?) and some moderns [who] have taken it ['was nigh'], 'lately past.'" The "singular commentary" is all the more extraordinary as it supplies its own refutation by solving its own difficulty.

"The mention of the feast in this verse was probably intended

to explain the concourse of people in the next verse, who were mostly pilgrims to Jerusalem, as distinguished from the multitude in verse 2, composed of those of whom many 'ran together on foot from all the cities' (Mark vi. 33) and were waiting for Jesus on the other side of the lake before He had arrived." [1]

"The perversity of 'some moderns,'" who insist in construing "was nigh" by "lately past," merits nothing more serious than this record of their contumacy. But the thrice repeated ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων calls for a more lengthened word. The first use of the expression (v. 1) has been the despair of commentators from early times, and is commonly known as "the unnamed feast." Yet attempts, laudable but futile, have been made to identify it with the Passover (Irenæus, Eusebius, Lightfoot, Neander, Greswell), Pentecost (Cyril, Chrysostom, Calvin, Bengel), Tabernacles (Ewald), Atonement (Caspari), Dedication (Petavius), and Purim (Wieseler, Meyer, Godet); and the presence (in ℵ, C. L. and early Egyptian versions) or absence (as in ABD, Origen, etc.) of the definite article ἡ ἑορτή ("added," says Bishop Westcott, "as soon as the second century") has further been adroitly seized as authoritatively clinching the discussion. Thus Bishop Westcott, while admitting (at

[1] Dr. McClymont is not alone in his bewilderment. Bishop Walsham How (*ad versum*) asks: "Why is it mentioned here at all?" and (Q.E.D.) connects it with "the great event which took place at the next Passover, when so new and bright a light was thrown upon the dark and mysterious words of the present chapter concerning eating and drinking Christ's flesh and blood." And Archbishop Trench (*Notes on the Miracles*, 282) offers a still more startling explanation: "St. John's apparently casual notice of the fact that *the Passover, a feast of the Jews, was nigh*, is introduced, some say, to explain from whence this great multitude came. But what should they have done in that remote region? St. John accounts in another way for their presence. They were there, 'because they saw his miracles which he did on them that were diseased.' The mention of the Passover here, if it is to find an explanation, and is anything more than the fixing of a point in the chronology of our Lord's ministry, must be otherwise explained." I can only regard this passage as a lamentable confusion both of fact and thought. The ὄχλος πολὺς of verse 2 was clearly distinct from the πολὺς ὄχλος of verse 5 (as Dr. McClymont points out, *ut supra*). To say, therefore, that the latter group was "there because they saw his miracles which he did on them that were diseased" is to transfer to it a qualification which belongs solely to the former. A blending of the "great multitude" and the "great company" would result from their conjunction, but the second group was composed of Passover pilgrims drawn aside from "the usual lines of communication," not because they had *witnessed* but had *heard* of the miracles. The Archbishop is nearer the truth in his closing sentence. It was plainly "the fixing of a point in the chronology of our Lord's ministry" that accounts for St. John's mention of this particular Passover. Godet (quoted with approval by Trench) sees in this record of it Christ's celebration of a Passover of his own, debarred as he was from attending that at Jerusalem.

v. 1) that "the evidence for the identification of this unnamed feast is very slight," yet (at vi. 4) claims that "the phrase, when it stands alone [as it does at v. 1] signifies the Feast of Tabernacles, 'the one great national feast,'" although in "Additional Notes" to v. 1 he says doubtfully, "if the definite article were authentic the reference would be to the Feast of Tabernacles, which was emphatically 'the Feast of the Jews,' and not, as is commonly said, to the Passover."[1] I fear that mere grammar will never settle this point with which I am no further concerned here, and regard it as does Bishop Drury (l.c., p. 21): "We do not seem to have sufficient data to enable us to locate it, all we can say for it is that it followed the second miracle at Cana and was before the miracle of Feeding the Five Thousand. St. John does not define it either by name or by season of the year, and we must be content on the whole to leave it where he does."

The second use of the phrase (vi. 4) has, as has been seen, also engendered much "darkened counsel," of which the instances adduced are the reverse of exhaustive. For, in addition to those, even the *τὸ πάσχα* is believed by some ingenious scribes to be an early interpolation, while others equally sapient have discovered that chapters v. and vi. have been "accidentally transposed" —a euphony for careless bungling. Bishop Westcott disposes easily of both contentions.[2] The *τὸ πάσχα* qualifies and locates this second use of the phrase, "explaining," as Bishop How observes, "to Gentile readers that the Passover was 'a feast of the Jews.'" It would be Christ's fifth Passover (including the Unnamed Feast), a year before His Passion (A.D. 28), at the close of the Central Galilean ministry.

The third occurrence of the phrase (vii. 2) in this Gospel, being qualified and located by *ἡ σκηνοπηγία*, affords no scope for interchange of exegetical amenities and can, accordingly, be dismissed with the solitary reference thereto.

Next, as to the hour question, the four reckonings stand thus :—

[1] Bishop Walsham How is as emphatically convinced that, definite article or no definite article, "it is best to understand it of the Passover, in which case it would be the second Passover since our Lord's Baptism."

[2] "Against (1) (Browne, *Ordo Sæclorum*, pp. 84, ff.) it must be urged that all direct documentary evidence whatever supports the disputed words . . . The transposition. (2) (Norris, *Journal of Philology*, 1871, pp. 107 ff.) in the absence of all external evidence cannot be maintained."

