

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

THE
CHURCHMAN

JULY, 1888.

ART. I.—TITHE RENT-CHARGE FICTIONS.

IT is impossible to deal with all the quaint inventions of speculative ignorance which have been put forward, in order, notwithstanding what the titheowner has suffered by the loss of his property through the commutation of tithes, to establish a present grievance against him. Mr. Baylis is a gentleman who has stood in the forefront in this respect. Perhaps it would not be easy to name anyone assuming to be an adviser of the tithepayers who has solemnly enounced so many fallacies, or who has stated them with such singular unconsciousness that he is arguing against himself. In a letter written not long ago to the Bishop of Oxford he says: "The Act of 1836 was passed in the days of Protection. The crops on the land were commuted on an artificial standard of twenty-six bushels of wheat per acre, instead of thirteen, the natural produce. But as long as Protection lasted the farmer was compensated for this error, as he obtained an artificial price for his corn. The repeal of the Corn Laws swept the artificial prices away, but the tithe was still levied on the artificial produce. Was this right? The tithe by the commutation became one-fifth of the profits, but now it is nearly one-half." With regard to the last statement, it does not appear what is meant by "profits." But it has elsewhere been shown that, so far from rising, the ratio of tithe rent-charge to rent had fallen from two-ninths in 1836 to, at most, two-fourteenths in 1885.¹ As to the first statement, it is simply not true that the crops were commuted on any artificial standard of produce-bushels per acre, or anything of the sort.

¹ "Land Rental," p. 24.

What actually took place was this: When at the commutation the right to take tithes in kind was extinguished in a parish, there was erected in lieu of it a right¹ to receive, in each successive year, the "variable value" of a fixed quantity of each of the three grains, such quantities being constant under all circumstances, and such value—"to be paid by way of rent-charge issuing out of the lands charged therewith," and "payable on the first day of July and the first day of January in every year"²—being ascertained in each year by the re-conversion of such quantities into money at the average price thereof in the septennial period then next preceding.³

Rejecting in favour of the landowner all such portions of tithe value as, through the sharp practice of the compounding tithepayer or the good nature or carelessness of the titheowner, had not been actually received by him, the tithe value of each parish was taken at the next previous seven years' net receipts, by composition or in kind, up to Christmas, 1835. One-third of this residual value was taken and converted into wheat, one-third into barley, one-third into oats, at the average price of the last seven years. The three grains, and not wheat alone, were taken for the express purpose of more equally securing to the titheowner, in return for all that was taken from him, an income abreast of the fluctuations in the money value—that is, of living costs, and were taken to represent, however inadequately, all the articles of land produce. The number of bushels so ascertained formed the tithe rent-charge endowment, and the apportionment-deed of every parish specifies the amount of the rent-charge and the number of bushels into which it was converted. There is no fixed money value receivable. Thus, if the tithe-value were £100, this, divided into three equal parts, and each part invested separately in wheat, barley and oats, at the average price of each for the years 1829-35, gave:

Of wheat,	94·95542 bushels,	being	£33 6s. 8d.	divided by	7s. 0 $\frac{1}{4}$ d.
„ barley,	168·42108	„	„	„	3s. 11 $\frac{1}{2}$ d.
„ oats,	242·42424	„	„	„	2s. 9d.

and so in proportion for any other tithe-value. The number of bushels thus derived is the measure of the quantity to which in all years the titheowner is entitled. But, instead of being paid in corn, its money value in each year is to be paid. The measure of value for any year is the average price per bushel of each grain in the previous seven years. There is here no sort of reference to any average or other amount of pro-

¹ *Walsh v. Trimmer*, House of Lords.

² 6 and 7 Will. IV. c. 71, ss. 57, 67; and 1 Vict. c. 69, s. 4.

³ "Fluctuations of Prices," p. 9.

duce, artificial or natural, and Mr. Baylis is simply drawing upon his imagination when he so states it. The notion that the crops were commuted on a standard of twenty-six instead of thirteen bushels per acre is pure romance. It is even not easy to understand what he means. It does not help to make his meaning clearer that the Agricultural Department of the Privy Council estimates the ordinary average produce at twenty-nine (28·94) bushels per acre.¹ The quantities being thus permanently fixed, the continual accession of value to tithe, which had existed for many centuries in proportion to land produce, and subject to which land had always been bought and sold, was summarily stopped, and transferred with other portions of its intrinsic value, over to the landowner. Thus a right to take a money value, variable only according to the prices of corn, and at this time largely diminished, was substituted for a tithe-value largely improvable, and which, in the hands of the landowner, has largely improved *pari passu* with the rest of the produce of the land.

