

# *Theology* on the *Web*.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

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

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



*Buy me a coffee*

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



**PATREON**

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbadshaw>

---

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

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

THE  
CHURCHMAN

A Monthly Magazine

*CONDUCTED BY CLERGYMEN AND LAYMEN  
OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND*

—♦—  
VOL. XIII.  
—♦—

LONDON  
ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW  
1886

THE  
CHURCHMAN

---

OCTOBER, 1885.

---

ART. I.—EVOLUTION.

IT may appear a very rash thing for any person who does not claim to be a man of science to presume to give an opinion on any of the theories of scientific men. But there is a vast difference between the facts of science and the theories suggested for their explanation. The facts are, as it were, the property of the investigators. The investigators have a power of investigation which we outsiders have not, and it would be folly for us who have not that power to presume to call in question their information. But it is a very different matter with the theories either founded on these facts or invented to explain them. When science has given us the facts common-sense can discuss the theories founded on them ; and, without presuming to call in question the ascertained results of scientific investigation, any person of ordinary intelligence may form his own opinion as to the conclusions derived from the known facts. The scientific men know the facts, and we do not ; but, when they have told us the facts, we can think as well as they. This point was exceedingly well put by Canon Garbett at the Norwich Church Congress in 1865. He said : “ Beyond a certain point the conclusions and arguments of the man of science cease to be exclusively his own, and become the common property of all men. All argument rests on common principles, and when once the facts of the case are clearly ascertained, any man who is trained to reason correctly is competent to judge of them.” Again : “ Let the man of science,” said Canon Garbett, ‘ reign supreme within his own sphere, and let none but those trained in the same school and learned in the same craft venture to dispute with him as he gathers his facts and generalizes his rules. But when all this is done, and he proceeds to reason, then it is different. He steps out of his

special department into a sphere open to all men alike. Tell me what your facts are, and if I sufficiently master them I am as competent to judge of the validity of the conclusions drawn from them as the man of science himself."

There is scarcely any subject to which this principle applies more completely than it does to Evolution; for what is called "the doctrine of Evolution" is only a theory. It is not a collection of facts, but a theory which some of its warmest advocates—as, *e.g.*, Professor Drummond—declare to be "still unproved."<sup>1</sup> While, therefore, we fully recognise that it would be the utmost folly "to debate a point of natural history with Darwin, or a question of comparative anatomy with Owen," we may, by the aid of common-sense, form an opinion possibly as sound as theirs on the unproved theory which has been founded on the ascertained facts which those great investigators have placed within our reach. This is all that I would attempt to do in the present paper. I do not propose to call in question a single fact ascertained by men of science. All that I would venture to do is to exercise the ordinary powers of thought in considering one of the theories which some scientific men have suggested as an explanation of those facts. I say "some scientific men," for there is a very great difference of opinion amongst scientific men, and no one can read the admirable papers produced by the Victoria Institute without perceiving how much accurate observation, how wide a scientific knowledge, and how great a force of Baconian philosophy is arrayed against the theory just now in the fashion.

Let us begin, then, with a few facts respecting which we are all agreed, and which as they are sometimes called by the name of Evolution, are supposed to supply evidence of the correctness of the theory.

(1) We all believe in *growth*. It is a matter of fact that the world is full of growth. And this growth is not limited to gradual, or continuous, enlargement or development; but consists sometimes in most remarkable sudden changes, as when the egg becomes a chicken, the caterpillar a chrysalis, and the chrysalis a butterfly. Every living creature, whether plant or animal, has its own mode of growth; and no living creature is born into the world in the fulness of its stature. The man was once in his cradle, the eagle in its egg, the oak in its acorn; and no one can point to any living thing, either in the animal or vegetable kingdom, that began life with the full development of all the powers or properties of its species. Whatever men may think of any theory, as a matter of fact

---

<sup>1</sup> Address in Grosvenor House, May 3, 1885.

there is invariably growth as the first, and most certain, accompaniment of life.

(2) Within certain limits we all believe in *variations*. Both plants and animals of the same species vary according to circumstances, and are all more or less affected by country, by climate, and by culture. Amongst dogs, *e.g.*, there are countless varieties of breed, to say nothing of all the mongrels. Just so amongst flowers; there are countless varieties of the rose, and these varieties may be multiplied to any extent by culture. There is, moreover, a power of adaptation to climate and other circumstances. In colder climates animals of the same species have thicker coats than they have under the tropics. There cannot be a question that both plants and animals will begin at once, if placed in a new position, to adapt themselves to it; and, as a general rule, if they fail in such adaptation, they die. Beyond all doubt, as a matter of fact, there are variations resulting both from parentage and environment. We are told by naturalists that some of these variations are not of a permanent character, as, *e.g.*, in the case of pigeons, of which it is stated by Darwin that any number of breeds, if left to themselves, will in time revert to the common Rock. But still the fact remains, that within certain limits there are numberless variations, and that these variations may be transmitted to posterity. Some of these appear to have been produced in one way, and some in another; but, however produced, there they are; and no one, whether scientific or unscientific, can for one moment call in question the fact.

(3) We all believe in *progression*. We see progression all around us. It appears to be a universal law that there should be perpetual movement. Sometimes there is advance, and sometimes retrogression—but always movement; for when there is no advance, there is invariably decline. Then, again, as far as observation is concerned, we find this progression gradual and continuous. Characters are gradually formed; learning is gradually acquired; power is gradually gained; and the whole world advances by the gradual attainment of increasing knowledge. Such progression is seen both in creation and revelation.

In Creation, for no one supposes that the world was created and peopled by one instantaneous act of the Creator. There may be difficulties in some of the commonly received interpretations of some of the statements of that most wonderful narrative contained in Gen. i.; but there can be no doubt whatever that it teaches progression. It begins with chaos, and leads us step by step to a perfected cosmos. At the outset, “the earth was waste, or without form, and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep.” And at the end we

see a fertile world covered with vegetation, peopled by countless living creatures, with man, in the image of God, at their head, all enjoying the bright light of the sun in heaven; and all in so perfect a condition that "God saw everything that He had made, and behold it was very good." But this change did not take place by one solitary act. The world did not leap by one bound from one condition to the other. There were, according to Scripture, no less than six successive steps in the process. Let people explain the six days as they please, and I fully acknowledge that there may be legitimate differences in their explanations. But no one can doubt that the narrative teaches progression; and that, according to that narrative, it pleased God by a series of successive acts to complete the work which He pronounced to be very good. No one, therefore, who believes in the Book of Genesis can for one moment doubt progression in the work of the creation.

Nor can there be the slightest doubt as to progression in Revelation. Some people seem to speak of this as if it were a new discovery connected with the theory of Evolution. Such persons ought to read an admirable book called "The Philosophy of the Plan of Salvation," written many years ago, and now published by the Religious Tract Society. It is perfectly impossible to read through the Old and New Testaments as a complete book without seeing progression. It is deeply to be deplored that such a man as Professor Drummond should have said, as he is reported to have said in his Sunday lectures, at Grosvenor House,<sup>1</sup> "The Book of Genesis must be regarded as presenting truth to children's minds;" and should have illustrated this by George Macdonald's poem, "The Baby," adding, "not literally true, but true for the child. So Moses gave truth in the form of a poem. If you say it is a scientific book, I give it up; but if you regard it as a poem, then I can deal with it." This appears to teach that the Book of Genesis is regarded by him as something like a nursery rhyme. But the report<sup>2</sup> is evidently abridged; and I hope it is incorrect. We know that there are sixty-six books in the Bible; but we also believe that it is "a Book" complete in itself, and with all its parts so beautifully proportioned that it forms one perfect whole for the gradual development of the whole counsel of God. Thus we believe that the one verse (Gen. iii. 15), "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel," is the seed, or germ, of the whole Gospel; and that just as the oak is in the acorn, so in these few words is contained the whole covenant of God. The first twelve

<sup>1</sup> May 3, 1885.

<sup>2</sup> In the *Christian Commonwealth*.

chapters of the Book of Genesis trace the pedigree of that seed of the woman till the call of the chosen family in Abraham; the historical books record the varied history of that family, and show how sorely the heel of the woman's seed was bruised by the serpent; while the prophecies enlarge, and expand the blessed hope of final victory in the promised One. At length the Gospels reveal the long-expected Christ; and the Acts and the Epistles unfold the principles and progress of His kingdom, till the whole is complete in the Apocalypse, where we read of "the new heavens and the new earth," with the curse of sin gone for ever, with Satan cast into the lake of fire, and with the seed of the woman triumphant over death and hell. As the acorn to the oak, so is that first promise to the Apocalypse. It is no poem, no myth, no nursery rhyme, but the germ of the whole counsel of God—a germ containing the whole Gospel, and requiring no less than four thousand years for its development.

Let no one suppose, therefore, for a moment that we do not believe in progression, for we see it throughout nature; and we find it distinctly taught in Scripture as a matter of historical fact, both in creation and revelation. But the fact of progression is a totally different thing from the theory of Evolution; and it is extremely important that the distinction should be carefully borne in mind; for there are many, and some of them clear-headed men, who, because they see the three things—growth, variation, and progression, avow themselves believers in Evolution, though all the while they really reject what should be strictly termed "the Evolution theory."

What then is the theory of Evolution? What is it which Bishop Temple describes as "just at present the leading scientific doctrine,"<sup>1</sup> and for which he says the evidence "is enormously great, and increasing daily"?<sup>2</sup> It is extremely difficult to answer the question; for evolutionists themselves, although they are perpetually trumpeting forth the superiority of their scientific accuracy, very seldom take the trouble to tell us what they mean. In a defence of Mr. Drummond's book, in the *Expositor*, the defender states, with reference to an article of my own in the *CHURCHMAN* of February last, that there are at least four theories of Evolution; and he also informs us which of the four it is that Mr. Drummond teaches. It is a pity that Mr. Drummond did not tell us this in his book, instead of leaving us to conclude, as some of us have concluded that it was the doctrine of Mr. Herbert Spencer that appeared to call forth his enthusiastic admiration.

<sup>1</sup> "Bampton Lectures," p. 162.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 167.

Bishop Temple speaks of "*the two theories of Evolution;*" and what he does with the other two I do not know. He describes the one as that of La Place, and the other as that of Darwin; the former being a theory for the construction of the universe, and therefore by some called "*Cosmical Evolution;*" the other for the development of vegetable and animal life, and therefore termed "*Biological Evolution.*"

To begin with the *Biological*. This is briefly stated by Bishop Temple<sup>1</sup> in the words: "It cannot be denied that Darwin's investigations have made it extremely probable that the vast variety of plants and animals have sprung from a much smaller number of original forms." So Darwin, in his summary,<sup>2</sup> writes: "The several classes of facts which have been considered in this chapter seem to me to proclaim so plainly that the innumerable species, genera, and families with which this world is peopled, are all descended, each within its own class or group, from common parents, and have all been modified in the course of descent, that I should without hesitation adopt this view, even if it were unsupported by other facts or arguments." I presume that there are very few amongst us who would differ materially from either of these statements; for both of them fully admit the original existence of a variety of common parents, which is, in fact, a complete surrender of the whole position; and Darwin limits the modifications in the course of descent to changes, "each within its own class or group." Now this is all for which the anti-evolutionist contends; for all admit most freely the existence of most marked variations within the circles of the various groups.

But, although in this passage there is this limitation, as a matter of fact there is a great deal more claimed by both writers for Evolution; for the title of Darwin's book, "*The Origin of Species,*" shows very clearly that he applies his theory not merely to variations within species, but to the formation of the species within which these variations take place. I do not gather from his book that his theory goes so far as to suppose that either plants or animals have passed over from one species to another, both species being already in existence; but rather that through the power of "*the struggle for existence,*" "*natural selection,*" and "*survival of the fittest,*" existing races have been so changed and modified that new species have been evolved out of them, and that in every such evolution there has been what evolutionists consider to be improvement.

The arguments which Bishop Temple adduces for this theory are—

<sup>1</sup> "*Bampton Lectures,*" p. 164.

<sup>2</sup> "*Origin of Species,*" p. 403.

(1) "The unity of plan which can be found pervading any great class of animals seems to point to unity of ancestry."<sup>1</sup> He illustrates this by remarking that vertebrate animals are formed on a common plan.

(2) "Slight variations are perpetually being produced."<sup>2</sup>

(3) "The frequent occurrence both in plants or animals of useless parts which still remain as indications of organs that once were useful, and have long become useless."<sup>3</sup>

But is this scientific evidence? As to the 1st, the Bishop only claims for it that it "*seems to point*." As to the 2nd, it quietly assumes the whole point at issue, for no one denies that there are variations "within each class or group," and the fact that such variations exist within a certain class or group is no proof that they can extend beyond it. And as for the 3rd, who knows that those that are called "useless parts" are really useless, though their use may not be known? And if they are useless now, what evidence is there that they were once useful, or were ever used? There is not the slightest scientific evidence in any one of these three points for the theory which they are adduced to support. There is not a single fact to prove the theory, and all that can be said by the most ardent advocate is that the conjecture seems to be probable.

But how different is the evidence on the other side of the controversy! There we find certain clearly-defined and indisputable facts which cannot be doubted, and which cannot be reconciled with this new theory.

### (1) *Biological Evolution.*

There cannot be a doubt that there are certain great classes of plants and animals found in the world, which have certain distinct characteristics, and which, as a matter of fact, do not merge into each other. There seems to be considerable variation in the names given to them, and they appear to be distinguished by the name sometimes of "species," sometimes of "genus," sometimes of "class or group," and sometimes of "kind." In the sentence quoted from Darwin on p. 6, he speaks of species, genera, and families; and describes them as being all descended each within its own class or group. This confusion of terms is difficult to reconcile with the boasted claim to scientific accuracy. That I may not be entangled by any questionable name I will distinguish these groups as A, B, C, D, etc., and our question is whether they have been evolved from each other or through each other, from a common stock; or whether they are separate creations. For the answer to this question let three facts be carefully considered.

<sup>1</sup> "Bampton Lectures," p. 164.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 164.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 166.

i. There is the remarkable and clearly-established law of the sterility of all hybrids between any two of these great divisions. Both A and B may contain a great number of varieties, and all the varieties of A can breed freely with each other. In such case there is no failure of fertility in the progeny. The same is true of B and all the varieties that spring from it. If these varieties be expressed by the figures 1, 2, 3, etc., A 1 may breed with A 2, A 3, or any other number, and so may introduce a fresh variety in the race A. But if A, or any variation of A, should breed with B, or any variation of B, there may be in the first instance a progeny; but there is a fixed and invariable law of nature that there should be no perpetuation of that progeny, for every individual so born is barren. Mules, *e.g.*, can never give birth to mules, and the mule race has no power of self-propagation. Now see how this bears on the subject of Evolution. If B were evolved out of A, there would, of course, be countless intermediate variations, and these variations would all have the power of perpetuating their kind. A would produce A 1, A 1 would produce A 2, and so on, till A 98 would produce A 99, and, finally, to complete the series, A 99 would produce A 100, or B. But at this point, if the Evolution theory is to be reconciled with facts, a new and most strange law must be suddenly evolved; and the continuity of law must be broken. A 98 may breed with A 99, and their offspring may perpetuate their race; but if A 99 should breed with A 100, which is B, it is true there may be offspring, but that offspring will have no power of self-perpetuation. How can evolutionism explain such a fracture in the continuity of law? And is not the scientific fact dead against the Evolution theory?

(ii.) As a matter of fact we do not find that continuous chain of intermediate links which the theory requires. The theory is, that as there are to be no sudden jumps in nature, the various numbers are evolved from each other in a vast series of almost imperceptible improvement; and it follows of necessity that, if the theory were true, instead of finding distinct classes, we should find various lines of progress stealing into each other in steps so minute that it would be very difficult to detect their differences. If, *e.g.*, man has been evolved from monkey there ought not to be a yawning chasm, as there now is, between the two, but there ought to be a vast series of connecting links bridging the chasm between monkeyism and manhood; and there ought to be a race of monkeys still existing so near to man in physical structure and mental power that the birth of man from such a parentage should be within the range of natural probability. Let A be monkey, and B man, then there ought to be a continuous line of intermediate

numbers, and A 99 ought to approximate so closely to B that it would be perfectly natural for B to be its child.

But where are these links to be found? and what naturalist can discover them? If the theory be true, the process must still be going on, and the world must be teeming with these intermediate races. But where are they? Bishop Temple has attempted to answer this question thus:

If it be asked why this variety does not range by imperceptible degrees from extreme forms in one direction to extreme forms in the other, the answer is to be found in the enormous prodigality, and the equally enormous waste of life and living creatures. . . . Eggs, and seeds, and germs are destroyed by millions, and so in a less but still enormous proportion are the young that come from those that have not been destroyed. There is no waste like the waste of life that is to be seen in nature. . . . The inevitable operation of this waste, as Darwin's investigation showed, has been to destroy all those varieties which were not well fitted to their surroundings, and to keep those that were. (P. 165.)

But if this be the solution of the difficulty, how is it that those at the bottom of the scale remain? One of the great principles employed to explain the theory is "the survival of the fittest." The result therefore must be continuous progress, and the *raison d'être* of each successive formation is its superior fitness above the form from which it sprang. A 1 survives because it is superior in fitness to A, and A 2 because it is superior to A 1, and so forth. The effect therefore of the Bishop's principle would be that the inferior forms at the bottom of the scale would perish, while the superior that have risen out of them, by reason of their greater adaptation to their environment, would survive. But this is not the fact. As a matter of fact, A, at the bottom of the scale, survives, though A 99, at the top, is gone. The countless multitude of intermediate formations has disappeared, but the parent stock remains. If ever there was a race of animals so near man as to render it nothing more than natural that it should give birth to man, that race has wholly disappeared, while animals vastly inferior still exist in all their strength. Such a fact appears to me to be fatal to the theory.

iii. But the geological evidence is stronger still. If all these creatures have arisen in succession, and perished, we may well ask, "Where are their bones?" Each successive race, according to the theory, has been sufficiently powerful to overpower its predecessors, and to reproduce its own kind. It is clear, therefore, that we should naturally look for the geological remains of those once-powerful animals. But here we are met by the hard, stubborn, rocky fact, that there is no trace of them in the geological record. We find the remains of A, B, C, D, etc., but between them there is a complete hiatus; and if there were 1000 links between A and B, the

geologist cannot show you one of them. He can show you A, and he can show you B ; but as for A 20, 30, and 40, he can only tell you that they are not yet discovered. I know that some good Christian people are afraid of geology, and in that I believe they make a great mistake ; for, though I grant there may be danger in shallow, superficial, theoretical geology, I never can doubt that the real record of the rocks is in perfect harmony with the real record of Scripture. So, in this instance, it has furnished us with an unanswerable proof that the evolutionist theory is not founded in fact, and that nothing has yet been discovered in the geological record to shake our confidence in the grand, old, Scriptural statement, "God made the beast of the earth after its kind, and the cattle after their kind, and everything that creepeth upon the ground after its kind : and God saw that it was good." We all know that it is not the object of the Book of Genesis to teach science ; and some, I grieve to think, are not afraid of calling it a myth, or even a poem for the childhood of the world ; but I venture to affirm that the statement of the Inspired Book which describes each kind as a separate creation is more in accordance with well-known geological facts, and is therefore more scientifically accurate than the theories of those who adopt the conjecture that the various kinds, species, or groups evolved themselves either from each other or from a common stock.

### (2) *Cosmical Evolution.*

But if this be the case with Biological Evolution, how is it with Cosmical Evolution, or the evolution of inanimate matter? Bishop Temple describes it as "that which begins with Laplace, and explains the way in which the earth was fitted to be the habitation of living creatures,"<sup>1</sup> and again he says :<sup>2</sup>

It cannot, then, be well denied that the astronomers and geologists have made it exceedingly probable that this earth on which we live has been brought to its present condition by passing through a succession of changes from an original state of great heat and fluidity, perhaps even from a mixture mainly consisting of gases ; that such a body as the planet Jupiter represents one of the stages through which it has passed ; that such a body as the moon represents a stage toward which it is tending ; that it has shrunk as it cooled, and as it shrank formed the elevations which we call mountains, and the depressions which contain the seas and oceans ; that it has been worn by the action of heat from within and water from without, and in consequence of this action presents the appearance when examined below the surface of successive strata or layers ; that different kinds of animal and vegetable life have followed one another on the surface, and that some of their remains are found in these strata now ; and that all this has taken enormous periods of time.

<sup>1</sup> P. 167.

<sup>2</sup> P. 162.

All this is exceedingly probable, because it is the way in which, as Laplace first pointed out, under well established scientific laws of matter, particularly the law of gravitation and the law of the radiation of heat, a great fluid mass would naturally change.

There is nothing in that explanation to militate against the Scriptural accounts of the formation of the present world ; and it may have pleased God to make use of the laws of gravitation and radiation of heat in order to bring our world into its present form. But the structure of the earth is not all, or nearly all.

There is found on the earth, and within it, an infinite variety of substances. There are metals ; such as gold, silver, lead, iron, etc. There are precious stones of gorgeous beauty, diamonds, rubies, etc., etc. There is vegetable matter of every description, from the tenderest blade of grass to the hard wood of the forest oak. And there are animals of all classes and all characters, from the lowest mollusk to the most perfect and elaborate vertebrate. And the question is, What made them ? Were they produced by the cooling of the earth ? Was it gravitation or radiation that made the gold, the ruby, the fern, the oak, the animal, and the water ?

But in addition to these various substances, the world abounds with what we call "Laws." There are the laws of electricity, of heat, of chemistry, of force, of motion, etc. ; besides those to which all these great changes are ascribed, the laws of heat and gravitation—and, What made them ? Are they all the result of the cooling of the earth ? Was one mass of fluid matter cooled into iron, one into gold, one into wood, and one into flesh ? and did they all evolve from themselves by some mysterious power, those wonderful laws of nature to which they are all subject and which they all obey ? In their case there was no "struggle for existence," no "survival of the fittest," and no "natural selection"—no thought, no mind, no design, and no plan in themselves ; and it is indeed hard to suppose that they not only evolved themselves, but also evolved laws of such marvellous subtlety and power, that their discovery and use form the greatest achievement of modern science.

It may perhaps interest some to know how it is all supposed to have been done, and as Mr. Herbert Spencer appears to be the great apostle of the theory, I will give, in his own words, the conclusion of his elaborate argument. In "First Principles" (p. 396) he gives his great conclusion, and prints it in italics that there may be no mistake as to its vast importance: "Evolution," he says, "is an integration of matter and concomitant dissipation of motion, during which the matter passes from an indefinite, incoherent homogeneity to a definite, coherent heterogeneity, and during which the retained motion

undergoes a parallel transformation." Is it for such as that that we are to give up our faith in the creation of God?