Matt. xiv. 15, 23.	Mark vi. 35, 47.	Luke ix. 12.	John vi. 16.
Ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης.	ὥρας πολλῆς γενομένης; ὀψίας γενομένης.	Ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤρξατο κλίνειν	Ὡς δὲ ὀψία ἐγένετο.

Strauss here abandons his Retrospective, or Precedent, theory for a Prospective one, with corresponding airy assumption and consequent failure. "The time of day, the late evening, supplies a motive for what was to follow," and reminds him of the evening at Emmaus and the Last Supper. As a mere reminder the observation is harmless, and even pious, but when meant to prove prefiguration it is pointless and captious. The three evenings are nothing more than undesigned coincidences or resemblances between separate facts.

For a wonder the German rationalist raises no difficulty over the significantly unanimous fourfold phrasing of this fact. But, by a curious cerebration, Bishop How scents hypothetical opposition to the repetition of verse 15 in verse 23 of Matthew's record: "Had verse 23 occurred in *another* Gospel, and not in this, how certainly would the enemies of the Bible have picked out this seeming difference as to the time as a *difficulty*."

The suggestion seems to me untenable. Why "in *another* Gospel"? For, first, a parallel instance does occur "in another Gospel"—Mark vi. 35 and 47—yet without the dreaded result either there or here. There can be no "seeming difference" between the repetitions in Matthew and Mark—save to those ignorant of what Edersheim (p. 681) puts so clearly: "Already the bright spring day was declining, and what was called 'the first evening' had set in (Mark vi. 35: ὥρα παλλή). For the Jews reckoned two evenings, although it is not easy to determine the exact hour when each began and ended. But, in general, the first evening may be said to have begun when the sun declined, and it was probably reckoned as lasting to about the ninth hour, or three o'clock of the afternoon. Then began the period known as 'between the evenings,' which would be longer or shorter according to the season of the year, and which terminated with 'the second evening'—the time from when the first star appeared to that when the third star was visible. With the night began the reckoning of the following day." [1]

[1] Dr. J. T. Marshall's note in this connection, as illustrative of an original Aramaic version of the Gospels (*Expositor*, iv. 4th S., 388) is interesting:—

"Here are [Matt. xiv. 15, Mark vi. 35, Luke ix. 12] surely abundant

Nor, further, for the above reasons, could there have been any difficulty manufactured, nor any seeming difference detected "between the two verses, even had verse 23 occurred in another Gospel and not in this," and though they referred to two (as they do in both cases) distinct events. But this is not all. The Bishop, of course, knows the Jews' division of their evening, yet, in his comment, he accounts it "strange to find the same expression as to the hour used both here [verse 15] and in verse 23, after the miracle was over and our Lord had retired into a mountain to pray," but adds in a note, "the occurrence of the same expression both here and in 23 may help to soften many of the little difficulties which are sometimes felt as to the differences in the different Gospels." Both statements appear to me to be alike mutually destructive and devoid of force.

And again. The same author concludes his note with the not very happy remark: "So too we can hardly doubt that, had this miracle and that of the Feeding of the Four Thousand been recorded only in *different* Gospels, they would have been declared by many to be only different accounts of the same miracle, and have been used as an argument against the perfect truth of God's word."

But the fact that they have been recorded in the *same* Gospels, the first in four and the second in two, has not saved them from such arguments. The hypothesis would merely have rendered them more acute but certainly not more conclusive.

J. B. McGOVERN.

(*To be concluded.*)

indications of free transcription from a common source. On the first line, ὀψία = evening, stands abreast of ὥρα πολλή = a late hour; πολλή referring to the greatness of the number, drawing near to the twelfth hour. I would suggest that in the first line the original was והוה שעת ערנית = And it was the hour of evening, or, the hour of evening prayer. This Luke freely renders 'when the day began to wear away.' In the last line we read in Matthew 'the hour (of prayer) has already gone by,' יגדר שעתא ענרת, the verb ענרת being 3 s. f. pret. of ענר, which in Aramaic as in Hebrew means to go by, to go past; whereas the reading in Mark requires שעת עונת וכוו = already it is the evening hour, a late hour."

Dr. Marshall's contention for an Aramaic original of the Gospels though apparently strong and advocated by a few German scholars still leaves the problem of the unmistakable originality of the Greek MSS. unsolved.

THE POSTULATE OF CHRISTIAN EVIDENCES.

By the Rev. E. Abbey Tindall, M.A., Rector of Didsbury.

A LONG era of preparation according to our Christian faith was prefixed to the revelation of Jesus Christ. From the patriarchs to John the Baptist a Semitic race received "at sundry times and in divers manners" the messages which should enable men to perceive the truth which "in the fullness of time" came into the world with the appearance of the Son of God. The need of evidences to a just apprehension of a Divine Saviour was thus providentially recognized, and a preliminary outline sketched to substantiate the fundamental postulate of the doctrine of Christ.