Mr. Baylis's next assertion, that when the Corn Laws were repealed in 1846 the tithepayer became the loser and the titheowner the gainer, in consequence of the wheat price at the Commutation having been made artificially higher through Protection, is also singularly unlucky. For, in the first place, the commutation price of wheat in 1836, on the seven years' average, was 56s. 2d. (In 1835 the wheat price was 39s. 4d.; in 1834, 46s. 2d. It was only brought up to 56s. 2d. by the inclusion of the three very high years, 1829-31.) The average of the thirty-three years, 1847-79, after the repeal, was 52s. 4d.; so that the extent to which the "artificial price was swept away by the repeal" averaged during this long period less than 7 per cent. *And all that time land-rental continued to rise.* 1876 to 1881 were the years of maximum rental. During the time, therefore, from 1836 to 1881, either the landowner was taking an unduly large share of the land produce as rent, or else the tenant was making equally improved profits as well. The share reserved to the titheowner rose only 12½ per cent., while the rental rose 65 per cent.² We may guess what the tenant's profits were. It has been only within a quite recent period, and under novel and, we may reasonably hope, transitory circumstances of foreign produce and freight, and under universal depression of all trade, that the effect of the repeal of the Corn Laws and other legislation upon land and tithe rent-charge has been developed

¹ "Agriculture Produce Statistics," 1887. "Parliamentary Papers," C. 5188, p. 27.

² "Land Rental," p. 22.

in disaster. And it has been shown already, by comparison of the fall in the two properties, how much more severely the latter has suffered.¹ Land has suffered in the whole a fall of (less than) 25 per cent—from 165 down to 124, but tithe rent-charge a full 25 per cent—from 112 to 84.

Again, it is strange that Mr. Baylis should not see that the higher the price at the Commutation, *the smaller and not the greater* must have been, and was, the number of bushels purchasable with the £33, which became the permanent endowment. Thus, in 1836, the average price being 56s. 2d. per quarter, the £33 purchased 95 bushels. Had the present average price of 37s. 8d. prevailed then, the same sum would have purchased 141 bushels. That is, in so far as Protection artificially raised the wheat price, and the wider the difference between the price then and the price to-day, so much the worse and not the better for the titheowner. He has ever since had only the current value of 95 instead of 141 bushels to receive. Similarly of barley, 168 instead of 180 bushels; of oats, 242 instead of 264. And he receives this year only £84 instead of what he would then have received, £100. Much *the better*, therefore, *and not the worse*, for the tithepayer, that the Act was passed in the days of Protection. Thus, through the intervention of the permanent bushel quantities, seemingly unknown to Mr. Baylis, the "artificially higher" price of 1829-35 works exactly the contrary way to that which he has supposed. It just reverses the whole action.

These are not all of Mr. Baylis's mistakes. The *Agricultural Gazette*, of the 14th of November last, states that the following letter has been addressed by him to the Marquis of Salisbury:

Wyfield Manor, Newbury.

May I call your lordship's attention as to how the Corn Returns Act (45 and 46 Vict. c. 37) is evaded, to the prejudice of the tithepayer? By s. 8 of that Act the Inspector of Corn Returns should convert the imperial bushel of wheat into a bushel of 60 lb., the imperial bushel of barley into a bushel of 50 lb., the imperial bushel of oats into a bushel of 39 lb. On examining the printed forms furnished by the Inspector of Corn Returns, I find no columns for the entry of the natural weight per imperial bushel. I have within the last three years sold at Reading and Newbury markets nearly 2,000 quarters of barley weighing from 55 lb. to 58 lb. per imperial bushel. On inquiry I find that not a single bushel has been dealt with according to the Act; in consequence, the titheowner has received a benefit of from 10 to 16 per cent. Every week at our local markets wheat weighing 63 lb. to 65 lb. is entered as 60 lb., and oats weighing 42 lb. to 44 lb. per imperial bushel are returned as 39 lb.