But this is not all, for not merely is the earth filled with various substances, and governed by various laws; but there is a third element for which even Mr. Spencer's definition fails to account, and that is life. There is life abounding everywhere; but what science can tell us either what it is or whence it came? Was it produced either by gravitation or radiation? Did the cooling of the earth produce life on its surface? I know no greater evidence of the utter failure of the evolutionist theory than the suggestion made on one occasion (I think in an inaugural address to the British Association), that life came in a meteoric stone from some already formed habitable world. With reference to such an idea it is enough to ask four questions. How did it get into that other world? How did it attach itself to the meteoric stone? How did it survive the awful blow which it must have experienced when it struck the earth? and how did it spread itself when it found itself alone in the utter loneliness of an uninhabited world? Such is the theory of those who would struggle to create a world without a God; and I venture to affirm that there is infinitely more true science in the words, "All things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made that was made. In Him was life, and the life was the light of men."

But, though I have thus followed Bishop Temple in his two-fold division of the theory of Evolution, there is another two-fold division which I regard as of incomparably greater importance. I refer to the Theistic and Atheistic theory.

I. There is a Theistic theory, for there can be no doubt whatever that many of those who accept the Evolution theory hold it in the firm belief in the creative power of a self-existing Creator. Bishop Temple, *e.g.*, states the question thus:

In the one case the Creator made the animals at once such as they now are; in the other case He impressed on certain particles of matter, which either at the beginning or at some point in the history of His creation He endowed with life, such inherent powers that in the ordinary course of time living creatures such as the present were developed. The creative power remains the same in either case.<sup>1</sup>

For my own part, I should be almost disposed to consider that the creative power was the greater on the theory of Evolution; for to make a germ which should evolve itself into all the countless varieties, both of animate and inanimate existence, is, if possible, a greater miracle than the creation of each separate species. There is great skill shown in the manufacture both of a railway train and a steamboat, but the

<sup>1</sup> "Lectures," p. 114.

skill would be of a much higher order if a person were to construct a train with its engine and all its carriages, and impart to it the remarkable property that when it arrived at the sea-coast it should of itself, without the action of man, turn itself into a steamboat.

Thus a person may hold the Evolution theory to its fullest extent without entertaining the slightest doubt as to the creative power of our God. Indeed, Bishop Temple says :

The doctrine of Evolution leaves the argument for an intelligent Creator and Governor of the world stronger than it was before. There is still as much as ever the proof of an intelligent purpose pervading all creation. The difference is that the execution of that purpose belongs more to the original act of creation, less to acts of government since. There is more Divine foresight, there is less Divine interposition ; and whatever has been taken from the latter has been added to the former. (P. 122.)

There is such a joy in the blessed assurance of Divine interposition, and it seems so clearly taught in Scripture, that it is impossible to regard without the utmost jealousy the suggestion of even such a transfer as that described in these words. But still, however greatly we may regret the theory, we are bound in justice to recognise the fact that those who hold it may believe in a Creator God with a faith as firm and unshaken as that which brings peace to our own souls.

I cannot refrain from adding that this was the view of Darwin himself. He has been claimed as an ally by those who deny the creation of God ; so that it is most satisfactory to read such a passage as that with which his book concludes :

There is grandeur in this view of life, with its several powers, having been originally breathed BY THE CREATOR into a few forms or into one ; and that whilst this planet has gone cycling on according to the fixed law of gravity, from so simple a beginning endless forms, most beautiful and most wonderful, have been and are being evolved. (P. 429.)

We may wholly differ from him in his theory of Evolution, but we rejoice to agree with him in the conviction that life, was originally breathed forth by the Creator.

2. But there is also an Atheistic theory of Evolution, which does, in fact, substitute Evolution for God. The doctrine of Evolution is used, according to Bishop Temple, " to prove that no intelligence planned the world." The theory seems to be that through the power of certain laws the original atoms have gradually evolved themselves into all the beauties and endless varieties of this thickly-peopled world. It is pitiable to see the hopeless shifts to which intelligent men are driven in order to maintain such a theory. They are compelled to face the questions, " Whence came the atoms ? and how did the laws originate ?" And Mr. Herbert Spencer for an answer to such questions is compelled to resort to what he terms " The Per-

sistence of Force." We might push the inquiry one step further, and inquire what was the origin of this Persistence of Force? and we cannot but wonder that a man who is considered one of the great thinkers of the age should not be compelled, when thus driven into a corner, to acknowledge with candour that his persistent force is nothing less than the omnipotence of God. But no, he cannot admit the existence of a God, and in a note on p. 192 of his "First Principles," he actually tells us that he and Professor Huxley invented the term "Persistence of Force," instead of what used to be the term employed, "Conservation of Force," because "Conservation implies a Conserver," and that he denies. Thus his theory of Evolution is employed to show how the world evolved itself without the interference of a Creator, or even a Conserver of Force. The whole thing is supposed to have been done without design, without plan, without intelligence, without skill, and in fact without any action of mind or intelligent power. The whole is supposed to be the result of certain unintelligent laws, not ordained by any Lawgiver, or carried out by any Conserver. In other words, the Evolution theory is the Atheist's substitute for God.

Now surely, if this be the case, those who write and speak in favour of the Evolution theory ought to be much more careful than some of them have been in defining what they are speaking of. Some of them speak of "the doctrine of Evolution," as if there was only one doctrine, and some speak in most rapturous terms of its most extraordinary value—as, e.g., when Mr. Drummond said in Grosvenor House that "It was the great thought of the century, perhaps the greatest the world has ever found out;" but surely when they do so they are bound to tell us what they mean. Do they mean simply growth? or progression? or variation within species? Or do they mean evolution from species to species? or the evolution of the inanimate world? On such points there ought to be a clear and unmistakable definition. Above all, do they mean an evolution by God, or without Him? An evolution by the design of a divine Person, or by "Persistence of Force," whatever that may be? "Evolution," in the vocabulary of Mr. Spencer and his followers, means nothing less than a theory for the formation of the world and all things therein, without the action or design of a personal Creator; and surely it is to be deeply deplored that Christian advocates should employ exactly the same term without the slightest caution or protest. I do not say that in their writings there are no passages which, if carefully collected and spliced together, may indicate what they mean. But what I maintain is, that as the word "Evolution" is employed by them to express the mode according to which our Heavenly

Father has formed the whole creation, both animate and inanimate, and by Atheists to express the mode by which the world is supposed to have formed itself, they ought not to use the word without making it as clear as the sun in heaven in what sense they employ it. They may speak of "Evolution" as the great scientific theory of the day, or as the greatest achievement of the age, and unless they are much more careful than some have been, their authority may be quoted as endorsing the theory invented by Atheists and maintained by them in support of their Atheism. Men's minds are governed by words, and surely we have a right to ask of those who glory in scientific accuracy that they should clearly define what they mean, and not leave their unscientific readers to discover, as best they may, whether they wish us to believe in self-evolution or Divine formation ; in a self-evolution by Persistence of Force, or in a marvellous creation by the design, the skill, and the omnipotence of God. If they write about Evolution in the loose way in which some have done lately while they appear to speak with admiration of Mr. Herbert Spencer's philosophy, they cannot be surprised if they are regarded as teaching his Evolution theory, and if the effect of their writing is to weaken faith and strengthen Atheism.

But let no one suppose for one moment that, because we deplore the loose, inaccurate, and unscientific manner in which some of those who glory in their scientific accuracy appear to confound fact and theory, on that account we undervalue scientific investigations, or think lightly of scientific facts. In proof of this I would conclude this paper by an extract from the writings of a truly scientific investigator, the late Mr. F. Buckland, who writes :

Of late years, the doctrines of so-called Evolution and Development have seemingly gained ground among those interested in natural history ; but to put matters very straight, I steadfastly believe that the Great Creator, as indeed we are directly told, made all things perfect and " very good " from the beginning ; perfect and very good every created thing is now found to be, and will so continue to the end. I am very willing to prove my case, by holding a court at any time or place, before any number of people of any class. I would impanel a jury of the most eminent and skilful railway and mechanical engineers, while the only witnesses I should call would be the fish fresh from the deep-sea trawler, the city fish market, or the fishmonger's slab : I would adduce from them evidence of " design, beauty, and order," as evinced in such as the electric organs of the torpedo, the gun-lock spine of the file-fish, the water-reservoir and spectacles of the eel, the teeth of the gilt-head bream, the anchor of the lump-sucker and remora, the colouring of the perch and bleak, the ichthyophagous teeth of the pike, shark, and silvery hair-tail ; the tail of the fox shark, the prehensile lips of the dory and sprat, the nose of the barbel and dogfish, the resplendence of the arctic *gymnætrus* and scabbard-fish, the dagger in the tail of the sting-ray, the nest of the stickleback, the armour-plates of the sturgeon, the nostril-

breathing powers and store of fat in the salmon ; migrations of the salmon, herring, pilchard, sprat, and mackerel ; and, above all, the enormous fertility of fishes useful as food to the human race. I am satisfied that I should obtain a verdict in favour of my view of the case, namely, that in all these wonderful contrivances there exists evidence of design and forethought, and a wondrous adaptation of means to an end.

E. HOARE.



## ART. II.—THE REVISED VERSION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

### THE TEXT, NOTES, GRAMMATICAL AND OTHER CHANGES, CONCLUSION.

ONE of the troubles of the New Testament Revisers was that they had to frame for themselves what is technically called a *text* as they went along. Owing to the antiquity of the Greek Scriptures, and the numbers of copies, versions, and quotations which have been made from them, the materials for the construction of a text which may fairly represent the autographs of the sacred writers, are embarrassing by reason of their superabundance. The case of the Old Testament is different. Here we have, in the first place, a limited number of variations, contained at the end or in the foot-notes of all Hebrew Bibles; beyond these, we have results of the collations by Kennicott and De Rossi, which can be seen in a compact form in Döderlein and Meisner's Hebrew Bible. The manuscripts from which these collations were made are not of very great weight ; and it appears to be the case that the oldest MS. which is known of, viz., the Aleppo MS., has never been collated at all. Another means whereby we can verify or correct the original text of the Hebrew Scriptures is the Septuagint. This Greek version, defective as it is in many respects, undoubtedly preserves many precious readings which have slipped out of our ordinary Hebrew copies. Those of our readers who know Dr. Cheyne's translation of the Hebrew Psalms, will notice that he often takes advantage of these readings. Sometimes a reading is obtainable by the study of the quotations from the Old Testament to the New, and still more often by the collation of repeated passages in the Old Testament. It should be mentioned that the editions of the Hebrew Bible which the Jews print for themselves differ in no material respect from those printed by Christians.

The Revisers have been very cautious in making textual changes ; and what little they have done will generally com-

mend itself to the student. Thus, in Isa. ix. 6, where we used to read "Thou hast multiplied the nation, and not increased the joy," we now read, "Thou hast multiplied the nation, thou hast increased their joy." In Jud. xviii. 30, Jonathan, the son of Gershom, is now called "the son of Moses," instead of "the son of Manasseh," as in the A.V. The difference lies in one letter, and it is supposed that the Jews put in the letter *n* to save the credit of Moses' family. Those who consult their Hebrew Bible will observe that the letter in question is not printed exactly in the text but rather over it, as if to show that it did not really form part of the old manuscript. In 1 Sam. vi. 18, the R.V. reads thus: "even unto the great (stone of) Abel;" margin, "great stone." The Revisers have taken the old marginal rendering, and have adopted it as their text, quoting as their authority the interpretation of the LXX. and the Targum. In 1 Sam. xii. 11, we read, "the Lord sent Jerubbaal, and Bedan, and Jephthah, and Samuel." Here the Revisers have left the text as it stands, but have rightly given Barak for Bedan in the margin; if they had also suggested Samson's name for that of Samuel, they would have got the four names which are grouped together in Heb. xi. 32. In 1 Sam. xiii. 7, the A.V. begins, "Saul reigned one year," in the margin we have, "Heb. The son of one year in his reigning." But this is a mistake, for the Hebrew word for *one* is not in the text. If we compare 2 Sam. v. 4, we have exactly the same idiom, "The son of thirty years in his reigning." It has been thought, therefore, that a word has dropped out from the Hebrew text of 1 Sam. xiii. 1. Accordingly the Revisers print thus, "Saul was [thirty] years old when he began to reign." In the margin they state that the whole verse is omitted in the unrevised LXX.; but in a later recension, the number *thirty* is inserted.

The letters R and D are very like one another in Hebrew, and have been sometimes substituted for one another. Thus, in Gen. x. 3, 4 we read of Riphath and Dodanim, and in 1 Chron. i. 6, 7 of Diphath and Rodanim. The Revisers might, we think, have harmonized the text in such cases, putting the Hebrew reading from which they depart in the margin: so in the case of Hadadezer and Hadarezer, and similar proper names. In Jud. x. 12, against the word "Maonites," the Revisers have properly inserted the reading "Midianites" from the LXX. In Gen. iv. 7 they have pointed out the very ancient addition to the text, "Let us go into the field." In Gen. vi. 3 they give in the margin another sense for the Spirit *striving*, based probably on a slightly different reading. In Hos. xiv. 2 they have not ventured to put "the fruit of our lips" instead of "the calves of our lips," though

the difference involved by the change would be almost imperceptible, but they have given it in the margin. In Numb. xxi. 30 they have suggested in the margin a reading which only involves the addition of a single letter, and which certainly makes the sense clearer. In Amos iii. 12 they seem to have been puzzled, and have put in the text "on the silken cushions of a bed," and in the margin "in Damascus on a bed." Damask may have been a recognised material in those days, and a damask couch is probably what is referred to. In 2 Sam. viii. 13 they have not ventured to alter the text from Syria (Aram) to Edom, though they must have been morally certain that the alteration was needed. In one case, however, viz., 1 Chron. vi. 28, the Revisers have been bold enough to make a needful change. The word "Vashni," which stands in the A.V., means "and the second;" and a word has dropped out of the Hebrew text, which the Revisers have now added, on the authority of the 33rd verse, and the parallel passage in Samuel: accordingly they read, "the first-born *Joel*, and the second *Abiah*."

On the whole, nothing can exceed the caution with which the Revisers have acted in the matter of text; in fact, they have hardly given English readers the full benefit of the knowledge which the critical student possesses.

The *References* in the R.V. are very defective. One is almost inclined to say that there should either have been more, or none at all. Where a writer incorporates into his text a verse or longer passage taken from the work of one of his predecessors, there ought certainly to be some indication of it; and where there is a definite historical reference, as in Deut. xxiv. 9, "Remember what the Lord thy God did unto Miriam, by the way as ye came forth out of Egypt," it seems hard that the reader should not have the key to the allusion put into his hand. The rule appointed for our translators in 1611 was a very good one, that "such quotation of places should be marginally set down as should serve for the fit reference of one Scripture to another." The tendency has been to have too many rather than too few. Dr. Scrivener says that more than half the references contained in the edition of 1611 are derived from manuscript and printed copies of the Latin Vulgate; but he adds that we have now seven times as many references as there were in the original editions of the A.V. The Revisers have gone to the opposite extreme, and have failed to show how the various books of the Bible are knit together; and how not only the most notable events, but the very words of passages contained in early Books are referred to or reproduced in the later. Now and then, indeed, the R.V. gives us

a remarkable reference. A good instance will be found in Isa. xl. 2. Here the Hebrew expression, translated in the A.V. "her iniquity is pardoned," is a very peculiar one. The Revisers have rendered it in the margin, "her punishment is accepted," and they give a reference to Lev. xxvi. 43. On turning to this passage we find ourselves near the close of one of the most remarkable prophetic chapters in the Pentateuch, a promise being held out that after Israel has been punished severely for their sin, if they should accept of the punishment of their iniquity, God would remember His covenant with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, and would restore them to their own land. The prophet Isaiah is evidently contemplating that period, and is referring to the very words of the passage in Leviticus.

A great deal of interesting matter is contained in the Revisers' marginal notes. Some of these are geographical, as when *Acmetha* is called *Ecbatana* in the margin, or when one river is explained as the Euphrates, and another as Nile. Others give explanations of names and places. Thus in Gen. iv. 1, where we now read, "I have gotten a man from the Lord," the Revisers read, "I have gotten a man with (the help of) the Lord;" and in the margin, "Hebrew *Kanah*, to get"—whence the name Cain is derived. The text is a curious one, and it is not certain that the Revisers' translation is the right one. Luther has, "I have gotten the man, the Lord." Notes on names will be found in Gen. iv. 25 (Seth), Gen. xvii. 15 (Sarah), Gen. xxix. 32 (Reuben), Exod. ii. 10 (Moses), Exod. xviii. 4 (Eliezer), and in many other places.

We do not think all the notes equally fortunate or even intelligible. Thus in Gen. xxxii. 2, Mahanaim is explained as "Hosts or Companies," but the fact of the word being dual might have been referred to, in connection with the subsequent incidents. It is now thought, indeed, that those old dual forms are not really duals; it is certainly curious that where we get the words "two companies" a few verses further down we have the plural form in the Hebrew. In verse 28 of the same chapter we have given in the margin an interpretation of the name of Israel. In the A.V. it was interpreted as "A prince of God," but in the R.V. as "He who striveth with God, or God striveth." The idea of the word "prince" has vanished entirely from the text. On turning to Hos. xii. 3, 4, we now read thus: "in his manhood he had power with God; yea, he had power over the angel, and prevailed;" and in the margin, against the word "power" (where it first occurs), we find "stroved." The Hebrew verb *Sarah* is only used in these two passages. The word *Sar* is a universal word in Hebrew for a prince. Why, then, should the thought of *strife* take the place

of it? The Revisers may be right etymologically, but where a rare verb can only be interpreted either by its cognate noun or else from Arabic sources, we shall generally prefer the former derivation.

Readers will notice the marginal rendering in Gen. xxviii. 13, according to which instead of reading "the Lord stood above it," we read "the Lord stood beside him." This certainly brings heaven very near to earth, and perhaps throws light on our Lord's words at the end of John i. But the interpretation seems hardly justified by the Hebrew. In the previous chapter (Gen. xxvii. 39) instead of Esau having his dwelling "of the fatness of the earth and the dew of heaven," it is suggested in the margin that he was to have his dwelling *away from* the fatness of the earth, etc. This is clever, but the Hebrew would probably be different if this idea was to be conveyed.

We do not know the good of putting the Hebrew word *kesitah* in the margin against Gen. xxxiii. 19; it cannot help an English reader. The interpretation of the "coat" given to Joseph, as "a long garment with sleeves," is what one would expect in a Bible Dictionary rather than in a Bible. The word first occurs in Gen. iii. 21, and it is a pity that if it means a long garment with sleeves the Revisers did not tell us so there. The truth is that the word needs no note; it is a most common word, and has travelled into many languages, including our own. If, however, a note had been put against the word translated "of many colours," something useful would have been done.

Passing by the note on Gen. xxxviii. 21, we observe that Pharaoh's magicians (Gen. xli. 8) are called "sacred scribes." The word is *Chartummim*, and we suppose that Khartoum is from the same root. These people *may* have been scribes. In Gen. xlvi. 7, instead of "Rachel died by me," the margin suggests "Rachel died to my sorrow;" but will the text bear it?

In Gen. xlix. 10, we now read: "until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the obedience of the peoples be." The rendering of the latter clause is accurate. Three other interpretations are suggested in the margin—(1) *till he come to Shiloh*, having the obedience of the peoples; (2) *until that which is his shall come* etc.; (3) *till he come, whose it is*, etc. Some reviewers have found serious fault with the Revisers for inserting these alternative renderings, which are supposed to do away with the Messianic bearing of the text. But if the Revisers felt that there was sufficient cause for embodying those three suggestions in the margin they could not well help doing so. What does the passage state? it speaks of Judah as destined to hold the sceptre. This is plain, and it is also plain that Judah did not begin to hold the sceptre until David

was king. How long was this pre-eminence of Judah to continue? As a matter of fact, when Benjamin became absorbed in Judah so as to be counted as one tribe with it, Jerusalem (which was properly speaking, in the tribe of Benjamin) became the chief city of Judah, having supplanted Hebron. And Jerusalem retained its political and spiritual predominance until the Lord came. Then, when all peoples were gathered to Him and yielded obedience to Him Who was the Lion of the Tribe of Judah, Jerusalem had served its purpose and the prophecy had been fulfilled. It would hardly be fitting to discuss at length in these pages the history of the interpretation of this text, or the critical difficulties which attach to some of the alternative renderings now inserted in the margin. An elaborate paper by Professor Driver in the summer number of the *Journal of Philology*, will lead most readers to the conclusion that no interpretation can give perfect satisfaction. Whether Shiloh means the peace-giver, or whether we should translate the sentence, "till he come to Shiloh," *i.e.* to the place of peace (compare the meaning of the word Jerusalem—the inheritance of peace), or whether there is some hidden sense in the then novel word Shiloh, answering to the words "He whose right it is"—whether any of these or some other interpretation of this particular clause be correct, may be open to question; but the general bearing of the words on the future of Judah and Jerusalem, and the fact that the passage is a link between the promise made to Abraham and that made to David, seems unquestionable.

In Deut. xxx. 3 we read, A.V., "the Lord thy God will turn thy captivity." This expression came into common use in after-times in Israel—probably on the strength of this primary passage. The Revisers have suggested in the margin "the Lord will return to thy captivity." At first sight this is not very clear. But the word "captivity" in the Bible frequently means the company of people taken captive; and the Revisers, we suppose, took it in this sense.

Attention may be called to one other marginal note in the Pentateuch, viz., in Exod. xxxiv. 29, where we read that Moses' face "shone" by reason of his speaking with God. The margin says it sent forth beams, or was horned. This interpretation is the origin of old pictures of Moses with horn-like objects protruding from his head.

The old marginal note in Judges xi. 40 is taken out. Perhaps some readers never noticed it. If the daughters of Israel went to "talk with" Jephtha's daughter; she was manifestly not slain. A reference is given in connection with this note to Judges v. 11, where the same Hebrew word (*Tanah*) is rendered "rehearse." The verb is only used in

these two places. The Revisers have put "to celebrate" (margin, "lament") in Judges xi. 40, but have not altered the other passage. There is a curious alternative rendering in 1 Sam. xviii. 10, where Saul is described as "raving" instead of "prophesying." The ordinary Hebrew word for prophesying is used in the passage. There seems little doubt that our idea of prophecy is too restricted, and that the stirring of the depths of the human soul which took place when God spoke to mortal man was sometimes (consciously or unconsciously) imitated when evil spirits took possession of the frame. We should have preferred the word "frenzy" to "raving."