The selection of the Hebrews as the people through whom God would make Himself more fully known to men was remarkable. "Philosophy proper had no existence, and could have none among the Hebrews. A process of thought free from pre-suppositions was unknown to them. God and divine revelation were accepted as fixed points."[1] The Jew was content with interpretative symbols of that which should be believed, and with earthly manifestations of the working of Almighty power; but the Gentile nations, although the conception of God was from the first indigenous in man, were dissatisfied without a richer intellectual acquaintance with the Divine Personality. The Pharisee clamoured for a miraculous racial deliverance and exaltation: the Athenian dedicated an altar "to the unknown God." "The Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom; but we preach Christ . . . the power of God and the wisdom of God." The Apostle came as a Jew to the Gentiles, assuming rather than proving the existence of God.

The quasi-scientific proofs of a Deity, demanded by unbelief, and sometimes attempted by the Apologists of faith, are doomed to failure, for the procedure is inadequate. The favourite methods have been by analogy and logic. As the watch which Paley found on Hampstead Heath was the work of a watchmaker, so the world with its wonderful contrivances and inherent fitnesses must have had an Architect. But since the scope of a man's enterprise is limited by the adaptability of his material—he cannot make bread

[1] Hastings' *Bible Dictionary* iv. 924 f.n.

of stones—the comparison does not lead to a Creator Who is transcendent over matter. Supposing that the law of cause and effect has always operated without intermission, that every effect is the outcome of a preceding cause which in turn was itself the effect of yet another cause, and that the long chain may be extended backwards until in weariness we assume a First Cause of all, it is illogical to hypothecate infinitude of this First Cause, for the sum total of visible effects, incalculably vast as it is, comes short of being infinite. The deduction of Reality from the Idea, first suggested by the acute intellect of Anselm, is too cumbrous a philosophcial process and of too disputable a character to convince an ordinary inquirer.

Interesting as are the speculations of the human mind concerning God, man, and Eternity, they are apt to carry us out of our depth. The counter-schemes to which Christianity is opposed may be classified as Atheism, Pantheism, and Deism, although for the sake of completeness each of them should be sub-divided into several distinct groups, and in fairness the first should be spoken of from its more constructive aspect as Materialism. The audacity of the usual Materialistic assumption that, where our present knowledge (as, *e.g.*, on the origin of life) is uncertain, time and increasing wisdom will justify that hypothesis; the mazes of Pantheism arising mainly from its negative definition of personality that the self is not the non-self, its struggle to harmonise the conception of creation as without beginning with the Absoluteness of God, and its endeavour to find room for progress in a self-governed universe; and the Deistic removal of God to such a distance in the remote past as to render continued existence at the least unnecessary, have induced the inevitable re-action of Agnosticism. This is a counsel of despair. Materialism and Pantheism are unmoral, for the sense of freedom and responsibility is fallacious when every thought and action is pre-determined by external necessity. Deism, with its warmer offspring Theism, is extravagantly optimistic, for its God is not concerned with the trifling affairs of men: sins, weaknesses and failures are of small account: the elaborate machinery of the universe will work all things out well. The removal of sin cannot be accomplished either by denying or by belittling its heinousness, nor does experience attest the Agnostic contention that education is emancipation.

The non-Christian systems spend their force in reasoning from the world to God. The evidence of facts is insufficient to support the weight of their theories. Christianity starts from God and the Creation with the corollary that a revelation of God is possible. The appeal is not to reason but to faith. Its evidence is corroborative, inferential, accumulative, not demonstrative. It does not ignore reason, nor conflict with reason, but in realms beyond the certainties of our knowledge states a case, asks belief, and adduces a class of evidence which would be technically described as circumstantial. Proclaiming the love of God, the sinfulness of man, the atonement by Christ, and a splendid hope of immortality, it utilises historical fact and daily experience as the needful testimony to its truthfulness.

The wisdom of Holy Scripture is shown by the order in which these great topics are introduced. Philosophers commence by developing their conception of the Deity. The inspired writers start from human iniquity defined as disobedience to God. The creation-narratives assert His existence and the possibility of communication between Him and man. Then the whole problem of evil with all its dire consequences is set before us, manifesting the characters of God by His treatment of offenders. From the outset the tendency of sin to harden the heart and induce the utmost indifference is apparent. The callousness of Cain succeeds the alarm of Adam. From the history of Israel we are taught how true this is in the individual, the family, and the nation. Endeavours to overthrow the tyranny, escape the bondage, and evade the results of sin are ineffectual. Its full strength is organized to resist amendment. If deliverance is to come, it must do so from without. Only the blind to moral truth and the inexperienced in social reform can dispute the statement. Human strength is insufficient to crush sin's virility. History repeats itself. Recent events have again demonstrated that legislative enactment, political treaty, police alertness, and military force are unable to wholly subdue the corruptive power of greed and lust.

The inspiration of the Old Testament is manifest in its mode of recording events. Externally sacred and profane history are not dissimilar. But the religious writer perceives an inner significance which is overlooked in more secular annals. Difficulties and troubles are the common lot of men. Frequently they can be traced to moral depravity, though at times the connection appears to be loose.

Behind these trials the operation of a hand of mercy is scarcely veiled. That a flood should follow the basest indulgence of carnal iniquity, or that fire from Heaven should consume the cities of bestiality in the vicinity of the Red Sea, is evidence of a righteous judgment inflicted by a personal Governor. The ruin of Pharaoh and his hosts, the fall of the walls of Jericho, or the scattering of the Assyrian forces, are just retributions of criminal ambition. Alike in unexpected calamities and in those which ordinary foresight might have predicted the finger of God is visible. His holiness is displayed in the catastrophe, His grace in the miraculous accompaniments which need no repetition after they have effectually drawn attention to His presence, and His mercy in the consequential impetus which through the deliverance of the elect is given to the forces that work for righteousness. These attributes of His character are not extolled in other creeds, but in the special preparation of the world for Christ they are placed in the foreground.