GEO. BAYLIS.

¹ CHURCHMAN, February, p. 233. "Land Rental," p. 25.

Mr. Baylis misapprehends the provisions of the Act and the inspector's duty. It is nowhere provided by section 8 that wheat, barley, or oats, sold by imperial measure, should be converted into artificial bushels of 60, 50, or 39 lb. respectively, and that the price should be recorded of such bushels. It is only when sold by other than imperial bushel, or by weight, or by weighed measure, that they are to be so converted. Mr. Baylis, *in fact*, sells by imperial bushels.

Such conversion is unjust enough, on Mr. Baylis's own showing. For, in his anxiety to circumvent the titheowner, he has unwittingly let the cat out of the bag. Upon his own experience he convicts the Act. For when corn weighs 65, 58, or 44 lb. to the bushel, as Mr. Baylis says his does, the price recorded, in cases of weight conversion, will represent 60, 50, and 39 lb. bushels. That is, if the price per produce bushel of the higher weight be 4s., 3s. 6d., and 2s., the prices recorded per artificial bushel will be 3s. 8½d., 3s., and 1s. 9½d., or a loss *pro tanto* to the titheowners and a gain to the tithepayer of 7·7, 14·0, and 11·4 per cent. respectively.

The supposition on which the Act was passed was, that the 60, 50, and 39 lb. weights truly represented the average weights per bushel. It was contended, on the part of the titheowners, that these weights were decidedly below the average weights (indeed Mr. Giffen, in his "Memorandum," admits that 60 lb. is a minimum weight for wheat), and that they would be damaged thereby. Mr. Baylis's undesigned admissions go a long way, in addition to other evidence, to prove that their contention was right, and that the Act is injurious and unjust. As on the preceding point, Mr. Baylis is innocently unaware that his own statement is conclusive proof against his own argument.

It is said, again, that the price of corn, which regulates the tithe rent-charge, is made higher than it should be, because "tail-wheat," or wheat below good market quality, is not now included in the returns of prices. It would be very unjust if it were to be, because it was certainly not included in the Commutation calculation of quantities. So Mr. Chamberlain correctly told the Essex Chamber in December, 1880: "You say that the tail-corn is not taken into account. *But it never has been;* and there is nothing new in the present system of taking averages." The landowner had the advantage, in the actual Commutation, of its not being included, since on that very account a smaller number of bushels was adjudged as the endowment of the titheowner. If it had been included, it is obvious that the prices would have been lower, and the number of bushels bought would have been higher. To introduce it now would be to mulct the titheowner at both

ends. The question was fully in the minds of the legislators at the Commutation period.

But this is not the only answer. There are the questions of *fact* and of *effect*.

(1) Of *fact*, whether there has actually been any such serious diminution of wheat marketed as is alleged, and, if so, whether such diminution has been caused by, and is correlative to, the fall in price?

In reply to the Chambers which raised the question in 1878 and 1879, the Comptroller of the Corn Returns, Mr. Giffen, in an official Memorandum to the Board of Trade, in June of the latter year, wrote: "The fact that the quantity returned has not fallen off any more than in proportion to the decline in the acreage and yield of wheat, would seem to confirm the opinion that there has been *no material diminution* in the proportion of the corn grown by them which farmers bring to market." And, "there is *no evidence* of the returns being affected, and the price being higher than it would otherwise be, in consequence of a larger proportion of corn being consumed by farmers at home than used to be the case." But for occupying too much space, I should be prepared to demonstrate, upon the grounds laid down by Mr. Giffen, and having regard to the varying acreage and upon the best estimates of produce, that his inferences are correct, and hold good down to 1882, and from 1885 to 1887.¹ A diminution to the extent of 2½ per cent. took place in 1881 and 1882, fully accountable for by the difference of quality in those bad and wet seasons. Otherwise, there was no variation between 1873 and 1882, and a marked increase between 1885 and 1887.