There is a singular expression used by David in 2 Sam. vii. 19, translated in the A.V. "is this the manner" (margin, "law") "of man, O Lord God?" The R.V. has "this too after the manner of men;" in the margin, "is this the law of man?" In the parallel place (1 Chron. xvii. 17), the A.V. and R.V. have, "thou hast regarded me according to the estate of a man of high degree." The Hebrew in both passages is worth careful study. Luther sees in both passages an indication of Messianic doctrine, and has expressed this view in his version.

In 2 Sam. viii. 18 the Old Version has "David's sons were chief rulers" (margin, "princes"). In the New the text gives "David's sons were priests" (margin, "chief ministers"). The same change is made in chap. xx. 28. In what the priesthood of these men consisted no one knows; but the Hebrew word *cohen* was probably a political rather than a religious word, and perhaps signified an administrator. It might have been best to have put "minister" in the text, and in the margin "Hebrew *cohen*, the word usually translated priest."

In 1 Chron. xxi. 1 the Revisers have retained the old text, "Satan stood up," but have properly inserted in the margin, "an adversary." This ought to have been put in the text. Where the word Satan has the definitive article before it, as in Job i. 6, it may be taken as a proper name, but not otherwise. The best illustration of 1 Chron. xxi. 1 in connection with the parallel 2 Sam. xxiv. 1, is 1 Kings xi. 14, where we read that the Lord stirred up an adversary (*lit.* a Satan) against Solomon. The mischief done was in one sense the Lord's doing, and in another sense an adversary's doing. This was doubtless the case when David numbered the people.

The note against the first verse of Ecclesiastes will be observed; instead of "the preacher" we may read "the great orator." How the Revisers have extracted this meaning out of the word *koheleth* we know not. In some of the South Sea languages the word for Bishop means Big preacher, but English preachers have never till now had any encouragement

offered them to consider themselves great orators. Still, "great orator" sounds less dangerous than "Congregationalist," which is the literal rendering of the word. In Prov. viii. 22, instead of "the Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old," we read in the margin, "The Lord formed me as the beginning of his way, the first of his works of old." We strongly object to the word "formed." We know of no authority for this rendering. The word *Kanah* (from which Cain's name is derived) means to obtain, acquire, or purchase, but certainly not to form.

There are some important notes on the Psalms. We will only single out a few for observation. In Ps. ii. 12 the Revisers have retained the rendering "kiss the son," but they have given two other ancient renderings, "lay hold of instruction," and "worship in purity." Fault has been found with them for so doing, but they could not well do otherwise. If the word translated "son" in this verse had been the ordinary one which we have in the seventh verse, the case would have been different. Our own feeling is one of satisfaction that the Revisers as a body felt the existing version to be the best here, and we are not inclined to quarrel with them because they refer to other versions. Another interesting reference to ancient versions is to be found at Ps. xx. 9.

Against Ps. lxxxix. 15, for "the joyful sound" we have "the trumpet sound," which is good; but the note against Ps. xcvi. 9 does not strike us as so good—the verse becomes a call to worship the Lord "in holy array." This will please some readers, but we doubt if the Hebrew admits of it. In Ps. cxxxiii. 2, the oil, instead of going down to the skirt of Aaron's garments, only gets as far as the collar. The Hebrew word is mouth, or aperture, and is translated "collar" in Job xxx. 18 in the A.V. It signifies the part at which a man entered his garment, and we imagine that Aaron entered his garment at the lower end, not at the comparatively narrow aperture through which he could only push his head; but others, we suppose, think differently.

Passing to the subject of grammatical changes, we feel the exceeding difficulty of offering any criticism, or of making any suggestions. The Revisers have not done anything startling; but here, as in other matters, their work has been patiently done, though a good deal of it is almost of a character to escape observation. We can only touch on a few points.

Much could be done to improve our Authorised Version by a more careful use of the definite article. The Revisers have had this in their mind. It seems curious to read of "a Tophet" instead of "Tophet" in Isa. xxx. 33; but it is more

startling to find "a son of a God" in Dan. iii. 21, "and "a son of man" in Dan. vii. 13, and "one that was ancient of days" instead of "the ancient of days" in the ninth verse. A sort of intuitive tact is needed, as well as grammatical acumen, in order to decide what course to take in such cases as these. We quite approve of "*the cherubim*" in Gen. iii. 24, and "*a Redeemer*" in Isa. lxix. 20, and "*the King*" in Hos. x. 3 and 15; but why should we read "*the peoples*" in Hos. x. 10?

The use of prepositions in Hebrew is sometimes peculiar. In some cases the Revisers have sacrificed sense to what they believed to be grammar, as in Isa. xxvi. 4, where they read "in the Lord Jehovah is an everlasting Rock." The word *in* ought not to have been introduced. Readers will observe that in Ps. lxxii. 15 the Revisers have put "men shall pray *for* him." The word means "because of," or "for the sake of," and there ought to have been a marginal note to this effect. The Revisers have made a slip in Jonah ii. 9, where they have put "salvation is of the Lord," forgetting that the passage is a quotation from Ps. iii. 8, where we read "salvation belongeth unto the Lord."

In the use of the *tenses* the Revisers had a high authority among them. Some of the changes are noteworthy. Thus, Joel ii. 18: "Then was the Lord jealous for his land, and had pity on his people;" Mal. i. 11, "My name is great among the Gentiles;" Isa. liii. 2, "He grew up before him as a tender plant . . . and when we see him there is no beauty that we should desire him;" Numb. xxiv. 17, "I see him, but not now; I behold him, but not nigh;" Ps. xviii. 43, "Thou hast delivered me from the strivings of the people: thou hast made me the head of the heathen."

The emphatic personal pronoun ought to be marked wherever possible. This may be done, as in Ps. xxvi. 11, by introducing the expression "as for me" before the principal verb, or by adopting the word "myself." We miss corrections which we had hoped to find in many places under this head; as in Ps. xl. 17, in lix. 16, and in Hos. ii. 8.

The change of conjunction and tense will be noticed in Ps. cii. 16, where the Revisers read, "For the Lord hath built up Zion; he hath appeared in his glory."

There is a word frequently used in the A.V. of the Old and New Testament which is often very misleading: it is the word "*then*." The student of the chronology of the Gospels and Acts has constantly to strike his pen through it; for many of the things said to have happened *then* are proved to have happened some time afterwards, or even before. In the Old Testament the case is somewhat similar; as the word frequently introduces a false sequence and gives a chronological

force which the original does not justify. Thus, 1 Chron. xxii. 1 : “Then David said, This is the house of the Lord.” It may have been *then*, but the Hebrew Bible does not say so. Readers of the English Bible might fairly have expected accuracy in the R.V. in this matter; but although some *thens* have been done away with, many remain which are misleading.

There are certain passages which the Revisers have left standing, where we looked for some alterations either in the text or in the margin. Thus, Gen. xxv. 18, “they dwelt from Havilah unto Shur that is before Egypt, as thou goest toward Assyria.” The last clause is puzzling from a geographical point of view. In 1 Sam. xv. 7, we are told that “Saul smote the Amalekites, from Havilah as thou goest to Shur, that is before Egypt;” and in 1 Sam. xxvii. 8, we read of the Amalekites and others as “inhabitants of the land, which were of old, as thou goest to Shur, even unto the land of Egypt.” The words “Assyria” and “Shur” are almost the same in Hebrew; and a note on the passage in Genesis would have elucidated the text.

Gen. xxv. 32, “Behold I am at the point to die.” Is that the whole force of Esau’s words? Gen. xxxiv. 30, “Ye have made me to stink.” Would not “unsavoury” have been enough? In Gen. xl. 1, etc., Pharaoh is still represented as having “butlers.” Why not cupbearers, as in 1 Kings x. 5? According to the A.V. and R.V. in Exod. xiv. 21, the water is still made to go *back* by a strong east wind, but it probably went forward. In Numb. xxiii. 10, Balaam still prays that his “last end” may be like that of the righteous, whereas he is probably speaking of his “final condition,” a matter of far greater importance. In Deut. iii. 11, Og is still said to have been possessed of an iron bedstead; and in Deut. xxxii. 14, wheat is still supposed to have kidneys. “God save the king” is retained as a version of “vivat rex;” and “God forbid” is retained instead of “far be it.” Swearing is still described as “lifting the hand” (Ez. xx), and we continue to read of a “darling” in Ps. xxxv. 17.

The Revisers might have inserted, in text or margin, the exact renderings of some peculiar words or expressions with which every Hebrew student is familiar. Thus, Ps. ii. 6, “I have set my king.” The A.V. here has, in the margin, “anointed;” but the word means, to pour out as a drink-offering. Ps. xix. 3, R.V., “Their sound cannot be heard.” This is hardly literal. The margin of the A.V. gives the literal rendering, which ought to have been preserved. In Ps. xlix. 2, the rendering “high and low” runs easily, but is not exact. The literal reading should have been given in the

margin, in at least one of the places where the expression occurs. Compare Ps. lxii. 9. No alteration has been made in Ps. lxxxvi. 3, though preachers often take the close of the verse in another way. The grammar is certainly in favour of the English as it stands. In Ps. vi. 15, we read, "Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints." There is a peculiarity in the grammar here which might well be noted in the margin. Jacob still says, "how dreadful is this place" (Gen. xviii. 17); and David continues to "scrabble," instead of "scribbling," on the doors of Gath. In Ps. viii. 6, the waters of Shiloah are represented as going "softly," without a reference to the translation suggested by the Palestine explorers. In Micah vi. 8, as well as Deut. x. 12, we continue to read, "What doth the Lord require of thee," without a hint given that the word means to seek, ask, or desire, rather than require. In Hab. ii. 2, a message is still to be written on "tables," although the word "tablets" has been properly used in Isa. xxx. 8. In Isa. vii. 23, we continue to read of "a thousand silverlings," although in Cant. viii. 11 the more intelligible expression is found. In spite of American protests, the word "fray" has held its ground in Zec. x. 21, and the "hornet" is retained in Exod. xxiii. 28, without any suggestion of the Egyptian national insect. We still read about "entering into peace" in Isa. lvii. 2, as if the expression "depart in peace" had never been heard of. The "region" of Argob is preserved without a note on the characteristic expression, and "like people like priest" is gravely retained in Hos. iv. 9, as if Isa. xxiv. 2 (where the same Hebrew idiom occurs) had never been written. We still read of the circle of the heavens in Isa. xl. 22, and the "circuit," where the Hebrew is the same, in Job xxii. 14. The Revisers have courageously retained the expression "should have reigned" in 2 Kings iii. 27, as if the Prince of Edom were not already reigning—a fact which the prophet Amos appears to certify; and in 2 Kings viii. 16, they have put "Jehoshaphat being *then* king," without printing the word "then" in italics, and thus obscuring the fact that father and son were reigning together.

These may be said to be all little things; probably all of them were considered at the time by some of the Revisers; but they did not see their way on these and some similar points to make the simple alterations or marginal suggestions which many students wished for.

Some interesting changes in familiar or difficult passages may now be noticed. Gen. i. 2, "waste and void." This is a decided improvement on "without form and void;" compare Jer. iv. 23, where the passage is quoted. The words appear again together in Isa. xxxiv. 11; but here, strange to say, the

Revisers have failed to give a harmonious rendering. They have given a strict rendering of Gen. i. 5. and similar verses; and although at first it may give no satisfaction, it will be seen in time to have a bearing on the truth. Sea-monsters are better than whales in the 21st verse. The serpent's question to Eve, Gen. iii. 1, is more accurate in the Revised Version, and brings out the fact that Satan attempted to exaggerate the restrictions which God laid on our first parents. We doubt if the marginal note in the 15th verse is called for; and we prefer a flaming sword to the flame of a sword: possibly a sword-like flame would convey the sense. Observe, in chap. iv. 7, "Sin coucheth at the door," and verse 15, "The Lord appointed a sign for Cain." People usually suppose that Cain was branded on his forehead; but the new rendering, which is accurate, gives a very different idea. The change in chap. ix. 5 is to be observed, "Your blood, the blood of your lives, will I require." In other words, God requires an account of life-blood. The introduction of the word "Dammesek" into the text, in chap. xv. 2., is ludicrous. Dammesek is the ordinary Hebrew spelling of Damascus. There are difficulties in the verse, but these are not alleviated by introducing this barbarous word into the text. Ishmael figures as a "wild-ass" now in Gen. xvi. 12, and Anah finds "hot springs" instead of mules in Gen. xxxvi. 24. Seraiah is no more a quiet prince but a "chief-chamberlain," or, if you will, a "quarter-master" in Jer. li. 59. The Israelites are no longer told to "borrow" jewels, but to "ask" for them (Exod. xi. 2). Abraham has been acquitted of "planting a grove," Gen. xxi. 33 (R.V., "tamarisk"). In Gen. xxii. 14 the true sense of "Jehovah Jireh" is indicated in the words that follow, "for the mount of the Lord it shall be provided." Leah cries out, "Fortunate!" instead of "A troop cometh" (Gen. xxx. 11); and the same Hebrew word is rendered "fortune" in Isa. lxv. 11. Leah and Rachel were half heathenish, and perhaps they had picked up the expression from others. In Gen. xlvi. 36 the Revisers have only ventured to put in the margin what deserved to find its way into the text—"all these things are upon me." The treasure cities of Exod. i. 11 are turned into "store cities." The word is peculiar, but occurs again in 2Chron. xvi. 4. Some people think that one of these cities has been discovered at Tell el Maskutah (near Tell el Kebir); but they have not noticed the possible relationship between the names. Moses figures as a bridegroom in Exod. iv. 25; and there is no note to give the Jewish interpretation of this difficult passage. Deut. xx. 19 now closes thus, "Is the tree of the field man, that it should be besieged of thee?"

No material change has been made in the Ten Command-

ments, but the word translated "in vain" appears to us to be imperfectly explained in the margin, and we still read of "all that in them is." The question of fermented wine is left very much where it was; but the discussion about marrying a deceased wife's sister nearly broke out afresh when the Revised Version of Lev. xviii. 18 was read. We are quite content with the margin of our Authorised Version here. We must leave it for zoologists to go through the list of clean and unclean beasts. There must have been the greatest pains taken in these things, as there have in all matters of topographical and antiquarian interest. Deut. i. 7 gives a good idea of the topographical changes introduced. The "Arabah" here stands for the Ghor or Jordan Valley; then comes the hill country, running north and south through the land; then the lowlands more westerly; then the south, or negeb, of Judea; and finally the sea-coast. We are almost sorry that the Revisers did not venture on the word *wady* for *nachal*, but watercourse would fairly have given the sense had it not been used in the R.V. for a very different term.

The "bleatings of the flocks" are turned to the "pipings for the flocks" in Judges v. 16, and the "ornaments" on the camels are now called "crescents," Judges viii. 21. The hollow place whence the water came is no more called the "jawbone" but "Lehi," in Judges xv. 19, the "jawbone" being allowed to lie in the margin. Huldah is no longer allowed to dwell in a "college," but in the "second quarter" (2 Kings xxii. 14). This is hard upon the advocates of ladies' colleges, but it was inevitable. We are glad to see "the tongue of fire" introduced in Isa. v. 24, and the formula "as the Lord liveth" in Jer. v. 2.

Great pains have been taken with the Book of Job, one of the most difficult books in the Bible. The passage which calls for most attention here is chap. xix. 25, 26, 27. Every reader of the A.V. must be struck with the number of italics this passage contains; and these italics exhibit the attempts to make up for the exceeding brevity and abstruseness of the text. The difficulty does not lie in the words, but in their sense. The middle verse stands thus in the R.V., "and after my skin hath been thus destroyed, yet from my flesh shall I see God." There are alternative renderings in the margin, but they are not clearer than this; a little touch often brings out the force of the original; thus Ps. v. 3 runs thus: "in the morning will I order (my prayer) unto thee, and will keep watch." Praying and watching are thus linked together. So in Ps. xvi. 2, "I have no good beyond thee," gives excellent sense. We do not care for the "cords of death," Ps. xviii. 4; "the bands" do better, and St. Peter's version, "pains," ought

to have been in the margin. Ps. ix. 17 ("the wicked shall return to sheol") reads rather strangely. Had they been there before? In Ps. xlv. 13 the King's daughter is now described as "all glorious within *the palace*," not in her inner being. This gives the true sense. "Free among the dead" is replaced by "cast off among the dead" (Ps. lxxxviii. 5). In Ps. cx. 3 we now read, "thy people offer themselves willingly in the day of thy power," another decided improvement.

In Isa. vii. 16 the R.V. runs thus: "The land whose two kings thou abhorrest shall be forsaken." This is a bold version; but will readers understand it?

The ninth chapter begins thus: "But there shall be no gloom to her that was in anguish. In the former time he brought into contempt the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali, but in the latter time hath he made it glorious." This is a feeling after a better version, and will be helpful.

Isa. xxvi. 19 opens thus: "Thy dead shall live; my dead bodies shall arise." At first sight this seems obscure; but there is ground for the departure from the old version. The twelfth verse of the next chapter gains precision from the new rendering, "the Lord shall beat off his fruit, and ye shall be gathered" (*i.e.*, as fruit is gathered) "one by one." A still greater change is made in chap. lix. 19. The old version is very beautiful, "when the enemy shall come in like a flood the Spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against him." But the new version has much to be said for it: "for he shall come as a rushing stream, which the breath of the Lord driveth." The strangeness of Ezek. xiii. 18 is a little removed by the Revisers. The pillows are sown to elbows, and the kerchiefs are put on the head of persons of every stature. But the verse is still obscure.

The Revisers seem to have bestowed great pains on the prophecy of the seventy weeks in Daniel ix. But there is even yet room for improvement. We are sorry to lose the word "Messiah" from the text. The twenty-sixth verse now runs thus: "After the threescore and two" (why not sixty-two?) "weeks shall the anointed one be cut off, and shall have nothing." We doubt this last clause. Interpreting this brief Hebrew expression by similar passages, we believe that it means, "and none shall be for him." The passage closes in the R.V. with the pouring out of wrath upon the "desolator," not on the "desolate."

The words "hear" and "answer" are frequently the same in Hebrew. Illustrations of this may be seen in the Revised Psalms; but the most interesting passage is Hos. ii. 21, where the R.V. reads: "I will answer the heavens, and they shall answer the earth," etc.

In Hag. ii. 7, instead of "the desire of all nations shall come," we read, "the desirable things of all nations shall come." The correspondence in the *Guardian* which this rendering has caused only tends to show the difficulty of determining absolutely the right rendering. The object of all nations' desire seems to be what is spoken of, but the words "shall come" is in the plural—hence the difficulty. A plural verb following a singular noun. We do not think that the Revisers have hit upon the real solution.

There is only one other point to notice before drawing these papers to a close. Will the R.V. of the Psalms chaunt? Some of the Revisers are musical, and they had this matter brought before them; but we know not whether it was specially referred to a musical sub-committee to arrange for the needful balancing of the sentences. We need not remind our readers that the reason why both the Roman and English Churches do not chaunt what may be called their authorised versions of the Psalms is because they had got used to the swing of the old words and could not brook the lack of the familiar rhythm. If the leading organists were to give a satisfactory report on the rhythmical character of the R.V., that would be a considerable step towards introducing the Psalms into public use. There is no reason in the nature of things why there should be one version in the Bible and another in the Prayer Book; and the sooner this anomaly is done away with the better.

The criticisms in the four papers now brought to a close may seem to some hypercritical; to others they may indicate that the Revision is unworthy of its authors. This conclusion is anything but what the writer desires. In reviewing so great a work it is hardly possible, and certainly it would not be right, to heap up indiscriminate praise, or to hide those defects which one observes by patient study of the whole work. It would be pleasant to go through passage after passage in order to show what has been done as well as to point out mistakes and omissions, but our readers would hardly thank us for our trouble.

On looking over the undertaking as a whole, we feel sure that the work has been faithfully and wisely done; many difficulties of idiom and translation have been removed; many obscurities and ambiguities have been cleared up; and there has been a tendency towards greater accuracy and consistency of rendering. When we consider the age of the Hebrew Books, the brevity and minuteness of the writers' allusions to the thousand fleeting ways and thoughts of their day, the variety of topics touched upon, and the absence of contemporary literature which would serve to illustrate the language,

we may well wonder and rejoice that we have so grand a Version and so helpful a Revision as we now possess. All honour to those who have laboured steadfastly to this great end. Their names will be emblazoned in the religious history of this century. They look not, however, to the praise of their contemporaries as their real reward, for they have a greater recompense owing to the nature of the work on which they have been engaged. May the blessing which they must have enjoyed amidst their sacred labours be widely diffused amongst our readers, and may it leave its healthful influence on the translations of Scripture to be made or revised hereafter for the benefit of all people and nations and languages upon earth.

R. B. GIRDLESTONE.



### ART. III.—SAINTS' DAYS IN THE CHURCH'S YEAR.

#### X. OCTOBER. ST. SIMON AND ST. JUDE.

##### A. THE APOSTOLIC AND PROPHETIC FOUNDATION.

“*The foundation of the Apostles and Prophets,<sup>1</sup> Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone.*”—EPH. ii. 20.

FEW Collects are more frequently used in our English Churches before the sermon, and few are more appropriate to such use, than that which is appointed for the Festival of St. Simon and St. Jude. No prayer at such a time could be better than that we may be “so joined together in unity of spirit by the doctrine of the Apostles and Prophets,” so that we may be all built “into a holy temple,” the one only “corner-stone” of that apostolic and prophetic foundation being “Jesus Christ Himself.” As to the practice of using a collect at this moment of the service, it is quite enough to say that it is a good custom, justified by very solid reasons. At no moment of the service is a special prayer of this kind more needed alike by the preacher and the congregation.

The composer of the Collect clearly took the words which we find here in the Epistle to the Ephesians, and incorporated them into the prayer for the day, and made them its distinctive feature. And if we were to seek for a reason why this was done in the Collect for the day marked by the names of St. Simon and St. Jude, we might perhaps say this. Other men, Apostles and Evangelists, who appear in this way in our

<sup>1</sup> A question, not quite easy to be answered, might be raised here in consequence of the word “Prophets” being placed after the word “Apostles.” Whatever we may say of the Old Testament, the Prophets of the New Testament must not be overlooked.

Calendar, have something marked and personal, which may be employed to give point to the service. Thus St. Matthew was "called from the receipt of custom;" St. Luke was a "physician of the soul;" St. Thomas, "for the greater confirmation of the faith, was suffered to doubt." But the personal history of St. Simon and St. Jude is obscure. All that can be said of them is what may be said equally of any and of all the Apostles and Prophets of the New Testament. St. Simon and St. Jude are simply exhibited to us here as having co-operated together in the founding of the Christian Church. Our thoughts then are turned generally to "the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief cornerstone."