The preacher enforces this doctrine from a wealth of Scriptural detail; the Christian apologist will avoid the prejudices of his antagonists against the Bible by turning to other sources of information. The Jewish race approached extermination in A.D. 70. A weak and impoverished remnant was scattered over the face of the earth, but in defiance of all the laws of sociology has refused to be absorbed into the peoples amongst whom it mingled, has maintained a strange aloofness in spite of gross persecution and slander, and after the lapse of eighteen centuries and a half is to-day making a bold and promising claim for restoration. A well-deserved punishment for the rejection of the prophets and the blood-guiltiness of the Crucifixion has been accompanied by a providential mercy, miraculous in its nature, and immediately fraught with benediction to all men by the abolition of the claims of the ceremonial law. The appalling iniquity of the Decian and Diocletian persecutions brought a tottering Empire to the verge of ruin in the civil wars which followed. The heroism and fortitude of the martyrs produced results which were marked by the half-hearted conversion of Constantine, the rise of Christianity upon the ashes of Paganism, and the salvation of society by the Church. The casual student and the cynical historian narrate the incidents with inadequate explanation. The suggestion that the world is governed by a God of Justice and Mercy exactly meets the whole sequence of events.

The Mohammedan peril of the Middle Ages alarmed Europe especially after the Conquest of Constantinople in 1453, was held in check after the defeat of Solyman outside Vienna in 1529, but never abated until the dawn of Christian missions for the conversion of the infidel. The condition of the Church had provoked disaster: the revival of learning and the Reformation showed the working of love beneath the penalty: activity for God rolled back the evil.

The extermination of heresy by scaffold and stake gave the Roman Church a notable victory. "Jam nemo reclamat, nullus obstitit" exclaimed the orator of the Lateran Council in 1514. "Jam omnes unum Deum, unam fidem, unum baptisma corde juste credunt, et ore salubriter confitentur." Within three and a half years the proud Church was reeling under the blows of a hitherto obscure monk, the whole ecclesiastical edifice recoiled with a wound from which it cannot recover, justification by faith only was preached everywhere, new life began to fill the world.

The moral degradation and the impure atheism of the eighteenth century plunged France into a Reign of Terror, excited the blasphemies of Notre Dame, and stirred the nations to prolonged and severe warfare. Nor did the horrors cease until the Evangelical Revival had well begun its work of purification. The arrogance of apostate Germany challenged the world to another clash of arms. In the spring of 1918 this power gave no signs of snapping. The day after the English Parliament decided to attend with the King a service of supplication at St. Margaret's, Westminster—the Americans under the leadership of President Wilson being also reliant upon prayer—the tide began to turn. After August 4, the actual day of intercession, the ebb became increasingly rapid. On the first day of the Jewish Feast of Tabernacles, in the plains of Megiddo, a welcome victory sent a feeling of consternation throughout the long line held by our opponents. Bulgarians, Turks, and Austrians capitulated, and the Germans sought an armistice. The mighty were dethroned, the punishment which had befallen all peoples for their guilt was relaxed, a fresh hope has been given to mankind.

The nature of our argument renders it incapable of production in its entirety. All that can be expected is that a few pigeon-holes may be clearly labelled into which epitomes of evidence can from time to time be placed as by research in history and biography an

ampler testimony is forthcoming. By sheer quantity this will become convincing.

The methods of Divine revelation are numerous. By dreams to Jacob and Joseph, by signs to Moses and Ahaz, by a prophet to David and John, by a seeming human appearance to Abraham and Joshua, by the Angel of the Lord to others, and by the theophanies of Isaiah and Ezekiel, truth was communicated. The purpose was either to convince of sin, to deepen remorse, to assure of pardon, or to enlist for service. When the soul is ripe for such movements, man most vividly realizes that he is built in the image of God. There is then a correspondence between the creature and the Creator, a closeness of contact, an understanding which at other times is lost or overlooked. That God hates sin, freely forgives the penitent, and uses in His work the consecrated servant is clearly perceived. Guilt and remorse are impossible to God, but the sin of man gives to Him the deep sorrow of an outraged affection. Repentance in man and pardon in God are linked inseparably together. The result is a desire for fuller co-operation in the redemption of humanity. The miraculous accompaniments occasionally recorded in the Scriptures are worthy of so great a revelation, and the evidential value of the biographies of a countless number of earnest Christians equally attests the truth. It would be idle to attempt a list of all whose experiences confirm the fact, invidious to make a selection, and needless to do either when one of the greatest living psychologists [1] tells us that " crises in the development of personality are the rule rather than the exception," and adds that this " is familiarly known in religious experience as conversion or 'second birth.'" Regeneration is parallel to generation in the use of natural agency. But the naturalistic explanations which are proffered are unsatisfactory. By some writers conversion is regarded as incidental to adolescence, the smaller outlook of the child yielding to the wider prospect of maturity. But eminent instances are by no means confined to that period of life, nor does instability in the new life cast doubt upon a divine origin any more than the sin of Adam disputes the initial creation by God. How else can these experiences be accounted for? Is it " unconscious cerebration " ? Then some power not our own must move the unconscious thought. Is it " automatism " ? The term implies the liberation of some freshly

[1] Prof. James Ward.

active force when a former has run a prescribed measure of its course, but does not define its character. Is it " subconsciousness " or the " subliminal self " ? The idea is to many thinkers a psychological mare's nest, throwing beyond our ken the sphere we desire to examine. In any case it agrees with the theological notion that when the influences of the world are less potent God Himself is nearer to us, but it leaves unstated what is the power that operates in this field of mentality. Thus we return to the contention that the Christian hypothesis alone explains the phenomena, and is confirmed by their perpetual occurrence.