(2) But supposing it to be the fact that there has been, over the whole country, some extra consumption of wheat on the farms, what can have been the *effect* of it upon the value of the tithe rent-charge? Here, again, I must be content with the *assertion* (reserving the proof) that the withdrawal could not possibly affect the general market of £37,000,000, so as to cause any difference, worth speaking of, in the value of tithe rent-charge. Very wild assertions have been made as to the quantity withheld. Mr. Harris, a gentleman of comparative moderation, has estimated that two bushels an acre, or 640,000 quarters, or one-fourteenth of the whole produce, extra have been withheld. Now supposing, what is really absurd, that the inclusion of this quantity, taken at a minimum or *nil* price, could lower the general market price in proportion to the whole market quantity, it could only diminish the wheat

¹ The two omitted years are those of the transition under the New Act. It does not seem that the returns of quantities marketed and the estimates of produce for those years can be compared together.

price of 1887 by 1½d., and the tithe rent-charge by 11s. 10d. on the £100; or which is the same thing inversely put, the withholding of it could only enhance the wheat price and the tithe rent-charge by the same sums. By still less, in proportion as the value of the tailcorn approximates to that of headcorn. It would be an exaggeration to set the enhancement of the tithe rent-charge, on Mr. Harris's estimate of quantity, at half-a-crown on the £100. The infinitesimal results, therefore, show the contention to be simply puerile.

Another complaint is made. The basis of the weekly average is the division of the aggregate proceeds of all the sales by the aggregate of the quantities sold. It is urged that the primary sale alone, and not re-sales, should be included in the average. But (1) if so, it is obvious that any amount of trickery could be applied to keep down the average price of the return. (2) A re-sale *ipso facto* proves that the primary sale does not represent the true market price. (3) It might fairly be contended *à priori* that, as the very object of tempering the tithe rent-charge by the corn averages was to give the titheowner an income always commensurate with living expenses, the value which most nearly corresponds with what he has to pay for food must be the most accurate for the purpose, viz., the corn-factor's and the miller's, which must always be the last price, and the nearest to the consumption price; and that therefore the medium point, the result of the average of all sales, must be below and not above the just amount. But the objections are fully answered by the Board of Trade reply to the National Association of Millers in 1883: "Your Council appear to be under a misapprehension in supposing that the object sought by the official Corn Returns is the average price obtained by the British farmer only, and not those obtained by the corn-dealer. A reference to the earlier Acts conclusively shows that the original returns on which the Tithe Commutation was based were those of *general market transactions*, and *not of purchases from farmers only*." Obviously the same rule must be followed first and last.

When the tithe-payer complains, as he is instructed by Mr. Baylis and his other advisers to do, of the above grievances and of others—such as that the rent-charge ought to depend upon the annual quantity of corn-produce, or that wheat or barley or oats ought to be excluded from the calculation of the averages in parishes where either is not grown, or grown in diminished quantity, or that, as corn-land is now worth less than it was, the rent-charge ought to be further reduced beyond the reduction provided by the averages, or that barley and oats are of greater influence than wheat in the calculation,

and others—he generally ignores several facts. He forgets that, rightly or wrongly as regards the tithe-owner, the object of the Commutation was not to provide an income varying with produce. That system was the tithe-system, which, in the interests of the landowners and their tenants chiefly, it was expressly intended to do away with. With the extinction of tithes, all relation to produce, or to its value to the producer, vanished wholly. Tithe rent-charge, substituted for, and created on and after the extinction of tithe, has no relation whatever to quantity of produce; except in so far as that, when land ceases to produce, the rent-charge value ceases, as rent-value does, to issue out of the land. It is not more because the crop is a large one; it is not less because it is a poor one. Nor has it anything to do with the produce-value to the producer, but is dependent upon the price to the consumer; and with that, only as affording (as hoped) a variable measure of the means of meeting the prices of all other necessaries. The statements of Lord John Russell, of the Poor-Law Commissioners, signed by Sir G. C. Lewis, and of Earl Grey, proving this, have been before quoted.¹ We will here only repeat the following words of Lord Grey: “The variation of the payment according to the seven years’ average price of corn was not meant to provide for varying the amount of payment according to the varying value of the crops (for if this had been intended the payment would have been regulated according to the annual value of corn, not according to its value on the average of seven years), but to guard against the loss the Church might sustain by a depreciation of the currency. It was also believed that by taking the average value of corn for periods of seven years the variations of prices from good or bad harvests would be to a great extent got rid of, and that a tolerably certain measured value would be obtained.”