But what is meant in this verse by "the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets"? The meaning is not quite so obvious as appears at first sight. Let us look at the matter closely. In familiar passages of the Scripture we often think we understand the meaning simply because we have used the words for years without understanding them.

Is the meaning this, that the Apostles and Prophets are "the foundation" of our holy religion, in common with Jesus Christ, Who is, of course, the chief part of the foundation? At first sight, as we read the passage in the English Version, this would seem to be the meaning. And it is certainly true that they were our first teachers after the Resurrection; and in that sense we trace up our Christian beginnings to them. But it seems hardly natural to say that they were the "foundation" of the great building of the Church. They themselves rested on Christ. Great as were these early living stones of the Temple, there was something still below them: and that which has something still below it is not the foundation. So St. Paul himself says in another Epistle: "Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ."<sup>1</sup>

Does then St. Paul here denote the foundation on which the Apostles and Prophets themselves rested? It can hardly be that this is the full meaning. This would seem to give too unimportant a place to the Apostles and Prophets. For *all* Christians in *every* age rest upon that foundation. So St. Peter says, addressing the Christian people at large: "Unto Whom coming, as unto a living stone, ye also, as living stones, are being built up a spiritual house."<sup>2</sup> The reference made to the Apostles and Prophets in this passage is so pointed that it appears evidently to mean something more than that they are merely an example which we are carefully to follow.

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. iii. 11.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Pet. ii. 4, 5.

There is another view, which, for simplicity and fulness of meaning, is more satisfactory, viz., *this*, that we are reminded here of the foundation which the Apostles and Prophets *laid*. They were not strictly the foundation. And they were something more than stones in that foundation. They took an active part in placing that great foundation-stone and setting, once for all, the lower courses of the building which has been rising, age after age, ever since. To this effect we may quote St. Paul again: “According to the grace of God which is given to me, as a wise master-builder, I have laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereupon.”<sup>1</sup>

And how did they lay the foundation? They laid it by revealing Christ in His person, in His offices, in His work for His people, and in His life, the memory of which runs through all the history of the Church. They showed how all depends on Him; how all Christianity has its central point in Him; how everything is weak without Him; how with Him and in Him everything is strong. This is “the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets,” or, as we might otherwise translate it, “the Apostolic and Prophetic foundation.”

“Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone,” all the foundation is concentrated, as it were, in the chief corner-stone. This is the foundation in its fullest sense. All the stress is laid here. All parts of the building meet here, and here find their resting-place and support. In every sense this is true. It is true historically. Follow the line of the old *Hebrew* wall, which is built up of the saints of the olden time, patriarchs and prophets of the Old Testament, and many an obscure and humble believer never mentioned in the sacred books, and you will find that wall leads to and reposes on Christ the corner-stone. Or follow up the *Christian* wall which has been built up of those that believed in Him since He came, and honoured Him and served Him, till we come back to the Apostles and the Prophets of the New Testament, who were both the early stones and the first builders, and you will find that in Christ and upon Christ this structure meets and becomes one with the former.

As to any objections that might be made to this view from the mixing of metaphors, all that need be said is this, that Scriptural images are not set before us with mathematical precision. Rather there is in them a rich and suggestive poetry, whereby the sacred meaning of such passages can be apprehended on many sides. Our part is to collect from it some instruction for ourselves. Its instruction is very plain, and evidently this, that if we are to be safe, if we are to be strong,

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. iii. 10.

and if our lives are to be seemly and orderly, if we are to adorn the place which God's providence has found for us, we must build and rest where the Apostles and Prophets builded and rested, on the one immovable foundation and cornerstone, "in Whom all the building, fitly framed together, groweth unto a holy temple in the Lord."<sup>1</sup>

And there is one word more, which we might easily overlook, simply because we are so familiar with the sentence and have heard it so often. This is the word "Himself," "Jesus Christ Himself"—Himself, and no other—"being the chief corner-stone."

This expression gives to Him an exclusive position in regard to our salvation and spiritual life. None other can take His place in this respect. The contrast is very strong between Him and the Apostles and Prophets, however great they be. The whole passage assigns to the Lord Jesus an unapproachable pre-eminence. This is everywhere the language of St. Paul, who, as has been well said, is "never weary of extolling His dignity and glory."<sup>2</sup>

And yet, if we use such language, the phrase is inclusive. The Lord Himself is built into the Temple. He is one with us, and we with Him. The union is so close that it cannot be broken without injury both to the Church and to Him. Separated from Him, the whole fabric, however fair and beautiful to outward view, would crumble away and fall. Separated from His people, if this were possible, the work of Christ would be in vain.

---

#### B. THE SALUTATION OF ST. JUDE.

"*Mercy unto you, and peace, and love be multiplied.*"—JUDE 2.

Concerning the life and labours of St. Jude we know nothing authentic. His mind, however, is set before us in the first verse. He there describes himself as "the brother of James." Whatever be the reason why this peculiar designation is adopted, whether as a proof of brotherly affection, or as a mark of the respect due to James, it is worth while to note (if it is the same James) that two of the Epistles which we possess in the New Testament were written by *two brothers*. There is no other circumstance of the same kind to be found in the sacred volume.

Part of the mind of St. Jude, with the Holy Ghost inspiring,

---

<sup>1</sup> Eph. ii. 21.

<sup>2</sup> See Dr. Eadie's "Commentary on the Ephesians."

<sup>3</sup> Dean Alford's "Commentary."

is seen in the wish and prayer he begins by expressing for his fellow-Christians: "Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James, to them that are sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ, and called, mercy unto you and peace and grace be multiplied."

There is a richness and fulness in this language, which makes known to us, so to speak, the *nature* of the goodness of God. From Him proceeds not only the communication of blessing, but the large unceasing growth and augmentation of blessing. It is like a copious harvest, perpetually increasing. "Whosoever hath," it is twice written in St. Matthew, "to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance." "I came that they might have life," says St. John, "and that they might have it more abundantly." "Of His fulness have all we received, and grace for grace," is St. John's own witness concerning Christ. And language of the same kind, in respect of the goodness of God, runs all through the Scriptures. "I will come into Thy house in the multitude of Thy mercy—hear us, O God, according to the multitude of Thy mercies," is the language of the Psalmist. "Prove Me now, saith the Lord of Hosts, if I will not open you the windows of heaven, and pour you out a blessing, that there shall not be room to receive it," is the Divine utterance through the last of the Prophets. The seed that fell on good ground brought forth "some thirty-fold, some sixty-fold," is the joyful assurance in the first of the parables. "I am sure that as I come to you, I shall come in the fulness of the blessing of the Gospel of Christ," is St. Paul's language in writing to the Romans. "Now He that ministereth seed to the sower both minister bread for your food and multiply your seed sown, and increase the fruit of your righteousness," is his prayer, when he writes to the Corinthians.<sup>1</sup> In the style of the Apostle the word "riches," applied to spiritual things, is so frequent that it may almost be taken as characteristic:<sup>2</sup> while to turn to St. Peter, it is remarkable that he opens both his chapters with the same phraseology, though in a form less copious, as that which we find here in St. Jude, "Grace unto you and peace be multiplied."

In the beginning of St. Paul's Epistles, addressed to churches, the salutation is "grace and peace," and in his more personal letters to Timothy, it is "grace, mercy, and peace." In St. John's letter to the "elect lady," again, it is "grace, mercy, and peace; in St. Jude it is "mercy, peace, and love," and he adds something further in the wish and prayer that those

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xiii. 12; John x. 10; Mal. iii. 10; Rom. xv. 29; 2 Cor. ix. 10.

<sup>2</sup> See the "Horæ Paulinæ" (edition published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge), pp. 214 and 457.

three blessings may be *multiplied* to those who read his letter.

And to take them in the order which St. Jude adopts—first, *mercy*. The mercy of God is the first great necessity of our souls. Without it, we are utterly hopeless and lost. Just as the multitudes were fed, because the Lord has compassion—just as the wounded man was gently cared for and placed in safety, because the good Samaritan had compassion—so is it with the hunger of our spirit and the wounds inflicted by sin.<sup>1</sup> And this compassion—this mercy—is a fountain always fresh, exuberant, and overflowing, and never failing in any season of drought. St. Jude knows that what he desires for his fellow-Christians *will be granted* in answer to prayer. “The Lord's compassions fail not: they are new every morning.” “Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return unto the Lord, and He will have *mercy* upon him, and He will abundantly pardon.” “Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which, according to His *abundant* mercy, hath begotten us again unto a lively hope.”<sup>2</sup>

And secondly, “*peace*.” In one sense, indeed, the peace of the Christian does not admit of augmentation. “*Peace*” has been fully made by Jesus Christ. Through the Cross “all middle walls of partition” have been “broken down.”<sup>3</sup> But the sense of *peace* in the heart, repose in the soul through affiance in Christ, this admits of degrees. The multiplication of this is a blessing, the value and magnitude of which cannot be described. *Peace*, too, among ourselves certainly admits of degrees, and we have often very serious reason for thinking of this.

That is a very beautiful salutation which appears in those letters of Oriental sovereigns contained in the Book of Daniel: “Unto all peoples, nations, and languages that dwell in all the earth, peace be multiplied unto you.”<sup>4</sup> We have surely learnt how to pray for this in a better sense than any that was known to Nebuchadnezzar or Darius. For ourselves, in our own troubled spirits, we long for the time when we shall “delight ourselves in the abundance of *peace*.”<sup>5</sup> For the Church, often now so “exceedingly tossed with a tempest,”<sup>6</sup> we long for the time when we shall be in the condition of those who, after a storm, look over a calm surface of ocean with only ripples moving in the sunlight.

And out of *mercy* and *peace* there grows up, in the third place, *love*. Whether God's love to us is capable of increase, we

<sup>1</sup> Matt. ix. 6; Luke x. 33.

<sup>2</sup> Lam. iii. 22; Isa. iv. 7; 1 Pet. i. 3.

<sup>3</sup> Eph. ii. 14.

<sup>4</sup> Dan. iv. 1.

<sup>5</sup> Ps. xxxvii. 7.

<sup>6</sup> Acts xxvii. 18.

dare not presume to say. But our love to Him, our love to one another, is so weak and poor, that it needs large and perpetual augmentation. St. Paul's prayer for the Thessalonians must be our prayer for ourselves: "The Lord make you to increase and abound in love one toward another and toward all men."<sup>1</sup> And again, though it is to be feared that this is far above our level: "As touching brotherly love ye need not that I write unto you: for ye yourselves are taught of God to love one another. But we beseech you, brethren, that ye increase more and more."<sup>2</sup>

"*Mercy, peace, and love*,"—this trinity of graces seems to direct our thoughts to the sacred Trinity of the Godhead. Mercy flows freely from God the Father, peace has been secured to us by God the Son, love is diffused in our hearts through the indwelling of God the Holy Spirit. "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, be with us all evermore. Amen."

J. S. HOWSON.



## ART. IV.—GENESIS AND THE BIBLE.

### DOCTRINAL RELATIONS.

THE place of the Book of Genesis in the Bible implies a corresponding office in the scheme of revelation. So they must think who believe that there is a revelation, and that the Bible is the Divine exposition of it. In fact, the relations which the first book has with the rest are vital and manifold, and these short papers cannot pretend to offer any adequate account of them; but they may serve to direct attention and suggest topics of thought.

In the former paper the distinction was noted between the method and the matter of revelation, how we are taught and what we are taught, the means taken to inform us and the truths of which we are informed. On the first of these questions enough has been said for the present purpose in the observations there made on the *historical relations* of Genesis to the rest of Scripture.

We now turn to the *doctrinal relations*, from the method to the result, from the onward flow of the story to the solid deposit which it leaves. These doctrinal results are to be here considered, not simply in regard to their reality, their amount, or their value, but in their *relation* to subsequent and ultimate teaching, to the revelation on the whole and in

<sup>1</sup> 1 Thess. iii. 12.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Thess. iv. 10.

the end. We ask, then, whether the doctrine in Genesis is such as to prepare for that which later books will yield, and especially for the Christian doctrine towards which (on the supposition of inspiration) all is tending? Is it of a piece with this later doctrine, and a distinct foundation for it? Does it give, not only principles of thought, but principles which, in fact, are afterwards used and developed?

Yes; the elementary truths embedded in this book are of the nature of foundations; they are purposely and firmly laid, and their lines indicate by anticipation the character of the fabric which they are designed to support. We, inspecting these doctrines from the standpoint of the present day, and under the influence of our settled habits of thought, scarcely see this fundamental character as distinctly as it deserves to be seen. We should dismiss, as well as we can, the familiar ideas, which in fact we have mainly derived from these very pages, and place ourselves in the world of thought which was round them when they were indited, and which, beyond the circle of their influence, is round them still. In regard to the origin of things, to God and the universe, to the nature of evil, to the mystery of this present world, to man, to nature, and to human life, what a chaos of opinion do we survey! what confused traditions! what subtle speculations! what rival philosophies! what confessions that nothing can be known! In the midst of all this, without argument and without hesitation, by simple statement, by a narrative childlike in style and profound in meaning, the Book of Genesis has on these subjects deposited the enduring foundations of thought.

Take the primary questions, which underlie all religions and all deeper philosophies; and first the question of *God and the universe*.

(1) Man wakes up to consciousness in the midst of the heavens and the earth, a visible material scene, which at once manifests and conceals its Author. What is to be thought of it and of Him? Is it self-existent, or did it come into being? Is there a Power which made, or shaped, or sustains it? Is that Power one with the material universe, a substratum of phenomena, a background of things that are? Is it to be thought of as a Law? a Force? an Energy? Is it an impersonal all-pervading Life, a soul of the universe?

A motion and a spirit that impels  
All thinking things, all objects of all thought,  
And rolls through all things?

Or have these things been generated from the Infinite and Absolute by successive emanations? Is the "Demiurge" Him-

self such an emanation; and is the limitation of His being a cause of imperfection in His work? Are there many subordinate Powers manifested in the forces of nature, intermediate rulers of things, and therefore objects of worship for man? What mean these evidences of opposing forces in production and destruction, good and evil, life and death? Is the universe a dual empire, a scene of conflict between two rival Powers?

Let a man only glance at this ocean of thought, more particularly Oriental thought, surging chiefly in the two directions of Pantheism and Manicheanism; let him observe the powerful attraction and wide prevalence of these opinions, and their large development in religious and moral consequences; he will then better understand what is secured by the first line of Genesis:

**In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.**

There it lies, still and immovable, beside this ocean of bewildered thought, like "the sand which God has placed for a bound to the sea by a perpetual decree that it cannot pass it; and though the waves thereof toss themselves, yet can they not prevail; though they roar, yet can they not pass over it."

All the questions on this subject which invade the mind of man are answered or anticipated by this single line. God is separate from the universe, which is His creation, and therefore His possession and dominion. The creature cannot be identified with the Creator, nor the Creator absorbed in the creature. Dualistic division is excluded: He lives and reigns alone. "From everlasting to everlasting Thou art God." "Thou hast made heaven and earth. There is none beside Thee." This one truth underlies all else that will be told; it is the ground which sustains and the life which pervades the entire fabric of revelation.

The living consciousness and practical uses of this truth are the glory of the Old Testament. In the New Testament it opens out yet further in the revelation of the living and eternal Word, Who is the mediating power in creation as in all the other work of God. "Through Him all things were made, and without Him was not anything made that hath been made." "He is the image of the invisible God, the first-begotten of all creation: for in Him were all things created, in the heavens and upon the earth, things visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers; all things were created through Him and unto Him."

Thus the final revelation is an outcome of the first announcement, giving it a fresh distinctness in itself and a more intimate relation to all later work of God. So "for us there is one God,

the Father, of Whom are all things and we of Him ; and one Lord Jesus Christ, through Whom are all things, and we through Him." The Son, in Whom "in the end of the days God has spoken to us," is the same "by Whom also He made the worlds (*aiōvas*)."<sup>1</sup> Creation and redemption, the formation and restitution of things, are by the same agent as well as from the same author, and the scheme of the Gospel is a part of the scheme of the universe.

(2) As with the Creator, so with the *creation* ; the view to be taken of it is fixed by the opening story. This has for its subject, not the universe, but "the heavens and the earth," as they appear to man, as fitted up for man, and as made the scene of human history. We see at once where we are ; in a world which had a beginning, and may therefore have an end. We are on a temporary platform, suited to our present existence, assigned for the time to our possession and dominion. "The earth hath He given to the children of men." It is so given to them as to share their fortunes and to suffer for their deserts : for the ground is cursed for man's sin, and the fountains of the great deep are broken up because of his corruption. Thus the material is subjected to the moral, and the destiny of the creation is linked with the destiny of its inhabitant. Hence it is that, while in human religions man is subjected to nature, and is either overawed or seduced into idolatry by its imposing aspects and irresistible forces, revelation asserts at first and maintains throughout the contrary relation between him and it, through the conscious relation with the Creator of all, which is his prerogative and glory.

The doctrine of the creation thus given in the opening chapters of Genesis and continued throughout the Bible is also one to which the later revelations correspond. Ever more and more distinctly we see this world-period (*aiōv*) running to its end. Its present state is to terminate "at that day," when present human history shall close. Destruction and restitution are appointed for it, as death and resurrection for man. For his sin "made subject to vanity," "groaning and travailing in pain together until now," it is still expectant of the time when, purified by a baptism of fire, it "shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God." So the end of the Bible answers to its beginning ; showing the first heaven and the first earth as passed away, with the old human life for which it was prepared, and succeeded by new heavens and new earth, destined for a new human life, to endure through "the age of ages."

(3) From the doctrine of the book on the Creator and the Creation we pass, naturally, to its doctrine on *Man* himself. What a mystery is man ! So great, so little ! A being "of

large discourse, looking before and after!" An atom in creation, yet surveying its heights and depths. In thought, wide-ranging, far-reaching, yet so impotent, so ignorant, so soon extinguished! He is flesh—is he also spirit? He is mortal—is he also immortal? A part of the material world—is he also part of an unseen universe? Conscious of a complex but disordered nature, he is to himself a subject of perpetual study, wonder, and debate. And the debate is of serious consequence, for the view which man takes of himself is above all things practical. On his habit of thought about himself, the aim and character, the worth and value of his life depend. Moral judgment, moral purpose, and moral action must be elevated or depressed in proportion to the recognised estimate of the capacities and destinies of human nature, of its place in creation, and of its relation to the animal world below and the spiritual world above it.

The whole question is settled at starting in the Book of Genesis :

God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness, and let them have dominion, etc. And God created man in His own image ; in the image of God created He him ; male and female created he them.

And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul.

Out of the ground wast thou taken. Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return (Gen. i. 26-27 ; ii. 7 ; iii. 19).

So man is the dust of the earth and the image of God, mortal and immortal, the meeting-point between the animal and the spiritual, lord of the creatures and a creature himself. He has dominion by investiture, not by right ; he gives names to all things round him ; he receives communications from God ; he is free, but responsible ; with self-determining will, but under a law of consequences which he cannot evade. Where else is human nature defined with the same firmness of outline, truthfulness of aspect, and insight into its essence ? In the first appearance of man and in his first action all his future is contained. His history, as recognised and developed in revelation, grows naturally out of this beginning, and the very terms of the account live on in the later language of the sacred writers. That elementary lesson taught them to see the vain life which is spent as a shadow in the dignity of its moral seriousness and the glory of its relations with the eternal. Thus the key-note struck at first gives the tone to the judgment and treatment of man, and to his own consciousness and experience, throughout the Bible, and not least when these rise to their highest strain in the mystery of the Gospel of Christ.

The incarnation of the Son of God and the gift of the Holy Ghost are consequences (so to speak) of the first chapter of

Genesis. The worth of the human being, as there asserted, makes him the proper subject of redemption, and the means which are used for it are justified by his original relation to God. Why was it fit that the Word should be made flesh? Because He was the light of man in the order of nature, before He became so in the order of grace; and, when that light only lingered in a darkness which comprehended it not, it became needful that the true Light, which lighteth every man, should personally come into the world. Only because man had been made in the image of God, was it possible that God should be "made in the likeness of men." The whole doctrine of Christ as "Goël," (kinsman-redeemer,) rests on the same basis. So also does the doctrine of the issue of that redemption, in the new man raised up in Christ, and, not only in the sense of capacity, but in the sense of actual character, "created after the image of God in righteousness and truth of holiness;" made the habitation of His Holy Spirit, and the heir of His kingdom and glory.

(4) From the constitution of man to his condition, from his original nature to his actual state, the mind passes rapidly, and so does the story. It goes straight to the *mystery of evil*, and lays the foundations of the *doctrine of sin*. There is a pressing and immediate need for this: for the mystery of evil is a question which cannot be overlooked or adjourned. It oppresses and bewilders thinking men. How came evil? Why is it suffered? What hidden power is at work in it? What is the nature of moral evil? What is its connection with physical evil? What is that character of it which we express by the word "sin"? How is it regarded by God? What are we to think of it in ourselves? What is this necessary hold which it seems to have on our nature? What are its laws and consequences? Is it possible to modify or counteract them? If so, by what means? A thousand such questions have agitated and must agitate men's minds; and the answers to them will give the character to philosophies, to religions, and to human life.

The answers, or the germs of answers, to all such questions are contained in the story of the Fall. The narrative, which arrests the conscience of a child, yields to the considerate reader the most definite and pregnant principles of thought.

What is the *origin* of evil? If the question means, in the universe, there is no answer; for the revelation is not to the universe, but to the inhabitants of earth. They are told what is its origin *here* and for their own race. It was not coëval with creation. When that was finished "God saw that it was good." Evil came *from without*. The story discloses, though it does not account for, its existence in time anterior to this

world and in regions of being exterior to it. In the entrance of sin into the world we see it introduced from elsewhere, and learn that the evil which we know has a living connection with wider and darker evil beyond. And that evil appears among us, not by chance or necessity, but by the will and purpose of an enemy seeking to mar the work of God, and to infect and subjugate the fresh and fair creation.

But if sin is imported, it is also adopted, and is realized in man not by force but by consent. It is his own doing, and if he is a victim he is also an accomplice.