" The law was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ." " To Him give all the prophets witness." The Messianic hope of lawgiver and prophets is one of the most arresting features in the evolution of human thought. All shades of opinion have found advocates from the buoyant but baseless optimism of the Deists to the acute pessimism of Schopenhauer and von Hartmann. The peculiarity of the Hebrew prophets is the combination of the two extremes. In a holy zeal for righteousness they dealt unsparingly with Israel's sin and pictured in lurid colours the dreadful disasters and desolations which were sure to come. Then turning to God they spoke of a golden age to follow in a new heaven and a new earth wherein righteousness would dwell. Wearied with the rebellions in the wilderness Moses warned the people of the awful sufferings which such conduct must precipitate, and also foresaw the coming of a prophet whom they would hear. John the Baptist preached of the winnowing fan, the axe, the fire, and also proclaimed " the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world." A hardened nation forgot the beautiful symbolism of their sacrifices, became self-satisfied, and maltreated the men of God. They trusted in Egypt, not in Jehovah. But a devout remnant looked for the promised consolations and redemption. The darker side of the prophecies has been abundantly fulfilled. The brighter finds encouragement in Christ. Whence came these opposite and conflicting tendencies ? They are not mere vacillations due to the transient moods of the speakers. Nought but the power and the truth of God could reconcile them in the actual experience of men.

The great saints of Christendom have shown the same leanings. They, too, have wearied of life, have prayed for death and thought the final judgment to be immediately impending. Yet at the same

moment they have uplifted the Christ of the Cross as mighty to save. Such men are in contact with hard facts. They cannot disregard the things which contradict the peculiar theories of their own minds. They are puzzled, yet quite certain : fearful, yet not afraid : weak in the presence of others, yet strong in their message. The antinomies of spiritual life are obvious. They describe the conflict between God and sin. And the victory rests with God.

In an age of scientific inquiry when men seek the certitude of direct evidence as the basis of all knowledge, the Old Testament has been subjected to the most searching critical analysis. The investigation of the literary sources is legitimate, and will afford beneficial results. But when on *à priori* grounds its history is turned into legend, the miracles are expunged, the predictions nullified, and the supernatural excluded, the question must still be asked how a doctrine—which so closely fits the condition of human life, lays bare the moral struggles and issues of men, and refers to God as the living Power which again and again uplifts when all is ready to perish—arose, if it has not come from the Most High. It did not come by scientific investigation, nor by philosophical meditation, for the method of the Scriptures is neither scientific nor philosophical. It is not an instinct, for the natural heart invariably resists it. Whence comes it but from God ? " That which is born of the flesh is flesh ; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit."

That God *is*, and can be known ; that God is very just and most merciful ; that God desires to win men from sin and lead them to a pure and blessed life ; that God has replaced the natural despair of the heart by a real and living hope—all this was first taught, and afterwards the Son of God came for our redemption. These convictions must possess the heart and mind before we can examine, not to say accept, the evidences of the Person and Work of Christ which in order of time were subsequently disclosed. They are the great postulate of a Christian faith. " He that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him." No further evidence will be given than Moses and the prophets. " If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead." And their witness is corroborated in the pages of Christian history.

E. ABBEY TINDALL.

THE CHAPELS ROYAL OF BRITAIN.

IV. CHAPEL ROYAL, WHITEHALL.

By J. Cresswell Roscamp, M.E.

" Sir, you
Must no more call it York Place: that is past,
For since the Cardinal fell, that title's lost;
'Tis now the King's, and call'd—Whitehall."

WHITEHALL derived its name from the old Palace that stood there till it was destroyed by fire in 1698. At the present time it is principally known from being the headquarters of all the various offices connected with the Government and for the Horse Guard's building which was designed by Kent and is beautifully proportionate.

The Palace of Whitehall was originally known as " York House," and was the London residence of the Archbishops of York till " it was delivered and demised to the King (Henry VIII) by Charter February 7 (1529), on the disgrace of Cardinal Wolsey, Archbishop of York, and was then called Whitehall." It was built in 1240 by Hubert, Earl of Kent, and soon afterwards became the property of the Friars Predicant of Black Friars (Dominicans), who in 1248 sold it to Walter de Grey, Archbishop of York; and from that time to the fall of Wolsey it belonged to the See of York. Cardinal Wolsey built much on to it including a Chapel, and it assumed under his ambitious tenure a splendour equal to, if not surpassing, that of any Royal residence. The Cardinal had a passion for architecture and building, and loved pomp and magnificence, and thus it is not surprising to find his having made great additions, as he did at Oxford and Hampton Court. At his fall, though forfeiting his own estates to the Crown, it required a man of " Bluff King Hal's " characteristics to appropriate the property of a See, for York House was not Wolsey's property at all.

In 1536 another Charter by Henry VIII annexed the Palace to that of Westminster, and it remained the home of the Court until the death of Mary II in 1694.

James I had intended a sumptuous Palace to be erected during his reign on account of the dilapidated condition it was getting into, but the Crown coffers were not sufficiently well re-

plenished to carry out any elaborate scheme and he had to content himself with building the Banqueting Hall, the only part of the buildings that escaped the fire that destroyed the Palace in 1698.

After the fire the Banqueting Hall was used as a chapel and in 1724 was formally converted into a Chapel Royal and was used as such until 1891, when it was closed on the advice of the Chapels Royal Commission and given over to the United Service Institution for a museum It was rebuilt then, in 1619–1622, at a cost of £14,940, 4*s.* 1*d.*, by the eminent architect Inigo Jones, who had also prepared the plans for the vast scheme King James had set his heart on, and which are preserved at Worcester College, Oxford. Accordingly the Hall, "besides being the sole relic of a Whitehall that never existed, is also the sole relic of the Whitehall that was."

"Revels at Court" thus describes the Banqueting House:—"A new building with a vault under, the same in length one hundred and ten feet, and in width fifty feet within, the wall of the foundation being in thickness fourteen feet, and in depth ten feet within the ground, brought up with brick; the first story to the height of sixteen feet wrought of Oxfordshire stone, cut in rustique on the outside, and brick on the inside, the walls eight feet thick, with a vault turned over on great square pillars of brick and paved in the bottom with Purbeck stone; the walls and vaulting laid with finishing mortar; the upper storey being the Banqueting House fifty-five feet in height, to the laying on and off of the roof, the walls five feet thick and wrought of Northamptonshire stone, cut in rustique with two orders of columns and pilasters, Ionic and Composite, with their Architrave, Freize, and Cornice and other ornaments; also rails and ballusters round about the tops of the buildings, all of Portland stone, with fourteen windows on each side, and one great window at the upper end; five doors of stone with frontispiece and cartoozes, the inside brought up with brick, finished over with two orders of columns and pilasters, part of stone and part of brick, with their architectural freize and cornice, with a gallery upon the two sides and the lower end borne upon great cartoozles of timber carved with rails and ballusters of timber and the floor laid with spruce deals, a strong timber roof covered with lead, and under it a ceiling divided into a fret made of great cornices enriched with carving."

The Hall is one hundred and fifteen feet long, sixty feet broad,

and fifty-five feet high and has a lofty gallery running along two sides, but the chief point is the beautiful ceiling for which Charles I employed Paul Reubens and which delineates the reception of James I by the deities of Olympus, and which is said to be worth over a million pounds sterling. The master mason was Nicholas Stone, who also carried out many other of Inigo Jones' designs including the York Water gate, which may be seen in the Embankment Gardens at the foot of Buckingham Street, and part of St. Mary's Church, Oxford.

Inigo Jones received a salary of 8*s.* 4*d.* a day as Surveyor General, with a house allowance of £46 a year, and was allowed a clerk and his incidental expenses—a paltry emolument for so great a man. Reubens is said to have had the assistance of his pupil Jordaens in his work, and to have received £3,000 for it. The Canvas is in nine compartments, the principal one representing James being translated to the celestial regions. In 1785 the work was cleaned and restored by the celebrated Italian painter Giambattista Cipriani at a cost of £2,000. This was the artist who designed the diploma of the Royal Academy. It was again cleaned and restored in 1832, when it was discovered that " the children are more than nine feet, and the full-grown figures at 20 to 25 feet in height." A bust of King James I stands at the top of the staircase and is the work of Le Soeur.

The Chapel was attended on many occasions by Royalty, and while Dr. Tait was Bishop of London the Ordinations took place there alternately with St. Paul's Cathedral, the last being on December 20, 1868. After the closing of the Chapel in 1890 the organ was given to the Chapel of St. Peter ad Vincula in the Tower, and the Communion Plate to the care of the Lord Steward.

The old Chapel Royal, which was destroyed along with the Palace in the fire of 1698, was built in 1240 and on passing into the hands of the Crown in 1529 was on several occasions restored and beautified by the Sovereign, and there are many notes in Pepys' Diary of his visits there, the installation of an organ and other matters of interest. One note especially may be mentioned as somewhat humorous. Recording his being taken, on one of his visits and in the absence of the King, to the Royal Closet of the Chapel to Service, he writes, that through the hangings that part the King's Closet from the place where the ladies sat, " the Duke of

York and Mrs. Palmer did talk to one another very wantonly."

At different times the Monarchs from Henry VIII to Charles I dwelt there, as did also Cromwell and Milton, and it was from a hole made in the wall between the upper and lower central windows of the Hall that King Charles I was led forth to the scaffold erected in the street close by. Here each year until 1891 the Royal Maundy ceremony took place on the Thursday in Holy Week. Queen Elizabeth used to perform this duty in person at Greenwich, and James II was the last monarch who officiated at it, the office afterwards being undertaken by the King's Almoner.

The staircase on the north side was added by James Wyatt in 1798, and the building was restored thirty years later by Sir John Soame. When handed over to the United Service Institution the oak pews were used to panel the walls and the bases of the pillars. A most interesting ceremony took place here on May 18, 1811, when the Eagles and other trophies "gained by the valour of our troops from the inveterate foes of Britain" were deposited within for safe keeping. George I made an annual grant of £30 to twelve Clergy, six from Oxford and six from Cambridge, to officiate in the Chapel each month in succession.