In this also is shown the true *nature* of sin; for in yielding to the enemy he renounces fealty to God. Sin is a breaking away from God, that is, from the living law of our moral being; as is taught by that profound saying of St. John, which no translation can adequately render: *ἡ ἀμαρτία ἐστὶν ἡ ἀνοία*. The process of this separation is also laid bare; first, questionings of mistrust ("Yea, hath God said," etc.); then disbelief of His word ("Ye shall not surely die"); then desire for independence and rising of pride ("Ye shall be as God, knowing good and evil"); after which, personal judgment and inclination alone remain to decide ("She saw that the tree was pleasant to the eyes, and good for food, and a tree to be desired to make one wise"). Then there is decision by act and deed: the choice is complete, and the consequences follow. They follow in the sense of being stripped and despoiled; in the shame, the fear, the flight; which prolong their experiences in the future consciousness of man. They follow in the sentences which proclaim the connection of outward with inward evil, and associate in our common fall the material state of the world with the moral condition of man. Marvellously do those few words of stern but compassionate sentence involve and concentrate the whole subsequent character of life upon earth.

Then what a discovery follows of the law of sin in respect of growth and expansion, as we pass to the episode of Cain and Abel; then to the violence and corruption that fills the earth; and so to "the flood brought in upon the world of the ungodly."

'Twas but one little drop of sin  
We saw this morning enter in,  
And lo! at eventide the world is drown'd.

The nature and the law of sin as thus outlined are in strong contrast with what we encounter in other systems—in Brahmanism, for instance—which eliminates the idea of guilt by making everything (sin included) the action of Deity in man; or Buddhism, which has no living God against whom sin can be committed; or Mahomedanism, which chills the

conscience by obscuring the moral attributes of God under a bleak ascription of sovereignty; or the speculations of modern thought, which reduce sin to an offence against society, or to the mere imperfection of the creature.

It were long to show, but it is plain without showing, that the historical and prophetical treatment of sin in the rest of the Old Testament, and the Christian treatment of it in the New, are in direct continuation of the doctrine of Genesis, which in this respect, as in others, lies at the foundation of revelation. For revelation, in one chief aspect, is a scheme to meet the case created by sin, and so at starting the case is made clear. As there exhibited it is critical in the extreme, but not desperate. Had the evil been generated from within, perhaps it might have been so; but it has come from without: and if man as an accomplice is the proper subject of judgment, as a victim he is the proper subject of redemption. If "an enemy has done this," a Friend may undo it, supposing that One with right and power for the purpose can be found: and the hope of this is given at once, in the well-known prophetic sentence; and there is a perceptible suggestion of hope in the dealings which follow.

In the subsequent course of revelation, the development both of the doctrine of sin and of the Divine plan to meet it is an expansion and interpretation of our first lesson on the subject. The teaching grows ever more distinct; till in the New Testament the author of the evil appears stripped of the disguise of parabolic figure. The Evil One is before us. The revelation of Satan is a consequence of the manifestation of the Son of God, Who comes "to undo the works of the devil;" and the issues are to be decided between "the prince of this world" and the Prince of Life.

As in regard to the author of the evil, so in regard to its nature, the last teachings are in line with the first. Sin is, in its essence, revolt and separation from God. It then becomes a substantive principle which infects the members and the mind and constitution of man. It becomes a Power which has a hold on him, reduces him into servitude, and claims him as of right, as one who has sold himself. It is, in the language of St. Paul, a *law*, working itself out, in the processes and with the results which belong to law; a law of sin which is also a law of death. So the subject is expounded by one who had most deeply studied it, and who saw clearly what had really happened, when "by one man's disobedience sin entered into the world, and death by sin."

(5) But the doctrine of sin would be one of utter and hopeless ruin without a *doctrine of redemption*; and Genesis, as has been said, is far from depicting an utter and hopeless ruin.

The remedy is not to be announced there: it remains in the foreknowledge of God, and is hid from the foundation of the world. Yet its purpose lurks in the sentence which intimates a reversal of the victory of the serpent, and its influence is felt in the tone of kindness to the fallen and even in the remonstrances with Cain, and generally in the terms on which, throughout the book, we see men permitted to live with God; while the onward-bearing story is explicitly directed to an issue in which "all families of the earth shall be blessed." The rising of the Sun of Righteousness and the full light of the Gospel only discover to us what had been the source of that faint dawn in the morning. And yet further, the very method of the redemption is foreshadowed in the notice that the victory of the seed of the woman is to be won by suffering, and in the altars of sacrifice seen on the horizon of the world, and more distinctly in the mystic act commanded on Mount Moriah. If the shadow of the coming Christ is perceptible in the Book of Genesis, it is the shadow of a Christ crucified, who "puts away sin by the sacrifice of Himself."

(6) From the particular purpose and act of redemption we may pass to the *general relations of God with man*. This is the subject of the Bible at large; and the doctrine to be taught has already become familiar in the pages of the first book. We have not here a Supreme Being indifferent to things below; or a capricious sovereign issuing arbitrary decrees; or a stern lawgiver inaccessible to man. Affections like our own are ascribed to Him with fearless freedom. He is in perpetual and various relations with men's lives, consciences, and feelings. He watches the growth of violence and corruption. He "repents that He has made man upon the earth; it grieves Him at His heart." He "goes down to see" what men are doing. Wrath and judgment, pity and kindness, favour and friendship towards men, directions for their conduct, reproofs for their faults, and interventions in their affairs, express the Divine interest in their characters and histories. Certainly the language belongs to the earliest efforts of expression, and, as proper to religion in its childhood, it gives too human an aspect to the Divine. But it achieves its end, by a representation which is fundamental to all succeeding revelation, of a God "very nigh unto us," a God "with whom we have to do."

(7) As to the *doctrine of judgment*, whatever may be taught in subsequent revelation of actions that are weighed, and of receiving the things done in the body, and of the certain visitation of sin; whatever of wrath to come, and the world "reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men;" whatever also of discrimination and

separation and of deliverance and safety in the day of visitation—it all has its first earnest and examples in these pages. To them distant writers revert to confirm their own teachings; citing the destruction of the old world and the saving of Noah the eighth person, or the cities which suffer the vengeance of eternal fire, out of which just Lot is delivered, as testimony through all ages that “the Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished.”

(8) Not less plainly is written in the book the *doctrine of Divine counsel*. So we may call that method of dealing with man by appeals to his reason, to his conscience, to his heart, which characterizes the whole Bible and distinguishes it from all other sacred books. “Adam, where art thou? Hast thou eaten of the tree whereof I charged thee that thou shouldest not eat of it?” Or to Cain: “Why art thou wroth, and why is thy countenance fallen? If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door.” These questions are the key-note of a teaching which treats man as the responsible judge of his own conduct, one which aims to awaken him to conviction, and to “guide him with counsel,” and which is best expressed by the words, “Come, now, and let *its* reason together, saith the Lord.” As He counsels, so He comforts. The voices of Divine sympathy and seasonable support to Abraham in critical moments, or to Jacob in the failings of his heart and the day of his distress, are earnest of the comfortable words which, by the voices of prophets and from the lips of the Son of Man, in various tones and through various exigencies, sustain and assure the hearts of the people of God.

(9) Akin to this subject is the *doctrine of prayer*, a main topic of the Bible, and deeply needed by those who, apart from such teaching, “know not what they should pray for as they ought,” or, indeed, whether in the way of distinct petition they have the right to pray at all. In this Book of Genesis the throne of grace is already set up, and it is made plain that we have a God “Who heareth prayer.” So we are taught in the repeated assent to the intercessions of Abraham, who “takes upon him to speak unto the Lord, though he is but dust and ashes;” in the answer to the petition of Eliezer, asking “good speed that day,” and guidance in the work that is given him to do; and in the name of Israel, which tells the anxious pleader that he “has striven with God and has prevailed.” These are our introductions to that long course of examples, instructions, and assurances, which culminate in our Lord’s own teaching as to the spirit and the power of prayer,

and in the revelation of the provision made for its assured success in the mediation of the High Priest in heaven.

(10) One more doctrine ought to be mentioned as more particularly taught in the last portion of the book. The great *doctrine of Providence*, as working in the world, and secretly ordering events for ends not yet discovered, in the lives of men, in the history of nations, and in the course of God's kingdom in the earth—this is surely a principal and pervading lesson of the Scripture records. It begins at once in the first book, and is nowhere more conspicuously authenticated or more exquisitely illustrated than in the story of Joseph. The doctrine which he sees in the retrospect of his own life, he himself expounds to his brethren and to the Church for ever (Gen. xlvi. 5-8), and the narrative remains to throw its light on many dark dispensations, to reprove many sad cries of "All these things are against me," to reassure the faith which trusts when it cannot see, and to typify with a strange exactness that greatest instance in which evil passions are over-ruled and mysterious events directed "to do whatsoever Thy hand and Thy counsel determined before to be done."

There are other doctrines on which the like observations might be made; but those which have been mentioned are the main substance of revelation. They are so, at least, if doctrine be distinguished from ethics; and on the ethical relations of Genesis to the Bible, a few words may perhaps be added in another paper. The doctrinal relation here pointed out between the teaching of Genesis and that of the later and the final Scriptures is one of *continuity of development, not one of conformity of dogma*. This last has at times been sought for in a somewhat unreasonable manner. The most has been made of such adumbrations as could be found of the Christian doctrines of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Atonement, Regeneration, etc. Such hermeneutics may be interesting; but they are of little consequence. What is wanted is a due apprehension of the advancing plan of revelation, in which the earlier teaching provides what the later teaching presupposes, and the rudimentary lines of doctrine show by their curve or inclination that the shape obtained at last was the shape intended from the first. Thus we trace the evidence of primeval design in the first steps of the elementary education of man, and in the Bible as a whole we recognise one presiding and foreseeing Mind as being (if we may so apply the expression) both "the author and the finisher of our faith."

T. D. BERNARD.

*(To be continued.)*

## ART. V.—ERASMUS.

## PART II.

THE career of Erasmus had hitherto been useful and glorious. He had, notwithstanding his poverty, his repudiation by his family, his want of books, and an incurable internal malady, become, by his transcendent abilities and indefatigable industry, the greatest scholar, and in some respects the greatest divine on this side of the Alps. Budæus may have surpassed him in Greek ; but he had no rival in Latin. He was equal to or surpassed the most distinguished men in Italy. In wit and satire he was absolutely unrivalled. The Pope and many distinguished prelates united to do him honour. The four or five years ending with 1517, when he was in his fifty-first year, were probably the happiest and most useful of his life. If he had died at this time, he would have been saved much misery, and he would have occupied a higher place than he does now in the good opinion of his fellow-creatures.

But we have now to present a melancholy reverse to this picture. About the time when Luther commenced his career, the ecclesiastics began to oppose him. Those who had assailed him hitherto had been men of an inferior class, monks and friars. We cannot wonder that they should have been so much incensed against him, when, in his "Praise of Folly," and in his "Enchiridion," he had censured their formality, their gross ignorance, and their attachment to the barbarous scholastic philosophy. The following severe and powerful passage from the "Praise of Folly" will illustrate the truth of this last assertion :

These very delightful men, who are remarkable only for their dirt, their ignorance, their clownish manners, and their impudence, pretend that they are the successors of the Apostles. One will show his paunch stuffed with every kind of fish ; another will number up myriads of fasts ; another will bring forward a heap of ceremonies, which cannot be conveyed in ten merchant ships ; another will boast that for sixty years he has never touched money, excepting with fingers protected by a pair of gloves ; another will produce a cowl so dirty and coarse that no sailor would think it good enough for him ; another will plead as his claim the loss of his voice from constant singing ; another the lethargy occasioned by solitude ; another the loss of the power of speech from long silence. But Christ will interrupt them in the recital of their good deeds, which would otherwise never come to an end, and will say, "Whence comes this new race of Jews ? I acknowledge one law as really Mine, of which I hear nothing. Formerly, when on earth, without a parable, I promised My Father's inheritance, not to austerities, prayers, or fastings, but to faith and the offices of charity. I do not acknowledge those who make much of their good deeds."

The monks brought the most absurd charges against him.

The following amusing story may serve to show their ignorance and prejudices. A monk, being in a company where Erasmus was highly commended, did not hesitate to express his dissatisfaction by his look and manner. On being urged to declare what fault he had to find with him, he said that he was a notorious eater of fowls, and that he knew it to be the case, not only because he had seen him do so, but because others had told him. "Did Erasmus buy them or steal them?" he was asked. "He bought them," replied the monk. "Why, then," said his questioner, "there is a certain fox which is a greater knave; for he often comes into my yard, and takes away a fowl without paying me. But is it then a sin to eat fowls?" "Most certainly," said the monk; "it is a sin of gluttony, and it becomes the more heinous when it is committed by Churchmen." "Perhaps," said the questioner, "he eats them on fast-days!" "No," replied the monk; "but we, who are ecclesiastics, ought to have nothing to do with delicacies of this description." "Ah! my good father, you have not got that large paunch by eating dry bread; and if all the fowls who now fill it could raise their voice, and cackle all together, they would make noise enough to drown the drums and trumpets of an army."

But the monks were not his only enemies. After 1520, at all times and in all places, but especially from the pulpits, were now heard fierce invectives against him. The reason was that one charge which the monks brought against him was partly a just one, that he had prepared the way for Luther. "Erasmus," as they used to say, "laid the egg, and Luther hatched it."

There can be no doubt that the examination of the works of the ancient Greeks, which, in consequence of the fall of Constantinople, were conveyed to Europe, was a most important means of promoting the Reformation. For the effect of the revival of the study of the immortal writers of antiquity was, that the human mind was aroused from its slumber, and pushed its inquiries into that vast and complex system of error which the Roman Catholic Church had declared to be essential to the salvation of its followers. Now, classical students were to be found in various parts of Europe. But Erasmus had been greatly instrumental in promoting the love and study of the works of the ancient writers. I have already described his "Adages," which are a monument of his profound erudition, his amazing industry, and his extensive knowledge of classical authors. He had also translated almost the whole of Lucian, most of the moral works of Plutarch, and several plays of Euripides into Latin, avowedly for the purpose of perfecting himself in the Greek language. He also published

afterwards editions of the works of Aristotle, and Demosthenes, Livy, Terence, Pliny, Cicero's "Offices" and his "Tusculan Disputations," Q. Curtius, the minor historians, Seneca the philosopher, Suetonius, and some minor works. Scholars have expressed their obligations to him, as well as their admiration of the great genius and the amazing learning of a man who, though unaided by lexicons and commentaries, and hindered in his work by the scarcity of books and manuscripts, was able to carry through the press voluminous works, the preparation of which would, even now, when these appliances are available, and when the art of printing has been very much improved, task the energies of the most diligent scholar of the age in which we live.

But we must consider the great purpose to which this scholarship was applied, in order that we may see how he prepared the way for the Reformation. The observations on the New Testament will illustrate this part of our subject. By publishing the New Testament in the original tongue, he enabled theologians to see the purity of the doctrine of the Reformers. The "Paraphrases on the Gospel and the Epistles," published in 1519, also greatly aided the Reformers in their work. His great object in this work was to explain the New Testament by itself. This work was so highly esteemed by Cranmer that he caused it to be translated into English, and to be placed, along with the Bible, in our churches for public use. Moth-eaten copies may still be seen chained to their desks. Erasmus further imposed upon himself the herculean task of bringing out one after another editions of the early Fathers of the Church. He published the works of Jerome, Hilary, Ambrose, Irenæus, St. Augustine, St. Chrysostom, part of St. Basil's works, some works of Lactantius and Epiphanius, some treatises of St. Athanasius, and others; thus showing to the world that their doctrines agreed with those of the Reformers, that the Church of Rome had corrupted as well as mutilated the faith once delivered to the saints, and affording us the means of reforming the Church according to the Scriptural model of the earliest ages.

But satire was the most formidable weapon wielded by Erasmus. In his "Praise of Folly" he used it against the Schoolmen, employing very much the same words which I used in speaking of their system in the THE CHURCHMAN article on Dean Colet. He has also shown the barrenness of their system in his more serious works. By these combined methods he did more than anyone else to emancipate the human mind from its bondage to the barbarous scholastic philosophy. He attacked also, with the same weapon, the follies, the vices, and the superstitions of the age in which he

lived. In all probability, if he had condemned them in a graver form, a cry of indignation would have rung through Europe, and he would have been called upon to expiate his offence in the dungeon or at the stake. But his sportive wit ensured his impunity. The authorities in Church and State, even though they might be fully sensible of the danger of his opinions, could not place under ban and anathema works which the world received with undissembled merriment. We have seen how, in his "Praise of Folly," he ridiculed the ignorance, the absurdities, and the formalism of the monks. "The Colloquies," first published in 1519, and afterwards much enlarged, were remarkable for their wit and biting satire. In them he laughed at indulgences, slighted auricular confession, derided the eating of fish on fast-days, and other superstitions of a similar description. The "Seraphic Obsequies," the finest of the "Colloquies" and the most exquisite in its satire, has a humorous description of a rich man assuming the robe of the Franciscan shortly before his death, because he felt sure that the influence of that garment would render the soul secure, so that it should be safe from purgatory. He tells us that the evil spirits have a great dread of that robe, and that crowds of black devils were seen jumping towards that body, but that none dared to touch it. One of the speakers is represented as saying that he had this feeling towards the Fransciscans, that, whenever he saw that holy robe, he felt himself to be in the presence of an angel. He adds, "I shall now live more happily; I shall put on the robe, and then I shall not torment myself with the fear of hell, or worry myself about confession or penance."

In the "Praise of Folly" he ridicules those who "derive very great comfort from false pardons and indulgences, and who measure the spaces of purgatory as if with an hour-glass; who, having cast down a small piece of money taken from the vast amount which they have gained unjustly, think that all the guilt of their life is purged away, and that they have purchased the pardon of so many perjuries, so much drunkenness, so many quarrels, so many murders, so much cheating, so many acts of treachery, and so purchased it that they may return afresh to a new circle of wickedness." Again, he speaks of the folly of "worshipping a little image marked with a coal on the wall in the same manner as Christ Himself." Again, in his "Colloquies" he derides the worship and adoration as well of images as of relics. For an illustration of the truth of this assertion we should read his humorous account of his visits to Canterbury and Walsingham Priory.<sup>1</sup> He thus spoke of the

<sup>1</sup> See his Colloquy, "Peregrinatio Religionis Ergo," or "The Religious Pilgrimage."

worship of the Virgin Mary and saints : " Some there are who have prayers addressed to them on all occasions, especially the Virgin Mary, to whom the common people attribute more power than they do to her Son. Now from these saints what, I say, do men ask, excepting those things which relate to folly ? "

In the " Shipwreck," while one addressed himself with loud cries to one saint, one to another, there is one calm person, shown to be the only wise man among them, who addressed himself to God alone.

The " Enchiridion " is directed against those who asserted that true religion consisted in the acceptance of scholastic dogmas, or the performance of outward ceremonies. In it he expresses, besides, some opinions which agree with those of the Reformers. He evidently thinks little of the worship of the image of Christ, of saints, and of relics, but he thinks much of the imitation of their holy and blessed example. " No worship," he says, " is more acceptable to Mary than the attempt to imitate her humility ; none is more pleasant to the saints than the laborious endeavour to exhibit in your own life a transcript of their virtues. If you adore the bones of Paul, buried in a chest, will you not show respect to the mind of Paul exhibited in his writings ? " Look, again, at his attack on the monks :

I think nothing of your vigils, your fastings, your silence, your prayers, and your other observances of the same kind. I will not believe that a man can be in the Spirit, unless I see the fruits of the Spirit. Why should I not declare you to be in the flesh, when, after your exercises of this kind, which are almost worldly, I see in you still the works of the flesh ? I refer to your envy, greater than that of a woman ; to your anger and fierceness, like that of a soldier ; to your inexcusable love of strife ; to your railing accusations ; to your slanderous tongue, which poisons like a viper's ; to your stubbornness, your slippery faith, your vanity, your lying, your flattery.

Look, too, at his condemnation of the distinction drawn in the Church of Rome between sins mortal and venial :

You must take care not to despise any one sin, as if it were of little consequence. In this matter many are deceiving themselves, so that while they freely indulge themselves in one or another vice, which everyone looks upon as venial, they strongly condemn sins of another description.

Consider, also, his exhortations to a diligent study of the Scriptures, as a means of victory in our spiritual warfare :

How, I ask, did Jesus Christ, our Head, conquer Satan ? Did He not, when He answered him from Scripture, strike the forehead of his enemy, as David conquered Goliath with stones from the brook ?

Examine, also, the following observations on the performance of rites and ceremonies :

You think that a lighted taper is a sacrifice. But David calls the sacrifices of God a broken spirit. Of what use is it for the body to be covered with a holy cowl, when the soul wears a filthy garment? If you have a snow-white tunic, take care that the vestments of the inner man are white as snow. . . . You tell me that you worship the wood of the cross. Follow much more the mystery of the cross. You fast and abstain from those things which do not pollute the man; and yet you do not refrain from impure words which defile your own conscience and the consciences of others. . . . You adorn a temple of stone. You have a reverence for sacred places. What matters all this if the temple of your breast, whose wall Ezekiel pierced through, is profaned with the abominations of Egypt? . . . Can it avail you, with your body to have gone on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, when your mind within is like Sodom or Babylon? It is not a matter of much importance for you to place your foot in the footprints of Christ; but it is a matter of paramount importance for you to follow them with your affections. If you think much of a visit to the sepulchre of our Lord, should you not think still more of acting out in your lives the mystery of His burial? . . . The more you love Christ, the more will you hate your sins; for the hatred of sin must follow the love of piety, as the shadow accompanies the body. I would rather that you should *once* hate your sins truly within, than *ten times* confess them in the language of abhorrence to a priest.

When we read all these extracts, we must surely admit that there is some truth in those words, "Erasmus laid the egg, and Luther hatched it."

Again, when we find him in the "Praise of Folly" thus attacking Pope Julius II., "There you may see decrepit old men, showing all the vigour of youth, incurring any expense, not fatigued by any toil, if only they can overturn law, religion, peace, and throw all the world into confusion. There are not wanting, too, learned flatterers who call this manifest madness real piety, and discover a way in which a man can brandish the fatal sword, and drive it into the bowels of his brother, while he yet possesses that great love which, according to the precept of Christ, he owes to his neighbour;" when we see him in his commentary on Mat. xvi. 18, "On this Rock I will build my Church," expressing his surprise that anyone should have so perverted these words as to apply them exclusively to the Roman Pontiff, to whom indeed they apply first of all, as the Head of the Christian Church, yet not to him only, but to all Christians; when, again, we find him saying on Matt. xvii. 5 that "Christ is the only Teacher appointed by God, and that this authority has been committed to no Bishop, Pope, or Prince;" when we find him animadverting on the royal palaces of St. Peter's Vicar, in speaking of the lodging of Peter with one Simon a tanner, mentioned in Acts ix. 43; when, further, we find him saying in his "Spongia" against Hutton, that he allows the first place among Metropolitans to the Roman Pontiffs, but that he has never defended the extravagant power which they have

usurped for some centuries—we must admit that he has done his best to shake to its foundation the structure of their spiritual and temporal dominion.

I could easily bring forward numerous other passages of the same tone and tendency. We might, however, suppose that though Erasmus is thus outspoken in the expression of his opinions, his books would have a limited sale, and so he would be unable to influence public opinion in Europe. But we shall find that the very contrary was the case. The sale of his works is a perfect marvel in the history of literature. His opinions flew on the wings of the press throughout Europe. We should say that when we take into account that the number of readers in those days was a handful when compared with the number at the present time, and that the resources of printing establishments were very different from what they now are, the sale of his works was far greater in proportion than the sale of those of the most popular author of the age in which we live. The "Praise of Folly" and the "Colloquies" were in every palace, in every house, in every school, and in every monastery. A bookseller at Paris, on giving out that the latter work was prohibited, sold above 24,000 of one impression. Both these works were translated into many of the languages of Europe. A Spanish friend informed Erasmus that in Spain his "Colloquies" were flying through the hands of men and women. The "Praise of Folly" in a few months after its publication went through seven editions. In April, 1515, Rhenanus wrote to Erasmus to say that out of an edition of 1,800 of the "Praise of Folly," just printed by Froben, only 60 remained on hand. After this edition the sale was very rapid, for the notes added to it had made it intelligible to many who had not previously understood the object of the author. The monks, whose ignorance of Latin was so great that they could not understand the Psalms which they read every day, now, when it was translated into modern languages, understood the diatribes against them, and vented their indignation upon Erasmus. Twenty-seven editions of this popular work were published during his lifetime.

His "Adages" also had an extraordinary sale.<sup>1</sup> We shall understand the full significance of the sale of this work with

<sup>1</sup> The first edition, imperfect as we have seen, was printed at Paris in 1500. Two more editions were soon afterwards brought out at Strasburg; and a fourth was printed at Venice in 1508. Froben, without the knowledge of Erasmus, had, before his acquaintance with him, imitated it at Basle in 1513. In 1517 Froben printed a sixth edition of this work, which had now become a thick folio volume. The sale of this edition was, considering the size, very rapid; for it was followed in 1520 by a larger folio edition containing 800 pages.

regard to the progress of the Reformation, when we remember that it not only diffused that knowledge of classical literature which, as we have seen, greatly aided it, but that also it became the means of making known to the world, as I have shown, the indignation which Erasmus felt when he saw the base conduct of the monarchs of Europe, and the vices, the follies, the impostures, and the scandals of the Church and Court of Rome. The sale of the "Enchiridion" was, after Luther began his work, very rapid. The printers could not print it quickly enough to meet the demand for it. A letter to Volzius, attached to a new edition of this work, called for in 1518, in which he censured, with impetuous acrimony, monks, schoolmen, ecclesiastics, and princes, was eagerly read all over Europe, and passed, in a short time, through several editions. Another edition of the "Enchiridion" itself was published at Cologne the next year. Many, even in bigoted Roman Catholic countries, who would have been unwilling to read works written by the leading Reformers, quite devoured the works of Erasmus, and were ultimately led to promote the progress of the Reformation. Multitudes in Spain, where the Pope had more devoted adherents than in any Roman Catholic country, eagerly, but unconsciously, imbibed the heretical poison contained in the "Enchiridion." "There is scarcely anyone," writes Alphonzo Fernandez to Erasmus, "in the Court of the Emperor, any citizen in our cities, or member of our churches and convents, no, not even an hotel or country inn, that has not a copy of the 'Enchiridion' in Spanish." It was read even by the Emperor Charles V. This letter was written on November 27th, 1527. Two separate editions of his letters were printed by Froben, and became the means of propagating through Europe the views expressed to his friends on the corruptions of the Church of Rome.

Thus, then, Erasmus did the work of the Reformers in circles to which they could not have obtained access. The wit with which some of his works were seasoned became like the honey which, as the Italian poet Tasso writes, nurses place on the edge of the vessel in order that children may be led to take the healing medicinal draught. Many Romanists, attracted in this manner, many also who, not caring for the wit, read his works on account of the learning and reputation of the author, when they would not have read those of a leading Reformer, learnt from him the errors of the Church of Rome, and became afterwards the most zealous in conveying a knowledge of them to others. Thus he promoted the progress of the Reformation throughout the continent of Europe.

Erasmus was, of course, reviled by the Romanists. The

Reformers were also much exasperated against him. They had hoped that they should prevent him from aiding their opponents in fighting their battles, and that his powerful arm would assist them in mowing down, like the bearded grain, the hosts confederated against them. But they were disappointed in their expectations. Irritated by his conduct, they began to libel him as an apostate, as a man who might be hired for a morsel of bread for any purpose, and who was ready to pay court to popes, bishops, and cardinals, in order that he might accomplish his own selfish and worldly objects. He became very hostile to the Reformers on account of these incessant attacks. I think that they here showed a great want of judgment; for he was altogether unequal to the work which they wanted him to do. It would have been better if no attempt had been made to drag forth Erasmus as a gladiator into the theological arena. He was not qualified to do the rough work of the Reformation. He was, as we have seen, a good pioneer. Even if they had not assailed him, he would not have joined them in their terrible struggle with their foes. While he agreed with them in condemning many of the dogmas of Romanism, he could not, as we have seen, accept Luther's doctrines of justification and original sin; and he could not unite with them in making their own interpretations of Scripture the rule of faith instead of the authority of the Church. But still, he ought not to have ceased to lift up his voice as a trumpet against the corruptions of the Church of Rome. Here, however, we see a proof of that timidity which has tarnished the fame of services rendered to the cause of the Reformation in the early part of his career. He saw, indeed, fissures in the walls of the vast structure of Romanism. But he thought that they would be repaired, and that the building would continue to stand on a firm foundation. He judged, therefore, that it would be the wiser course not to separate himself from the existing system, and not to cast in his lot with Luther and his associates.

The truth was that, as he said to Pace, "he had no inclination to die for the sake of truth." He was conscious that he had, by his satirical publications, rendered himself obnoxious to a large proportion of the clergy. He, therefore, lost no opportunity of securing the goodwill of the Pope and his cardinals. Thus, when Clement VII. was raised to the Papal throne, he congratulated him in the most flattering and artful manner. It gave him the greatest satisfaction, he said, to hear of his advancement. He was a man possessed of the qualities, both mental and bodily, which the turbulent times required. In regard to himself, he could venture to swear that it his Holiness did only know how he had been solicited to join the

Lutheran conspiracy against the Roman See, and how steadfastly he had resisted motives of every sort, he would not think him undeserving of his protection.<sup>1</sup>

The following is one out of many proofs of his timidity, and of his wish to accommodate matters. When he heard that Berquin, a French gentleman, whom a study of his writings had led to separate from the Church of Rome, had suffered martyrdom, he not only concealed his share in his death, but even thus expressed himself: "I often endeavoured to persuade him to disentangle himself from that matter; but he deluded himself with the expectation of victory." He here refers to advice such as that given to him in one of his letters: "Remember," he said, "not to provoke the wasps, and peaceably enjoy your own studies. Above all, do not mix me up with your affairs, for this would be of no service to you or me."

But he did not wish his connection with the Reformers to be altogether dissolved. He endeavoured for some time to pursue a middle course between the contending parties. Thus we find that, in a letter to Zwinglius, written at the same time as the letter to Pope Clement, he is as little pleased with the Pope as with Luther, and inveighs bitterly against the tyranny and cruelty both of bishops and kings. What strange words are these from one who had just written in the above strain to Pope Clement!

This tortuous course into which Erasmus was led by the fear of persecution is very discreditable to him. If he had lived in the present day, when persecution in its worst form is not the portion of God's Church, he would have probably been happier in his own mind, more useful to the community, and would have occupied a higher place in the good opinion of succeeding generations. Living in a period of fierce controversy, he endeavoured for a time to satisfy both the contending parties; to-day identifying himself with one of them, tomorrow with the other, till at last he lost the esteem and confidence of both, and all, both Romanists and Protestants, believed him to be insincere; and till he became so perplexed in his views of religious truth that he was unable to give a very distinct account of them, or to say very decidedly on what foundation he was building for eternity. Formerly he had condemned the sacrifice of two Augustinian monks, and had the courage to foretell that the blood of the martyrs would be the seed of the Lutheran Church. But he had been

---

<sup>1</sup> Some people, he said, had selected a number of half-sentences from his works, and had most impudently misrepresented them. *Undoubtedly, if he could have foreseen the sectarians of the present day, he would have suppressed many things which he had said.* On all occasions he submitted himself and his writings to the Roman See.

gradually receding farther and farther from the position which he then occupied. The trumpet now gives an uncertain sound. He speaks with a hesitating utterance. He fears that he shall involve himself in difficulty and danger, thus presenting a remarkable contrast to Berquin, whom he has described as exhibiting a holy tranquillity, even when death approached him in his most forbidding form, heralded by the dark executioners of his mandates.

But at length Erasmus abandoned this feeble neutrality, and became the inveterate enemy of the Reformers. He was induced, by the Pope and some leading monarchs and distinguished men in Europe to take the field against Luther. He selected the subject of Free-will on which he differed from the latter, because he was limited in his choice, having condemned in the strongest terms the corruptions of the Church of Rome and many of her doctrines. This was a feeble production. He gave offence to both parties. The Lutherans were much exasperated. The Papists revenged themselves for the failure of their champion by the violence with which they attacked his former works. He could not by his recantation satisfy them, for they declared that he had, by his publications, inflicted great injury on the Church. A doctor at Constance kept his picture for no other purpose than that, when he passed, he might spit upon it; and on being asked why he treated him with this contempt, answered that Erasmus was the cause of all the mischief in the world. It appears, from a letter of Henry VIII. to him, that he was in danger of his life from his enemies, and that he was nowhere safe from their malice.

We can easily imagine that Erasmus suffered severely from this opposition. He loved popularity, and yet he was more abused than anyone in Europe. He loved peace, and yet he had the din of angry controversy sounding in his ears. He went heavily all the day in the bitterness of his soul. A dense and dismal darkness brooded over his spirit. "In the morning he said, Would God it were evening! and in the evening he said, Would God it were morning!" His wan and wasted countenance, his dejected air, his sleepless nights, his neglect of his daily food, his downcast look, the longing for death which he often expressed to his friends, afforded sad evidence that an anguish had taken possession of his soul which surpasses all description. How different would the case have been if he had sought God's grace to enable him to conquer that "fear of men which bringeth a snare," and to act up to his convictions! He would then have possessed a holy serenity of soul which would have formed a strange contrast to the storm raging around him. When abandoned by those

whose friendship he prized so highly, he would have been sustained by the sympathy of his Almighty Saviour; he would have been cheered by the assurance that He would support him by His presence as he passed through this world of trial and temptation, and at length avenge his cause before an assembled universe.

Erasmus was now often painfully reminded of that solemn hour when his own dilapidated tabernacle would fall into ruins. He saw his friends fleeting like leaves before the autumnal blast. He makes a touching allusion to the death of four of them :

The present time has been very cruel to me, for it has deprived me of greatly valued friends—William Warham, Archbishop of Canterbury; William Mountjoy; the Bishop of Rochester; and Thomas More, whose breast was whiter than snow, to whom, in point of genius, England never has produced, nor ever will produce, anyone who bears the least resemblance.

Soon afterwards he foresaw that the time of his own departure could not be far distant. At last the end came at Basle, where he had been residing since 1521, with the exception of six years at Friburg, in Brisgau. He breathed out his soul in these ejaculations : “ Mercy, sweet Jesus, how long? Jesus, fountain of mercy, have mercy on me!” He died calmly at midnight, on July 12th, 1536, without one prayer to the Virgin Mary or to any of those saints whom the Church of Rome has taught her followers to regard with a superstitious reverence.

I trust that, in these papers, I have given a just and impartial review of the character and work of Erasmus. English writers have not paid very much attention to him. In foreign languages there have been “Lives of Erasmus.” But till my own and Mr. Drummond’s “Life” were published a few years ago, there has been no complete “Life” in our own language since Knight’s and Jortin’s in the last century, and Butler’s, published about fifty years ago, all of which are, for various reasons, unsatisfactory. The authorities at the University of Cambridge have shown their sense of the importance of this subject of Erasmus by fixing it as one of the subjects of examination in the Theological Tripos for January, 1884. I have now only space to add that the mind of Erasmus was essentially sceptical. He had doubts about everything excepting the existence of God and the obligation of the moral law. He wished the articles of faith to be brought within a very narrow compass. I have endeavoured to indicate his position in regard to the Reformation. It was because he opposed the great doctrines of original sin

and justification by faith in Christ, because he hoped by peaceful means, by literature and cultivation, to accomplish his object, that he failed hopelessly in his scheme for the regeneration of European society. Of what use is the mere knowledge of literature and science, independently of religious truth, in taming the passions, in quenching pride, in moderating ambition, in stifling envy and all the malignant passions of the natural heart? How, too, can it preserve a man from those crimes and excesses which degrade human nature, and place him on a level with the beasts that perish? But union to Christ by faith necessitates the renunciation of every known sin; attraction to God by Christ prevents the deliberate omission of any acknowledged duty. Having laid the foundation in faith, then, enjoins the Apostle, "giving all diligence, add to your faith virtue." The mere knowledge of science and literature, unconnected with the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel, cannot "bring into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." It may shed a gleam of light over "the cloudy and dark" day of adversity, and minister consolation during the weary moments of languor and disease; but it cannot cleanse us from that moral pollution with which our nature is infected; it cannot deprive death of its sting, and the grave of its victory; it cannot speak peace to the man who is troubled with a sense of his sinfulness; it cannot give us the assurance of pardon and reconciliation with our Maker; it cannot ensure us approval on the day of judgment; it cannot "minister unto us an entrance abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." Then only can we be instrumental in saving the souls of others around us, and in promoting the peace and good order of human society, when we constantly exhibit Christ as the sole atonement for known and forsaken sin, and as the best example of virtuous and holy living; Christian morals as founded upon Christian doctrine, and Christian principles as leading to Christian practice; to "the holiness without which no man shall see the Lord."

ARTHUR R. PENNINGTON.



#### ART. VI.—THE AGITATION FOR DISESTABLISHMENT.

THE preparations for a new Parliament on an extended franchise have brought the question of Church and State into sudden and excessive prominence. Whilst professing to

decline to make Disestablishment a test question for candidates at the forthcoming election, the so-called Liberationists—a designation which is still retained by those who, by their leaders, plainly declare that they are wholly indifferent to the liberation of religion, but are very deeply interested in ecclesiastical endowments, and their possible appropriation—have done their utmost to elicit a distinct enunciation of the views and intentions of candidates in this matter; and where a public cross-examination seemed inexpedient, they have, we are told, essayed to procure secret pledges.

As a result, we have a very large number of candidates practically pledged to Disestablishment and Disendowment, either unconditionally or "in the event of its being taken up by the Government of the day." This is a position of undoubted gravity, though not quite so alarming as some people have imagined. Many of these pledges have been, we are well aware, given with the greatest reluctance, and those who gave them will make not the slightest effort to promote the policy for which, on a division, they have promised to vote. At the same time, the fact that the party which will in the future, as in the past, do all in its power to impede, harass, and humiliate the Church in her great work, have secured even so many nominal adherents among the possible members of the next Parliament, is one which is far from being satisfactory to any thoughtful Englishman who recognises the many hindrances which the Church may be confronted with in the prosecution of her sacred mission.

Those who have been for any time engaged in Church Defence work can hardly be surprised at this partial success of the assailants of the Church. The enemy has long been sowing tares while men slept. The watchman on the walls has again and again tried to rouse the slumberers, but few, comparatively, have heeded the warning, appreciated the mischief which was being done, and set to work to eradicate the bad seed. Consequently, the seed has been sown broadcast, and now is bearing fruit. The franchise has been enlarged, and it will be exercised by men who, through the culpable neglect of Churchmen, have learnt to believe many strange things: that, for instance, all rectors are wealthy and fat; that the Church, as a whole, is enormously rich; and that the labour of the poor man is grievously taxed to support it. These are but samples of the delusions, diligently fostered, which are prevalent in all parts of the country to-day. The Bishop of Durham presides over a diocese whose inhabitants are not deficient in intelligence or common-sense, but he has publicly stated that it is a common belief in the Diocese of Durham that the clergy receive not less than £700 a year

each, and that their incomes and the revenues of the Church generally are derived from the taxes. On the publication of the Bishop's remarks, the anti-Church papers affected to ridicule this statement as an exaggeration or an isolated experience. I could adduce numberless examples to prove, and few of the readers of *THE CHURCHMAN* but could corroborate me, that the misconception is most common, and I question much whether, under other circumstances, the Liberation Society's representatives would so promptly ridicule it. Certainly it has been no unimportant factor in producing an acquiescence in the Society's schemes; a state of things which otherwise would be unintelligible, seeing that the working class is that which derives the greatest benefits from an Established Church, and would be the first and most serious sufferer by disruption.

At length, however, the slumberers are waking up. The heads of the Church have spoken out in trumpet-tones, and, whether they will or no, men must hear, and learn their duty. Four years ago the late Primate, having had his attention drawn to the designs of the Liberationists, issued a pastoral letter both to clergy and laity, which at the time was universally read and discussed, and for a while produced the best results. But as the impotence of the most radical Parliament of Queen Victoria seriously to injure the Established Church was realized, a false sense of security began once more to prevail, and it needed an apprehension of the unknown possibilities which resided in the newly enfranchised millions to disturb again the repose of the sleepers. Accordingly, the address of Bishop of Durham at the Annual Meeting of the Church Defence Institution in June, the few but well-considered words in which the Primate touched on the subject in speaking to his own Conference in July, and the letter which the Bishop of Rochester has forwarded to the laity of his diocese, have fallen on ears which were no longer wholly closed. The words of these prelates have received the consideration due to the high position held by them, and to their own intrinsic importance and suggestiveness. While the Archbishop speaks with dignity of the serious consequences to the State of forcing the Church to assume a resolute and united attitude against the common foe (not of attaching herself *en masse* to the Conservative party, as he was untruly charged with saying), the Bishops of Durham and Rochester deal more especially with the necessary consequences of Disestablishment, and with the measureless wrong which would be thereby inflicted on the State, the poor, the sick, the children, as well as on the daughter communions, the American and Colonial Churches. Both these documents should be read with care. They will

show to many who have, indeed, hitherto not been insensible of the magnitude of the calamity involved in Disestablishment, how far-reaching, how well-nigh universal would be its consequences, that not only would the cause of religion suffer owing to the means of its support being suddenly withdrawn, but that it would suffer just where it was most needed, and would be least likely to be supplied, in quarters where Dissent had found it impossible to live ; that it would suffer not only in England, but in every continent of the globe ; that the evil would not stop with purely religious work, but that all philanthropic efforts would be injuriously affected—schools, hospitals, temperance work, and much besides—and that, in fact, for the country to commit itself to such a scheme of Disestablishment and Disendowment as has been propounded by the Liberation Society would be nothing less than an act of national infatuation. If the truth and force of these arguments required confirmation, it has been supplied by the eager unanimity with which anti-Church papers have sought to minimize and explain them away. Their importance is, however, only too obvious to impartial judges ; and it being conceded, as anyone who reads these documents must concede, that Disestablishment would prove an unspeakable calamity, the question remains, what is our immediate duty ?

It is primarily the duty of trustees. We hold this trust of our National Christianity, nationally endowed, which has been the distinguishing characteristic of our empire for more than a thousand years, and under which God has so richly blessed our country, for those who are yet unborn, for those who are not old enough to speak and act for themselves, and for those who unassisted cannot know or appreciate adequately the heritage which is theirs. If we are unfaithful to our duty as trustees, the day may come when these may let that pass out of their hands, which, as I believe, no power can put back in its place, and which, once lost, will be regretted to all future time. There is no lack of material whereby any one may inform himself and become qualified to inform others. Books and pamphlets abound, dealing with every conceivable point of the controversy. Not to refer to older and larger works, I may mention the various volumes (S.P.C.K. and Walter Smith) prepared by Mr. Moore of Maidstone, one surely of the most indefatigable writers and workers on this subject ; to Mr. Freeman's "Essays on Disestablishment and Disendowment" (Macmillan), which maintain so clearly and unanswerably the continuity of the Church and her right to pre-Reformation Endowments ; and to the "Handy Volume of the Church Defence Institution," which is, as the press has pointed out, a very storehouse of facts and opinions. Of leaflets, the supply

is almost endless. Not to refer to some which have been prepared for local use, I may instance Bishop Ryle's (W. Hunt and Co.), not so well known as they deserve; the *Banner* leaflets which have had a very large circulation, and which, though unfortunately not altogether free from political bias, are, so far as they go, very pithy and pointed; and, lastly, to those of the "Church Defence Institution," which offer a choice of between seventy and eighty different publications. At the time when I write more than a million of these have been issued during the present year, and the demand for them appears to grow daily.