This then is all that is left of the once famous old Palace that existed in those days of splendour and pomp and magnificence. How truly indeed do we find that :—

"The worldly hope men set their hearts upon
Turns ashes—or it prospers, and anon,
Like snow upon the desert's dusty face,
Lighting a little hour or two—is gone."

J. CRESSWELL ROSCAMP.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

CHARLES WESLEY.

CHARLES WESLEY: A STUDY. By D. M. Jones. London: *Skeffington & Co.* 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

The literature of the Methodist revival of the eighteenth century, and of the Wesley family in particular, is very extensive, and on first thoughts any new book on the subject seems superfluous. But the memory of Charles Wesley has been so overshadowed by the memory of his greater brother, that a popular sketch of him has been a desideratum, and here it is. The author (or authoress ?) is indicated by the dedication to be a son (or daughter ?) of "William Rodwell Jones, for over fifty years a Wesleyan minister," and apparently has a special sympathy with Charles Wesley and, to some extent at least, with those ecclesiastical views of his in which he differed from John. So we can thank "D. M. Jones" for a book written with competent knowledge of the hero's life and environment, and with full appreciation of his mind and of his character.

Charles Wesley worked for many years alongside John as an earnest evangelist and devoted leader of the Methodist preachers. But his marriage, and his less robust health, prevented his continuing a laborious life as John did to extreme old age; and in his later years he had more intercourse with literary and musical folk than John; besides which he had not the heavy responsibilities of his brother, who always remained sole head of the Society. Moreover, he retained his High Anglican convictions, and insisted on them strenuously, while John, though still holding them by tradition, let them yield sometimes to the urgent need of unrestricted liberty of action. Charles used all his influence to prevent the Methodists from the Church of England. John did the same, but with less decisiveness. When John sent Coke and Ashbury to the American Colonies as "superintendents," commissioning them to ordain ministers because there was no bishop there, Charles expressed himself bitterly in the familiar lines—

> How easily are bishops made
> By man's or woman's whim!
> Wesley his hands on Coke hath laid,
> But who laid hands on *him*?

So again, when John reluctantly registered his "preaching halls" (as he called them) as "Dissenting Meeting Houses" under the Toleration Act because it was the only way of legalizing them, Charles strongly objected.

But Charles Wesley's chief claim to honour and to our grateful remembrance is due to his hymns. He was certainly the greatest of all hymn-writers. Of the six thousand which he wrote, only a small minority now survive, but they did a mighty work in the revival; and although there are individual hymns by men which are equal or even superior to his best, no other writer has equalled him in the excellence of a large number. The whole Christian Church owes him a debt never to be repaid for our Christmas hymn, "Hark! the herald-angels sing" (so now written); our Easter hymn, "Christ the Lord is risen to-day"; our Ascension hymn, "Hail the day that sees Him rise"; our Advent hymn, "Lo! He comes with clouds descending"; also "Jesu, Lover of my soul," "O for a heart to praise my God," "Come, let us join our friends above," "O for a thousand tongues to sing," "Love Divine, all love excelling," "Rejoice, the Lord is King," "Soldiers of Christ, arise,"

and that magnificent sacred poem, "Come, O Thou Traveller unknown." It is good to have so interesting a sketch of the man who enriched our hymnody with these and many others, as we have in the volume now before us.

MR. MACDONALD'S RECOLLECTIONS

AS A TALE THAT IS TOLD: RECOLLECTIONS OF MANY YEARS. By the Rev. F. W. Macdonald, sometime President of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference. London: *Cassell & Co.* 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

The eminence of Mr. Macdonald as a Wesleyan preacher and his services for many years as Secretary of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society are well known to members of the Church of England, amongst whom this distinguished preacher and speaker has many friends. We welcome, therefore, this account of his long life of happy usefulness told in the graceful and easy English for which he is famous. It brings us into closer acquaintance with the many members of his family who have shone in the artistic and literary worlds. When it is stated that one sister was the mother of Rudyard Kipling, another was the wife of Sir Edward Poynter, and yet another of Sir Edward Burne-Jones, it will be realized that Mr. Macdonald has personal experiences to record which do not fall to the lot of the average minister of religion. Himself a Methodist minister in the third generation, he speaks with great reverence of the influence of both his grandfather and his father. In these days of selfish extravagance the record of what was possible in a home where plain living and high thinking went together conveys something of a reproach. The accounts kept by his father in 1841, the year he was born, are in Mr. Macdonald's possession, and they show that with four children the total income was £163 16*s.* 0*d.* and the total expenditure £162 5*s.* 1*d.* In the expenditure household expenses appear for £72, subscriptions and charities £7. Besides smaller sums given to poor friends, the £7 included four guineas to the Missionary Society, one guinea to the Kingswood School, Bath, and one guinea to the Bible Society, revealing principle as well as generosity in the matter of charity.

Mr. Macdonald's long life—he is now seventy-eight years of age—falls into three main periods: his work as a circuit minister, his stay at Didsbury College as Theological Lecturer, and many years spent as a Missionary Secretary. He has been a very considerable traveller, and all his life devoted to literature of the best kind, so that his reminiscences of, and comments on, books are many and interesting.

Mr. Macdonald's well-known humour, and great powers of preserving and telling stories, contribute many a light touch to the volume which, by reason of its style, is delightful to read.