The faithful trustee having been shown what Disestablishment would involve, will therefore have no difficulty in doing his duty to avert it. From these various sources of information he will first instruct himself more perfectly in the history and position of his own Church, and he will next do his utmost to inform others who have not his opportunities or capacity. But do not let him be content with merely buying leaflets to distribute, or obtaining grants of them. Let him spare no pains by word of mouth to state facts, to remove misconceptions, and to correct misstatements. There is a readiness to learn and be put right on the part of those who have hitherto been in favour of Disestablishment, simply because they knew no better, as the lecturers of the "Church Defence Institution" can testify, from experience, in all parts of England and Wales; and it will be our reproach if the involuntarily ignorant are not taught. We can thus work, and we can give. For the next few weeks there will be special pressure. The staff of the Institution's lecturers will be considerably increased to meet increased demands, and good men deserve to be well paid. The occasion is a very serious one, and surely no one who realizes this will refuse to do his utmost. The occasion is very serious, because of the great prominence which has been already given to Disestablishment in the present electioneering campaign; but I must not be supposed to express an opinion that the struggle for Disestablishment is imminent. Even those who would most like to think so are convinced of this. "It is true," says the *Liberator*, the organ of the Liberation Society, "that the approaching General Election will not be a decisive one as regards Disestablishment; but," it adds, "it will be decisive as to the position which it will subsequently occupy in the programme of the Liberal party." I do not think my own belief could be better expressed than in the foregoing words. Our duty, then, and especially the duty of Liberal Churchmen, is to show the Liberal leaders that Disestablishment must not have a place now or hereafter in the programme of the Liberal party. Mr. Chamberlain no doubt

desires it, and some weeks ago seemed disposed, as far as he could, to insist upon it; but Lord Hartington gives no encouragement to him; and Mr. Herbert Gladstone, who may be assumed to know his father's mind, both in England and Scotland, has distinctly deprecated it. Well, indeed, he might. Never to be forgotten are his father's words in reply to the late Mr. Watkin Williams in 1871, and they may be commended to the earnest attention of some of Mr. Gladstone's lieutenants to-day:

I do not envy my hon. and learned friend, or my hon. friend the Member for Merthyr Tydvil, or any other man who ventures to take in hand the business of Disestablishing the Church of England. Even if it were as fit to be done as I think it unfit, there is a difficulty in the case before which the boldest man would recoil. It is all very well so long as we deal with abstract declarations put upon the Notice Paper of this House, of what might be done or ought to be done; but only go up to the walls and gates and look at the way in which stone is built upon stone, on the way in which the foundations have been dug, and the way they go down into the earth, and consider by what tools, what artillery you can bring that fabric to the ground. I know the difficulties, and I am not prepared in any shape or form to encourage—by dealing with my hon. and learned friend's motion in any way except the simple mode of negative—the creation of expectations which it would be most guilty, most unworthy, most dishonourable on our part to entertain, lest we should convey a virtual pledge.<sup>o</sup>

Long may such sentiments be the sentiments of the Liberal leaders; and, meanwhile, of this let Churchmen be assured, that if by the force of honest persuasion and pure conviction they ward off the present attack, they will do far more than leave the Church where they found her: they will leave her much stronger, because far better understood, because any number of cobwebs will have been for ever swept away, and the people, having seen through the fallacies by which interested parties have sought to delude them, will realize that the Church is their own Church, that those who attack her strike at them, and that they would not only be false to their trust but utterly blind to their own best interests if with open eyes they consented to part with their religious inheritance, the admiration of Continental Christians, the pride and stay of Anglican Churchmen in all lands.

H. GRANVILLE DICKSON.

<sup>o</sup> Since this paper was written, Mr. Gladstone's manifesto to the electors of Midlothian has been published; and it must be confessed that it does not leave the Church question precisely where it was before. Mr. Gladstone undoubtedly now regards Disestablishment as a possibility, though in the dim and distant future; but he insists "that so vast a question cannot become practical until it shall have grown familiar to the public mind by thorough discussion." Certainly we should have liked to have seen higher ground taken, but Churchmen will only have themselves to blame if they do not accept the warning which is offered them, and labour strenuously to inform "the public mind" on this all-important question ere it becomes "practical."

H. G. D.

## Review.

*The Oldest Church Manual, called the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, the Didache and Kindred Documents in the original, with Translations and Discussions of Post-Apostolic Teaching, Baptism, Worship, and Discipline, and with Illustrations and Facsimiles of the Jerusalem Manuscript.* By PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., LL.D. New York. Funk and Wagnalls. 1885.

THIS somewhat prolix title gives a tolerably full account of the contents of the volume which Dr. Schaff has lately added to his numerous valuable works. It is probably the best work on the *Didache* that has as yet appeared ; and those who have not yet provided themselves with a commentary on the newly-discovered treasure can hardly do wrong by in at once providing themselves with Dr. Schaff's most interesting book. His "Church History" has for many years been one of the very best in the English language. The recently revised and enlarged edition of it is virtually a new work, especially as regards the very important item of bibliography. The second volume of it, which covers the ground occupied by the *Didache*, was already out before the *Didache* itself had become generally known. Consequently, Dr. Schaff has given us a separate volume devoted to the discussion and illustration of this treatise. And his readers may rejoice that he has thus had full scope for the exercise of his ability and learning, instead of being compelled to crowd the subject into a chapter or two of the "Church History." The result is a monograph fully up to the level of the larger work. And that is no mean praise.

In the very limited space that can be granted here it is impossible to do justice to the book, but a few of the conclusions arrived at may be noticed.

Dr. Schaff successfully vindicates the *Didache* from the charge of Ebionism. It "shows no trace of the chief characteristics of this Judaizing heresy : the necessity of circumcision for salvation, the perpetual obligation of the whole ritual as well as moral law of Moses, the denial of the Divinity of Christ, the intense hostility to Paul as an apostate and heretic, the restoration of the Jews, the millennial reign of Christ in Jerusalem" (p. 24). Rather the *Didache* shows us that early, simple form of Christianity, narrow in view, but very earnest in practice, which is prior to Ebionism. Its writer sees no necessity for insisting upon those truths which the Ebionite afterwards assailed.

Dr. Schaff asserts the *authenticity* of the document with confidence. He agrees with Bishop Lightfoot that "no one could or would have forged it." And its *date* is probably very early. "There is nothing in it which could not have been written between A.D. 70 and 100." This is shown rather by what it does not contain than by what it does. The chief features of Church History and Christian life in the second century are absent from it. No heresy is attacked, no creed formulated, no festival indicated, no Canon of New Testament Scripture hinted at. In these respects, and in the Scriptural simplicity of its language, it is certainly older than Justin Martyr, Barnabas, or Hermas. It is less easy to determine the *place* in which it was composed ; but with M. Sabatier (*La Didaché ou l'enseignement des douze Apôtres*), though for somewhat different reasons, Dr. Schaff inclines to Syria, and in particular to Antioch, where "all the conditions (except the community of goods) were given for such a Jewish-Christian Irenicum as the *Didache*. The book must have been

well known in Syria, for there it was expanded and superseded by the Pseudo-Clementine Constitutions and Canons, which are certainly of Syrian origin" (p. 125).

Chapters XXIV. and XXV., on the relation of the *Didache* to the Canon of Scripture, and on its style and vocabulary, are full of very valuable material. On the former subject Dr. Schaff takes the view advocated in THE CHURCHMAN of July, 1884, that "the writer of the *Didache* was acquainted with our fourth Gospel and the other Johannean writings, or at all events with the Johannean type of teaching. He would thus furnish the earliest, or one of the earliest, testimonies to the existence of that Gospel." "He never quotes from it, but there are remarkable resemblances between the two which cannot be accidental" (pp. 89, 92). These "Prolegomena" conclude with a very full digest of the literature which has appeared in Europe since the publication of the edition of Bryennios in February, 1884. The amount is surprising, and the guide to it, thus furnished, most valuable.

Then follows the text with parallel translation and copious notes (pp. 161-218); and the remainder of the volume is mainly taken up with an elucidation of documents closely connected with the *Didache*, viz., a Latin fragment of the *Doctrina Apostolorum*, the appendix to the "Epistle of Barnabas," certain portions of the "Shepherd of Hermas," the "Apostolical Church Order or Ecclesiastical Canons," the "Coptic Church Order," and Book VII. of the "Apostolical Constitutions." Throughout there are marginal references to the parallel passages in the *Didache*, and the words which are common to the *Didache*, and to the document compared with it, are distinguished by different type—a great convenience to the student.

To determine the exact relationship of these early Christian writings to one another is a problem of great interest and some intricacy. A far more profitable and more simple problem is that which arises when any or all of these documents are compared with the New Testament. The immeasurable superiority of Scripture to the very best that these pious writers of the first and second centuries have produced is evident and indisputable. On what hypothesis can this superiority be explained, if the reality of Divine inspiration is rejected? Those who wish to judge for themselves will find clear statement of the evidence and able guidance in estimating it in Dr. Schaff's book.

The volume is enriched with some valuable illustrations, especially an interesting facsimile of portions of the unique MS. of the *Didache*, edited by Bryennios.

The following extract will give our readers some idea of Dr. Schaff's manner of exposition :

The PROPHETS are mentioned in close connection with the Apostles, but with this difference, that they were not sent as missionaries to the heathen, but instructors and comforters of converts, and might settle in a particular congregation. In this case, they are to be supported like the priests in the Jewish theocracy, "according to the commandment." A congregation, however, may be without a Prophet, though not without Bishops and Deacons. There were, it seems, itinerant Prophets and stationary Prophets. In the absence of a Prophet the congregational offerings should be given to the poor.

The *Didache* shows a preference for the Prophets: they are mentioned fifteen times (the Apostles only three times); they are called "chief-priests," and they alone are allowed the privilege to pray extempore as much as they please in public worship. But as there are false Apostles, so there are also false Prophets, and they must be judged by their fruits. Avarice is a sure sign of a false Prophet.

Paul gives the Prophets the preference over the Glossolalists, because prophecy

was for the edification of the congregation, while the glossolalia was an abrupt, broken, ejaculatory, transcendental utterance of prayer and praise for the gratification of the individual. . . . It seems to have passed away soon after the Apostolic age. It is not mentioned in the *Didache*.

. . . In the Jewish dispensation the Prophets, since the time of Samuel, constituted one of the three orders of the theocracy, with the sacerdotal and royal order. In the New Testament there is no trace of a prophetic order. The gift was distributed and exercised chiefly in expounding the deeper sense of the Scriptures, and rousing the conscience and heart of the hearers.

The Prophets of the *Didache* are the successors of these earlier Prophets. . . . Gradually the prophetic office disappeared before the episcopal, which would not tolerate a rival, and was better suited for the ordinary government of the Church. Montanism revived prophecy in an eccentric and fanatical shape, with predictions of the approaching Millennium; but the Millennium did not appear, and the new prophecy was condemned and defeated by the episcopal hierarchy. In our days Irvingism made a similar attempt and met a similar fate. (Pp. 69-72.)

ALFRED PLUMMER.

---

## Short Notices.

---

*The Case for "Establishment" Stated.* By THOMAS MOORE, Vicar of Holy Trinity, Maidstone, author of "The Englishman's Brief on behalf of the National Church," etc., etc. Pp. 237. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

THE author of this very welcome Manual is so well known that words of introduction are not here needed. His admirable works on "Church and State" questions have been several times commended in THE CHURCHMAN; and he has in many ways been doing right good service during the last few years. The present Manual, as a whole, will meet with very general acceptance, we think; but a statement now and then in regard to the strictly legal aspects of the case will probably appear, in a second edition, in a somewhat different setting, or at least be expressed in a more precise and cautious fashion. For ourselves, we are inclined to agree with the able author in the main; but we feel a difficulty touching the modification of "restraints" of Reformation statutes. Many loyal Churchmen, perhaps, will be of opinion that restraints imposed upon the Church by the Act of Submission might be "modified, compatibly with the rights of the Crown" (p. 75). It is easy, however, in one's dislike of "Erasianism," to run to an extreme in an opposite direction. A large proportion of Mr. Moore's book, as we have said, is sound and valuable; it shows not only patient labour and research, but literary power.

An extract from the preface will explain the title of the book:—

In giving this book the title of "The Case for 'Establishment,'" [we read] the author desires to explain, with reference to the word "Establishment," that he does not accept that term as accurately descriptive of any formal Act

by which the State established the Church, or gave her status or prestige ; nor does he accept the word as legally descriptive of any specific statutable basis of the existing relations between Church and State. He simply takes the term "Establishment" as a word in current use which is popularly but loosely and inadequately employed to represent the union between Church and State ; and in dealing with it, while protesting against its historical inaccuracy, for the purposes of discussion he falls in with its popular use.

*Hymns of the Present Century, from the German.* Rendered into English verse by the Rev. JOHN KELLY, editor of the "Present Day Tracts," translator of Gerhardt's "Spiritual Songs," etc. R.T.S.

Many admirers of sacred poetry will be much pleased with this little book. It is a good selection from the works of the Christian singers of Germany in the Nineteenth Century ; and on the whole Mr. Kelly has done his translating work remarkably well.

*Nenia ; or Voices from the Silent Land.* By J. T. HEATHERTHWAYTE, author of "Only a Little Organ Boy," etc. London Literary Society, 376, Strand. 1885.

A thoughtful and well-written work. Readers who admire literary skill, but above all value religious teaching, will like it much. Quiet, simple, and of a tender tone, its pleasing fable-lessons—the voices of birds and flowers—will win their way. On one page we notice the words "perfect self-abnegation ;" in a second edition probably the accomplished writer will express the intended lesson in simpler, easier words.

*For Ever with Jesus ; or Home at Last !* By DAVID A. DOUDNEY, D.D., Vicar of St. Luke's, Bedminster. Pp. 264. W. H. and L. Collingridge.

Dr. Doudney's writings are well known ; and the present work—issued, as the title-page tells us, in his seventy-fifth year—will be welcomed by many attached friends.

*Egypt and Syria : their Physical Features in relation to Bible History.* By Sir WILLIAM DAWSON, C.M.G., LL.D., F.R.S. The Religious Tract Society.

This volume is No. VI. of that valuable series, "By-paths of Bible Knowledge," and a very good volume it is. It contains the results of observations made in the winter of 1883-4. Here are a few sentences from the concluding chapter :

The descendants of that great race that made the valley of the Nile the seat of the highest civilization of the ancient world have become servants of servants, and have fallen under the yoke of peoples who, in the days of their forefathers, were mere barbarians, and who at this day are at a lower social level than that of Egypt in the days of the Pharaohs.

Yet we cannot view Egypt and study its modern people without seeing that there may be hope for them yet, and that "Jehovah shall return to Egypt, and they shall return to Jehovah, and He will be entreated of them and heal them" (Isai. xix. 22), a prophecy which no doubt had its partial fulfilment long ago, but which may have a greater and brighter one in the future.

*The Lord is Coming.* A Plain Narrative of Prophetic Events in their Order. By Rev. W. HASLAM, M.A. Third thousand. Morgan and Scott.

This book has clearly an interest of its own : it has been read by at least three thousand persons. Its divisions are—(1) The Parousia, or the secret coming of the Lord for His saints ; (2) the Apocalypse, or

the revelation of the Son of Man to execute judgment on the world of the ungodly ; (3) the Epiphaneia, or the manifest coming of the Lord to take the Kingdom. Here is a bit from the section which expounds "the restitution of all things :—

Zechariah tells us that "the Lord's feet shall stand in that day upon the Mount of Olives . . ." (xiv. 4, 5). In these remarkable words we have note of a change which is to be in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem. A valley is to be formed from the Mediterranean to the Dead Sea. In consequence, a channel shall be opened across Palestine, through which the waters of the Atlantic, by the Mediterranean Sea, will pour through and fill the desert beyond. Then a highway shall be made to the East and to the West. This physical change evidently refers to some intended improvement, not to destruction. It will render Jerusalem more accessible to all the nations of the world.

*Easter in St. Paul's.* Sermons bearing chiefly on the Resurrection of Our Lord. 2 vols. By H. P. LIDDON, D.D., D.C.L. Rivingtons.

In these two volumes appear, we need hardly say, many passages of real eloquence and power, and, viewing the sermons as a whole, the standard—take it how one may—is singularly high. A certain amount of repetition, in two volumes of discourses on the Resurrection, is almost unavoidable ; and here and there in each volume, perhaps, one notices a passage which—as the Canon modestly remarks in a prefatory note—a "true literary judgment would have proscribed." The first sermon, "The Importance of the Resurrection," was preached at St. Paul's in April, 1883 ; the second, "The Empty Tomb," on Easter-Day, 1877.

Upon certain points of doctrine we differ widely from Dr. Liddon ; and several statements in these sermons, here and there, invite criticism. For instance, Canon Liddon says (vol. ii., p. 95), "A well-spent Lord's Day should always begin with that supreme act of Christian worship in which we meet Jesus verily and indeed . . . the Most Holy Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Redeemer." "Begin with . . ." we read ; and on the next page we find the words "before breakfast." Now, what authority has Dr. Liddon for this? The Prayer-Book? Certainly not, for the Prayer-Book makes no provision whatever for "Early Communion." The New Testament? Certainly not, for the practice in the period of the New Testament was *evening*—not early in the morning. But we refrain from comment.

Here is an extract from the sermon entitled "Christianity without the Resurrection :—

If we do indeed believe that He is risen, that stupendous faith does and must mould thought, feeling, resolve, in very various ways. If we do believe that He is risen and living, then we know that to part with this faith would affect the life of our spirits, just as the extinction of the sun's light and warmth in the heavens would affect all beings that live and grow on this earth. If Jesus Risen is indeed the Object of our faith, then our religion is not merely the critical study of an ancient literature, but a vitally distinct thing : it is the communion of our spirits with a living and Divine Being. It is faith in the Resurrection which marks our present relations to Jesus Christ, as altogether different from those which we have to the famous dead who have in past years filled the thoughts and governed the history of mankind. At the beginning of this century—as it is natural to reflect within these walls—Nelson and Wellington were second to none among the men who claimed the attention of the world. Where are they now? Their ashes moulder beneath our feet. Where are they now? Their disembodied spirits are waiting, we know not exactly where, for the hour of the Judgment. But where is Jesus Christ? He, risen from His grave, arrayed in His glorified manhood, is seated on the Throne of Heaven ; He is the meeting-point of the vast empire of living souls ; He is in communication, constant and intimate, with millions of beings, to whom, by His death and His triumph over Death,

by His persistent and exhaustless life, He is made Wisdom and Righteousness, and Sanctification and Redemption. Yes! to believe in the Risen Jesus is to live under a sky which is ever bright. It is to believe that He is "alive for evermore, and has the keys of hell and of death."

*Christ for To-day.* International Sermons by eminent Preachers of the Episcopal Church in England and America. Edited by Rev. H. D. RAWNSLEY, Crosthwaite Vicarage, Keswick. Pp. 250. Swan, Sonneschein and Co. 1885.

The opening sermon in this volume is Archdeacon Farrar's on "The Duty of Governments." Sermons by Dr. Hatch, Mr. Lambert, Vicar of Greenwich, Dr. Llewellyn Davies, Mr. Barnett, Vicar of St. Jude's, Whitechapel, and others of the same School, follow. We have read with interest the sermons of American preachers.

*Under the Shadow of His Wings.* Comforting Words for the Weary. Pp. 206. The Religious Tract Society.

A selection of Scriptures, with appropriate hymns and expository extracts. The illustrative extracts are from well-known authors, and are, as a rule, judicious.

*A Schoolmaster's Retrospect of Eighteen and a Half Years in an Irish School.* By MAURICE C. HIME, M.A., LL.D. (Barrister-at-law), Head Master of Foyle College, Londonderry. Second edition. Simpkin, Marshall and Co.

Dr. Hime's writings have more than once been favourably noticed in these pages; and we are pleased to invite attention to a second edition of the "Retrospect."

*Paul the Apostle.* A Poem by JOSEPH BEVAN BRAITHWAITE. Seeley and Co.

There is much in this poem which we like; it is sound and suggestive, and we have pleasure in commending it. As to its literary merits, viewing it strictly as poetry, opinions will differ. The devout reader will, at all events, esteem it, as we have said, suggestive; its tone is true and sweet, while many passages have a pleasing power. Here is a specimen extract :

Thence urging on his course  
Along the shore of inland bay retired,  
Fair Salamis athwart his eye reveals  
Her beauty, and recalls heroic deeds  
When Greece was young. Now, Daphne passed, he sees  
Where o'er the plain Ilissus softly flows,  
Proud Athens rise, lovely as cloudless dawn,  
Bright star of Hellas, shining still undimmed,  
Her halls and temples glorious as they stood  
In age of Pericles, unscathed by time.  
By groves of olives old as Socrates,  
Of which, perchance, some even now survive,<sup>1</sup>  
Onward he comes along the "Sacred Way."

We have pleasure in recommending a reprint from THE CHURCHMAN a twelve-paged pamphlet, published by Mr. Elliot Stock: *Man's Dominion over the Lower Animals not Unlimited*, by Hon. P. CARTERET HILL, D.C.L., late Premier of Nova Scotia.

<sup>1</sup> So I was informed at Athene, by my friend Professor Rhouseopoulos.

In the *Art Journal* appears "The Evening Hour," from the picture by B. W. Leader, A.R.A. The continuation of "Hammersmith and Chiswick" is excellent.

In the *National Review* (W. H. Allen and Co.)—a very good number—"My Lecturing Tour in England," by Professor VAMBÉRY, is very readable.

The *Monthly Interpreter* (T. and T. Clark) has a thoughtful paper on "Our Lord's Groaning in Spirit," by Rev. J. HUTCHISON, D.D.

In *Cassell's Family Magazine*, as we have occasionally remarked, the papers on "Health," by a "Family Doctor," are exceedingly good. Here is a bit about indigestion. Forcing the appetite, dyspeptic, *won't do!* Regulate your life, and live according to the rules of health. Tone is needed :

The greatest mistakes of all are over-eating and eating too often. So long as a person is growing, the system needs extra nourishment to enable nature to build up the framework of the body. But adults have need of food only to supply the materials for new blood to make up for the waste of tissue. This waste of tissue is constantly going on, to be sure, but only in direct ratio to the work we do, whether mental or bodily. If a greater quantity of food is taken into the system than can be used up, it is more deleterious than if we had swallowed so much sand. The food so partaken of leaves the stomach in an undigested form, and never fails to work all kinds of mischief, and, instead of doing good, it does injury, and weakens the body that it was intended to strengthen.

It may be a convenience to some of our readers to be informed that the work of Professor SCHAFF, *The Oldest Church Manual*, reviewed in these pages by Dr. Plummer, is issued on this side the Atlantic by the eminent Edinburgh publishers, Messrs. T. and T. Clark.

The September *Foreign Church Chronicle and Review* (Rivingtons) has three or four interesting and informing papers. The Editor says : "We cannot but be thankful to see that by his first appointment the Prime Minister has shown himself to be conscious that the school of Words-worth and Hook requires strengthening among the chief officers of the Church." Certainly, under Mr. Gladstone, High Churchmen who were loyal to the principles of the Reformation, learned and liberal, have been much neglected.

We have much pleasure in recommending *Illustrated Lectures on Ambulance Work*, by R. LAWTON ROBERTS, M.D. (H. K. Lewis, 136, Gower Street, W.C.); a capital little book, which many of our clerical as well as lay readers, associated with Ambulance "centres," may be glad to hear of.

The *Thirteenth Annual Report of the South Eastern Clerical and Lay Church Alliance* (Maidstone : W. S. Vivish) will have an interest, no doubt, for many of our readers. It gives information about the South Eastern College at Ramsgate and the Maidstone Deaconess Home. The statement made by the Head Master of the College, the Rev. E. d'AUQUIER, must have been welcomed by many supporters of that excellent institution. The address at the annual gathering of the Alliance was given by the Dean of CANTERBURY, the President ; and papers were read by the Rev. W. WALSH, J. W. MARSHALL, Rev. W. O. PURTON, and others. Mr. Purton's paper was entitled "Some Aspects of Modern Literature ;" and the chief portions of it may here be quoted.

Mr. Purton said :

"Taking up a certain review one day, some three years ago, Lord Beaconsfield said, 'Curious, is it not ? Reading an article in this publi-

"cation I find it demonstrated that there is no God. Going a little further, and perusing another paper, I discover that the Pope is God's vicegerent. Well, that is a little perplexing.' This remark of Lord Beaconsfield shows one of the aspects of modern literature. There are publications of a composite character—publications which remind us of "an old word (Latimer used it), *mingle-mangle*. In one part of such a publication you will find Infidelity, in another Infallibility; one article is sceptical criticism, and another apologetic. This, for many readers, is not only, as Lord Beaconsfield said, a *little* perplexing; it perplexes sorely. A subtle argument against miracles appearing under the same cover as a defence of dogma by an orthodox divine, may with the younger and less-experienced readers work much mischief, particularly if the anti-Christian paper be what is called brilliant, and the orthodox "rather the other way.

"The growth of periodicals of this composite character, as readers of Anthony Trollope's *Autobiography* may recollect, has been considerable, and it is worthy of note. But the principle concerns publications of different kinds; 'Essays and Reviews' may be quoted in instance.

"Again: there are encyclopædias, and there are commentaries. There is literary co-operation in the way of what may be called company-concerns, with limited liability. Of these joint-stock publications many, "no doubt, are excellent. But the effect of others must surely be evil; "writings which sneer at matters which young persons have held sacred; "which take for granted that such and such novelties are at least 'open "questions'; which patronize, as worthy of kindly treatment, 'old- "fashioned' beliefs. If parents place these publications upon their "drawing-room tables, what can they expect? Much, I fear, is admitted "into the family circle which can hardly fail to instil doubts and relax "the sinews of Christian effort. There are honest and good souls, it is "true, upon whom anti-Christian literature makes no impression what- "ever. Some, because their faith is strong, settled, established; others, "because they hardly see what the sneer or innuendo means. Worthy "creatures there are, tens of thousands, no doubt, like Mrs. Nesbit in the "novel 'Dred.' When somebody warned Mrs. Nesbit, as she was reading Gibbon's 'Decline and Fall,' that its principles were infidel, she replied, "Gibbon! why he struck me as a very pious writer! I'm sure he makes "the most religious reflections, all along!"

Another aspect of modern literature, said Mr. Purton, is the increase of fiction:

"All will agree, no doubt, that in the literature of our day fiction plays a large and important part. There can hardly be a dispute about it; whether we approve or regret it, the fact remains. Observers will have noticed, e.g., how large a portion of periodicals is taken up, as a rule, with stories. In certain cases the story is sweetened with Christian love and hope; in others, the absence of religion is conspicuous. Tales, stories, novelettes, and novels are growing more numerous every year. Many are pure and good; some, no doubt, really helpful. Yet to cultivate the imaginative faculties too keenly is not desirable; and to mistake dessert for dinner is sure to spoil the digestion. An accomplished scholar, an earnest and keenly reflecting Christian, has lately complained that for serious study 'light literature' has left but little room. Nor is such a complaint uncalled for. There is the magazine, the review, the newspaper, the three-volume or single-volume novel; writings of various kinds that are 'attractive.' But for history, poetry, travels (unless with plenty of illustrations, and amusing and startling incidents), and the graver kinds of literature, what room is left? Certainly the very common demand, as regards periodicals, for

"brilliant" articles leads to the conclusion that with many readers—not to say with most—the one unpardonable offence of an article is to be *dry*.

"Of a by no means small proportion of three-volume novels the tone and tendency is bad. This is the general opinion, probably, among devout and thoughtful lookers-on. There is about them a flippancy, a "worldliness, a 'spicy' sensationalism, which for youthful readers especially must be mischievous. Sensational in some sort, no doubt, a work of fiction can hardly fail to be; and there are sensational novels which are either strongly moral, or leavened with old-fashioned piety. But as to a large number of sensational novels no earnest Christian would hesitate for a moment to say, 'They are bad; they shall not enter my house.' Some are prurient, and others coarse; perhaps the prurient, "with their double meanings and innuendoes, are the worst. It is said that pruriently suggestive descriptions of immorality in aristocratic circles are sure to *pay*. That pictures of handsome Lord Adalbert and dainty Lady Fanny, with reckless expenditure and shameless lust, "tricked out and apologized for, are potent for evil, whether they appear in penny papers or expensive volumes, there can be no doubt. It was stated recently, that a novel which was prohibited in Paris was displayed in a bookseller's window in London; it was also stated that the circulation of French novels of a very mischievous type is increasing in England."

Another aspect of modern literature, said Mr. Purton, is a growing dislike to religious controversy:

"As to controversy, one can understand people growing weary of it. Recent years have been largely controversial. People now cry, 'Enough!' The spread of Agnosticism and Atheism has an effect on many devout disputants; it softens, if it does not silence, their disputings upon secondary matters. Just now, moreover, an earnestness of spirit which seeks to diminish ignorance, drunkenness, and social evils of various kinds is an important factor. *Work* is the demand of our age—an age which ought not lightly to be sneered at as utilitarian. And, further, there is a great wave of evangelistic feeling; happily it is still increasing; and if this be rightly regarded by Christian people, it will result, under God, in unspeakable blessings for our own dear country and for the world. Expository and evangelistic writings will probably be yet much more valued."

It may be granted, indeed, continued Mr. Purton, that of controversial literature, much, practically speaking, is useless:

"Looking over the controversial writings of our own day, one can hardly avoid the thought—What *waste*! Many are only read by those who agree with the author; many are only partly read; many are never read at all. Some are too stiff with regard to minor points; some relate to matters about which no interest is felt; some remind one of Cecil's remark, that the offence of the Cross may be increased by want of courtesy and tact."

The attack upon dogma in modern literature, he proceeded to say, takes many forms:

"There is Positivism, and Pessimism, and Agnosticism, and Atheistic Socialism; there is patronizing Infidelity, bland, good-humoured, which takes you by the button-hole and discourses of sweet, soul-satisfying "culture (though to be sure it is a little doubtful whether you have a "soul); and there is coarse Infidelity, 'rough and ready,' with jeers and sneers and blatant blasphemies. All these agree that dogma is delusion.

"The infidelity of the artisan and working classes is not, speaking broadly, of the cultured nineteenth-century type. The readers of those cheap

" weekly newspapers, which are not very friendly to Christianity, know " nothing apparently of Positivism and the anti-Christian fads of Bel- " gravian doubters. For artisans who are really inclined to Atheism, the " speculative stuff which plain English cannot expound has no attraction. " The English Deism of the last century, dressed up by German scepti- " cism, with a dash of *Tom Paine*, forms the staple of their infidelity."

Mr. Purton recommended, for many inquirers, the "Present Day Tracts" of the Religious Tract Society—an excellent series; and he added "that to those who are perplexed by Dutch-English assaults on the Old Testament, such books as Mr. Sime's 'The Kingdom of all Israel' will prove most helpful."

" Of apologetic and of expository publications which are sound and " practical there is a tolerably good supply. Some of these, however, lack " freshness. Now the present period may not be studious; nevertheless " it reads, and it likes something fresh; it protests against a dry repeti- " tion of the conventional. Suggestiveness certainly tells. Another " quality admired is strength. Many sound writings are dubbed (often " unjustly) goody-goody; others, no doubt, are not robust; they are poor, " thin, and unsatisfying. It is true, of course, that the best food for " babes is milk; yet even in a milk-and-water diet there may be too " much water.

" In regard to Infidelity and our shrewd, hard-headed working men, " what is to be said? It is my firm conviction that it is to evangelical " teaching for Christianizing the masses of this country that the Church " must look. I do not use the word 'evangelical' in any party sense; I " have not written the word with a capital 'E.' Nor is my reference merely " to the evangelical teaching of the National Church. As regards the " people of this country in these democratic days, the great need, surely, " is 'the truth as it is in Jesus.' I mean the pure, simple Gospel, with its " notes of liberty, and dignity, and duty.

" But 'what of the middle and the upper classes?' it may be asked. " The middle class does not perhaps at present influence religious thought " as once it did; but there is no sign or symptom that evangelical teach- " ing is likely to lose its hold over them. And as to the cultured classes, " I hopefully quote the recent words of an accomplished writer, an acute " observer, Mrs. Oliphant. Mrs. Oliphant remarks that after the long " reign of freethinking and over-liberality, the faith of the Evangelical " party may, perhaps, again prevail.

" As to the co-operation of Christians in presence of anti-Christian " tendencies, it is surely expedient, just, and wise to agree to differ upon " minor points, and to make more prominent the fundamental verities " upon which they are agreed, specially the truths which are embodied in " the Lord Jesus Christ.

Among sincere Christians, Mr. Purton added, "there prevails now and " then a tendency to give up this or that established truth with the view " of propitiating unbelief. A foolish policy, and fatal. As an eminent " scholar, Canon Cook, has recently remarked, 'An all but unlimited tolera- " tion of speculative opinions is perhaps the most prominent characteristic " of the Christian intelligence in our age. . . . There is no inconsiderable " danger . . . lest the minds of young or untrained inquirers should be " seriously affected.' It is most important, therefore, adds the venerable " Canon, 'that we should strenuously, earnestly, fearlessly, hold fast all " fundamental principles, and deliberate most carefully before we abandon " any position by which these principles seem to be supported, or by the " surrender of which they seem to be imperilled.' Such counsel, given by " a scholar who is at once tolerant and liberal, while staunchly orthodox, " seems most timely. For myself, speaking only for myself, applying the

" Canon's touchstone to the inspired record of the creation of man and " woman, I confess I am surprised at the facility with which a Darwinism, " which virtually, if I am right, contradicts that record, has been largely " accepted in the circles of Christian literature."

The next division of Mr. Purton's paper touched upon "Modern Literature with regard to the Church of England. Summing up books, tracts, magazines, and newspapers, and so forth—what is the influence of the Press touching that grand old Church, which is Scriptural, Catholic, Protestant, National?" On one point, at least, he said, all would be agreed; in looking over the field of duty, they ought, as loyal Churchmen, to remember the PRESS in connexion with the Church:

" Much attention, nowadays, is excited with regard to the deepening " of the spiritual life. For this of course we are thankful. But of those " suggestive books of devotion, and perhaps of exposition, which are of a " *present-day* character, the store is somewhat scanty. The Ritualists " have been very active. There are manuals—specially manuals for com- " municants—which old-fashioned High Churchmen would reckon un- " sound; and these, being puffed and pushed, circulate widely. Some " excellent books, unhappily, are little known. Again, as to the Church, " what the Church is, and what the Church teaches, more good books, " cleverly composed and of a popular character, are greatly needed. Ignor- " ance sadly prevails among nominal Church-folk. In the book of Lord " Malmesbury's, just out, 'Memoirs of an ex-Minister,' there is an auec- " dote which may, in a fashion, illustrate this remark. A rustic being " asked what was the outward and visible sign in Baptism, replied 'The " baby'! Seriously, the lack of publications with sound Church teaching, " as regards artisans as well as peasants, is undeniable. For the middle " and upper classes, again, there is need of manuals, of a good style, clear " and readable." Mr. Purton mentioned, in passing, two excellent little books, Canon Stowell's on the Catechism and Archdeacon Bardsley's on Confirmation; also "A Layman's View of Church Ordinances" by Captain Churchill. He proceeded: " If people are not taught how " Scriptural the Prayer Book is, how noble an institution the Church " is, why should we wonder at Indifferentism or Dissent? I well " remember a conversation I had some twenty years ago with Charles " Bridges, a man in whom spirituality and common-sense were (as in " Edward Auriol) closely combined. Mr. Bridges said to me with " emphasis, ' We ought to make them good *Church* folk.' 'Unsectarian' " literature is one thing; 'Church of England' literature is another."

The last division of Mr. Purton's paper referred to members of the Evangelical School, and literature. " What influence do Evangelicals exert through the Press on the Church, and on the country? Have they as much influence as they ought to have, as they might have?" Mr. Purton said:

" Lately, in the *Record*, a Cambridge Professor wrote that the Evan- " gelical party neglected literature. His exact words I do not remember, " but the friendly suggestion was obvious, viz., that in due measure " Evangelical Churchmen should cultivate literature, should both read " and recommend that which for each class in the community is good, " and should strive through the Press, in various ways, to exercise legiti- " mate influence. It is an old story, it may be said, this remark about " Evangelicals neglecting literature; but the question is, surely, how far " is it true? It is urged that the Evangelicals do not appreciate cul- " ture, make a poor figure in scholarly theology, and neglect higher " education; and that by such a course they lose much in an age which " is becoming more and more educationist. In passing, I may remark, " that as to higher education I am speaking in the neighbourhood of a

"College which is a brilliant success ; and further, as to scholarship, that "an able and erudite divine—eminent in the highest rank—is our president to-day. But the question is worthy of serious consideration. It "has been, no doubt, the great and most honourable distinction of the "Evangelical body that they have devoted themselves to really practical "and pressing work. The laity and clergy of Evangelical principles "founded missions, and missionary agencies for home and foreign work ; "and the clergy aimed, before all things, to be earnest in house-to-house "visiting, as Pastors, while faithful and laborious Preachers. Nevertheless, each period has its own peculiar duties ; and at the present crisis, "when almost everybody reads, and many think, and many are influenced "by the Press who read little and think less, it is surely the duty of the "laity, as well as of the clergy, to strive to exercise a legitimate influence "on the literature of the day.

"Authors are needed quite as much as readers, and those who can recommend ; nor are writings only of a religious character required. In many different departments of literature an Evangelical influence may "make itself felt. The other day I heard the question : 'How many of "our good school books, lower and higher, are written by Churchmen "of the Evangelical School?' Constructive rather than controversial "literature seems to me the special need of this time. St. Paul mentions "ἀπολογία and βεβαιωσίς. The Church ever needs the positive as well as "the negative. We must teach as well as criticize ; set forth the true "as well as expose the erroneous. A party which is for ever protesting, "which spends much of its strength in criticizing and complaining, "which does not courageously, cheerfully, consistently construct, will "assuredly not stimulate or sway the masses, or change the currents of "thought."

As regards the three great Schools of the Church of England, the High, the Evangelical, and the Broad, Mr. Purton concluded by asking, Does present-day literature show signs of increasing friendliness and appreciation between one another ? In his opinion it does. He thoroughly went with his valued friend, Canon Garbett, when in his preface to the book entitled "Evangelical Principles," published nine or ten years ago, he regretted the coldness and unfriendliness of loyal High Churchmen towards their Evangelical brethren. "It is," said Canon Garbett, "of the utmost importance to the Church of England that the various orthodox sections of the Church should understand and appreciate each other's opinions." "With this," said Mr. Purton, "I "thoroughly agree. If moderate men—men who hold the great fundamental truths, who are faithful Churchmen—can only draw more "together, Rationalism and Ritualism will certainly be checked. Of such "drawing together it seems to me there are many hopeful symptoms ; "and the number of those Churchmen, and I hope of Churchwomen, is "steadily increasing, who in some particulars 'High,' or 'Broad,' or "Low,' respect each other and regard each other with friendly eyes ; all "being thoroughly loyal, to quote the title of your Alliance, to the "principles of the Reformation."

---

### THE MONTH.

THE Disestablishment Returns of the *Record* have naturally attracted much attention throughout the country, and have brought forth a good deal of controversial correspondence and comment. These Returns, for obtaining which our

contemporary merits hearty thanks, will in many ways, we believe, do good service. The *Record* (Sept. 11) says :

Of the 579 Liberal and Radical candidates now before the constituencies of England, Scotland, and Wales, we have ascertained that 403 are in favour of Disestablishment, and only 37 against. If the 106 candidates of whose views we have been unable to learn anything are to be divided in the same ratio, it follows that the enemies of the Church on the Liberal side are in an overpowering majority ; while even if we assume that all the 106 blanks ought to be filled up as "against Disestablishment"—a wholly incredible hypothesis—the Liberationists would still have a large working majority.

The *Guardian* (Sept. 16) remarks that if Liberal Churchmen are "to act to any purpose, there is not a moment to be lost. If the list of candidates which the *Record* has prepared with so much care and labour is anything like accurate, they have hitherto been terribly remiss. Unless they can now redeem their neglect, the Liberal party will enter the new Parliament pledged to Disestablishment." The *Guardian* adds :

If Liberal Churchmen will at once make known to the candidates for whom they would naturally vote that they cannot support them except on the understanding that they will not vote for Disestablishment in the next Parliament, this great evil may yet be staved off. But as only some eight weeks remain in which they can work, it behoves them not to lose another moment.

Such advice is really practical ; and the long fidelity of the *Guardian* to the Liberal cause gives special weight to its words. Our Liberal readers will excuse us for reminding them of the excellent article on this subject, by Chancellor Espin, in a recent *CHURCHMAN*. Much depends on the attitude of moderate Liberals at the present crisis.

To-day (the 18th) the *Record* says :

The impression produced by the publication of our Disestablishment returns has far exceeded our anticipations. Public opinion is profoundly stirred, and the newspapers from one end of Great Britain to the other have been busy this week reproducing our statistics and commenting on their results. Their accuracy has been generally accepted, and is to a certain extent avouched by the returns independently collected by the Liberation Society.

We thoroughly agree with the opinion expressed in many journals that Churchmen throughout the country owe much to the energy, courage and foresight of the *Record*.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer in a recent speech, strongly supporting the National Church, has spoken of reforms. "Correct and reform, as is timely," said the Right Hon. gentleman. And for ourselves we repeat the advice given in the September *CHURCHMAN* : let Church Defence speakers, when working men or agricultural labourers talk about reforms, remind them that it is not necessary to pull down a house because the chimney smokes.

The Bishop of Chichester has issued an admirable letter to the Rural Deans of his diocese, on this question.

A Pastoral from the Bishop of Exeter thus concludes :

Above all at this juncture are we bound as witnesses for the truth to testify that our God is the God of nations as well as of individuals and of families, that He deals with nations as nations, and that of nations as of persons it is true, " Them that honour Me I will honour, and they that despise Me shall be lightly esteemed." A national Church is the expression of national fidelity to God. It is often alleged, indeed, that the Christianity of a land is in nowise dependent on an Established Christian Church ; and the instance of the United States is cited in proof of this. Let me mention one fact, which may at least give rise to serious reflection. In the year 1870 a chaplain was to be appointed for the House of Congress. Of the candidates for the post, eventually an Unitarian was elected ; and so the deliberations of that generally Christian nation were opened day after day by one who denied the Eternal Godhead of Christ. If England's Church were disestablished, what guarantee should we have against the same dishonour being done to our Lord ? for the Episcopal Church would stand on the same level before the law with all other bodies who professed and called themselves Christians. That God may evermore keep us as a Church and nation steadfast to the faith once delivered to the saints is the sincere prayer of your affectionate brother in Christ,

E. H. EXON.

Preaching at York Minster, Canon Paget said it was to be feared that England was fast losing its old distinctive character of truthfulness, and therefore its correlative courage :

Untruth in party controversy, both political and religious, was a crying evil of the day. It was always foreseen that secret voting would encourage lying and tend to degrade the English character ; but it was never foreseen that clergymen would encourage electors to promise their votes to one party and then sneak with cowardly secrecy and give it to the other.

The Bishop of London has written to an Incumbent at Notting-hill about freeing of the church from pew-rents :

I entirely approve of your proposed experiment in All Saints' Church, but I hope that you will make it clearly understood that the failure of the fund for the support of the clergy *must* be followed by the revival of seat-rents.

I do not myself object to seat-rents, provided the free seats occupy the best part of the church. Justice requires that people who like to secure their seats should be content with an inferior seat. But it is best that all seats shall be free if we can afford it.

Lord Randolph Churchill, in an able speech at Sheffield, instituted an investigation into the solidarity of Liberal principles and the unity of the Liberal party. He touched upon the topic of the hour—the Disestablishment of the Church of England. The connection between Church and State he happily defined as "one of the great features of the British Constitution—as great a feature as the Monarchy itself." Neither Lord Hartington nor Sir William Harcourt, Lord Randolph Churchill pointed out, had as yet declared their convictions. He asserted the right of the electors of England

to know the opinions of the leaders of public opinion upon "so enormous a constitutional question."

It has been difficult to decide whether the speeches of Lord Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain in regard to land, and other matters, pointed to a schism in the Liberal party. And about Disestablishment as regards Scotland, and England and Wales, it has been difficult to find out what course the leaders of the party have agreed to take in the coming election.

This evening (the 18th) we have received a copy of Mr. Gladstone's manifesto. That portion of it which relates to the Church and State question is ambiguous. We prefer at present to quote it without comment. Mr. Gladstone says :

When the subject of State religion comes into discussion, although it has been more fully probed and unfolded in Scotland than elsewhere, and although a lively feeling, as was naturally to be expected, exists with regard to it in Wales, yet it is the larger case of England which principally arrests attention.

Bearing in mind all the circumstances of the question, in connection with the length of my own past career, I might perhaps plead for an exemption from all share in this controversy. But having regard, on the other hand, to the deep interest felt in it, with strong conviction, on the part of so many whose confidence I have enjoyed, I think it right to say a few words, if they only tend to qualify over-sanguine expectations, and to mitigate alarms, which appear to me exaggerated, though they are entertained by many whom, both officially and personally, I revere.

With respect to the severance of the Church of England from the State, I think it obvious that so vast a question cannot become practical until it shall have grown familiar to the public mind by thorough discussion ; with the further condition that the proposal, when thoroughly discussed, shall be approved. Neither, I think, can such a change arise in a country such as ours except with a large observance of the principles of equity and liberality, as well as with the general consent of the nation. We can hardly, however, be surprised if those who observe that a current, almost throughout the civilized world, slowly sets in this direction, should desire or fear that among ourselves, too, it may be found to operate. I cannot forecast the dim and distant courses of the future ; but, like all others, I have observed the vast and ever-increasing development for the last fifty years, both at home and abroad, in the Church to which I belong, of the powers of voluntary support. Those abridgments of her prerogatives as an Establishment, which have been frequent of late years, have not brought about a decrease, and have at least been contemporaneous with an increase, of her spiritual and social strength. By devotedness of life, and by solidity of labour, the clergy are laying a good foundation for the time to come. The attachment of the laity improves, if I may so speak, both in quantity and in quality. The English Church also appears to be eminently suited, in many and weighty points, to the needs of the coming time. And I have a strong conviction that, if this great modification of our inherited institutions shall hereafter be accomplished, the vitality of the Church of England will be found equal to all the needs of the occasion.

The Right Rev. S. E. Marsden, Bishop of Bathurst, has been constrained, from the state of his health, to send in his resignation.