Mr. Macdonald's devotion to the Bible has proved itself by the ready service he has ever rendered to the Bible Society. Three times has he spoken at its annual meeting. He was a member of the special Centenary Deputation that visited the Australasian Colonies and Ceylon in 1903, and he has appeared hundreds of times upon the Bible Society's platform in England. Friends of the Society in the Church of England are grateful to him for this service.

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

82 VICTORIA STREET, S.W.1.

Sunday Schools.

A LITTLE book entitled *Talks to Teachers in Sunday Schools*, by the Rev. C. H. K. Boughton, B.D., Diocesan Inspector of Schools in Bradford, has just come to our notice, and we are very glad to recommend it. The book makes no pretence to be elaborate or exhaustive, or to add anything new to the science of education. The talks are simply meant to be plain statements of the elementary rules of teaching for those working-class teachers of good intelligence but little leisure by whom Sunday Schools are mainly staffed. A chapter is devoted to "The Teacher," and the book goes on to give some guidance as to the characteristics of the various classes of children who attend Sunday Schools. As the Bishop of Ripon says in a very interesting preface, "The modern results of Child-Psychology have not been sufficiently recognized in the past. Hence the need of knowledge of the children, sympathy with their individuality, and above all that intuition which is the fruit of Love." As regards the methods of teaching Mr. Boughton has a good deal to say and says it well. The book is published at 1*s.* 3*d.* net and can be obtained from the Church Book Room.

The Person and Work of Christ.

A new re-print of *Christianity is Christ*, by the Rev. W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D., has just been issued at 2*s.* net. Unfortunately the increased price was found necessary owing to the exigencies of the present time. The book has had a very large circulation and we hope that there will be a good demand for the present edition. Its aim is to present in a short popular form the substance of what has been written in recent years on the central subject of Christianity—the Person and Work of Christ.

Confirmation.

In view of approaching Confirmation Classes, we have prepared a sample packet of the various Confirmation leaflets and manuals which is published and recommended by the Church Book Room. This packet can be obtained for 1*s.* 3*d.* post free. It contains four courses of instruction to candidates for Confirmation. (1) *Class Notes*, by the Rev. Henry Edwards, which has reached its fourth edition; (2) *A Soldier in Christ's Army*, and (3) *The Christian Disciple*, both by the Rev. Canon E. R. Price Devereux; (4) *Strength for Life's Battle*, taken from addresses given by the late Canon Hoare of Tunbridge Wells. These courses are issued at 2*d.* net each, or at 14*s.* per 100. The packet also contains several leaflets on Confirmation suitable for distribution to the congregation before classes, to Candidates when they come forward, and for the newly confirmed; a card entitled *Your Confirmation*, to be given to the candidate, containing special prayers and instructions. Sample Confirmation Hymns, a letter to confirmees on the anniversary of their Confirmation, Confirmation cards and labels are also included in the packet.

Benediction.

In response to many requests the article on *Benediction and its Advocates*, by W. Guy Johnson, which appeared in the CHURCHMAN for October, has been reprinted in pamphlet form, price 1*d.* net each, or 7*s.* per 100 for distribution. This is a question which has come to the front of late, and this paper puts the issue with remarkable clearness.

The Power of the Presence.

The Bishop of Durham a short time ago read a very instructive paper at a large meeting at the Cannon Street Hotel, organized by the London Clerical and Lay Evangelical Union, entitled *The Power of the Presence and its Relation to the Holy Communion.* The paper was afterwards printed in pamphlet form and has been out of print. In view of the many requests which have been received a new edition has been printed and is now on sale, price 1*d.* net, or 7*s.* per 100.

Holy Baptism.

Arrangements are being made for the re-issue, in pamphlet form, of an address by the Bishop of Durham, entitled *Holy Baptism* (price 1*d.* net each, or 7*s.* per 100). The Bishop takes for his text "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." The question of dealing with Infant Baptism is considered in view of Scripture and the teaching of the Church of England. The pamphlet is a suitable one for popular distribution, and will, we think, be of service in general parochial work.

Holy Communion.

A new edition of Canon Barnes-Lawrence's *Holy Communion, Its Institution, Purpose and Privilege* is now in the press. Canon Barnes-Lawrence has practically re-written the book and the new edition will, we feel sure, be much appreciated by those into whose hands it may come. It will be re-printed in a convenient size for general use. It will be remembered that the book deals by the method of positive teaching rather than by controversial treatment with the fact that the Holy Communion is central to those foundation truths which underlie the whole Christian life. Its reverence, its thoughtfulness, its spirit of sober and quiet devotion, all combine to render it a truly beautiful work. It is intended more for the young of the thoughtful and educated classes. It is hoped to publish at 1*s.* 3*d.* and 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

The Catholic Faith.

The new edition of this well-known manual, by the Rev. W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D., has been much delayed in the press owing to the shortage of labour. The proofs have now been finally passed and it is hoped that copies of the book will be on sale early in November. Unfortunately the price has had to be slightly increased, as the cost of publishing is now very much in excess of pre-war rates; but as a large edition is being printed and a wide circulation of the book is desired, the increase to 1*s.* 6*d.* net for a cloth-bound edition and 2*s.* net for the cloth gilt edition will not, we hope, prevent a ready sale, particularly as the increase does not cover the whole of the extra cost.