The tithepayer complains that the seven years’ averages of corn prices, required to constitute the corn values, work unfairly upon him. That he is at some temporary disadvantage in a falling market is true, because the tithe rent-charge moves down rather more slowly. But, for the same reason, he has the advantage in a rising market, the tithe rent-charge moving up more slowly.

The subject, as dealt with in the 10th clause of Lord Salisbury’s Bill, has two branches: 1st, the policy of making the change from septennial to triennial periods; and 2nd, the terms on which it is to be made.

1. That the change will be to the advantage of either party

¹ CHURCHMAN, February, 1888, p. 226.

may well be doubted. When the question was one to which the tenant was a party, it might be of some advantage to him, as his tenure might be short. But when the landowner, a permanent holder, is to be the payer, the case becomes quite different. The tithe-receiver will certainly prefer to have his income as equable and free from extremes of fluctuation as possible. The established tenant tithepayer, if he at all forecasts his balance-sheets for a lease-period, must certainly desire to equalize that he may more precisely estimate his risks. But the landowner tithepayer, above all, must prefer to have a charge as nearly fixed as possible. And it may safely be said that he will be the very first person to regret the change, and that he will soon cry out with no small bitterness at having to pay sudden extremes of value.

The following will show the effect, in ten several extreme years, of the triennial and annual averages, as compared with £100 actually paid under the septennial :

	1840.	1848.	1851.	1855.	1856.	1861.	1869.	1877.	1878.	1887.
Septennial	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Triennial	111	98	85	113	122	90	113	103	98	92
Annual	123	128	75	137	130	82	122	95	102	86

Or, again, taking the whole range for the fifty-two years 1837-1888 :¹

	Minimum. £	Maximum. £	Extent of Variation.	Excess of Variation. Per cent.
The Tithe Rent-charge, or the Septennial averages, ranged from	84.1	to 112.8	28.7	
Ditto Triennial ditto	76.0	„ 122.5	46.5	62
Ditto Annual ditto	70.5	„ 131.7	61.2	113

It is inconceivable that either party could, on reflection, prefer the wider variations. It must surely be the interest of all parties to leave the matter alone. Both tenant-farmers and landowners have expressed their great dislike to the change. But the titheowner will be the one to suffer, because it will certainly before long be made a fresh grievance against him.

2. As regards the terms on which the change is to be made. Assuming the corn-prices of the first five months of 1888 to continue, the tithe rent-charge in 1889 will be £81 2s. 8 $\frac{3}{4}$ d. under the septennial system, and £72 18s. 6d. under the triennial—a reduction of 10.12 per cent. Lord Addington has kindly intervened to obtain some remission of the penalty by postponing the change for a year. The effect is this: the septennial tithe rent-charge in 1890 will be £78 7s. 5 $\frac{1}{4}$ d.; the

¹ In "Fluctuations of Prices," Table A, is shown a comparison of the tithe rent-charge under each of the three schemes for each year from 1837 to 1887. See also p. 18 of the same.

triennial, £72 6s. 4d.—a reduction of 7·73 per cent. The concession therefore amounts to a remission of £2 7s. 9d. on the £10 2s. 5d. penalty as proposed. To that extent the douceur to the landlords is to be diminished. That is the utmost concession.

Who has called for the substitution of the triennial for the septennial period? Not the titheowners. If anybody, the landowners, or some of them; though, as above asserted, they will very soon repudiate it. But who is to suffer this loss of 10 or 8 per cent.—of £330,000 or £245,000? Not the landowners, who, if anybody, have asked for it; but the titheowners, who have not. In spite of the fact that one-half of the tithe property has been handed over to the landowners; in spite of the fact that land-rent has not on the whole fallen, nearly, down to the level of the tithe rent-charge, a further spoliation, and together with it a further ground of grievance, is to be given as a sop to Cerberus.

The clergy appeal, with good reason, to Sir Robert Peel's declaration on the second reading of the Tithe Commutation Bill: "Considering our peculiar situation as landlords, and also considering that the parties interested are the clergy, who have no direct representation amongst us, it is required, no less by a due sense of our own interests than by a proper regard to the rights and privileges of the clergy, that we should not appear to sanction any principle which we are not satisfied is consistent with JUSTICE."

Titheowners ask no more than this. They submit that they are entitled to no less.

C. A. STEVENS.



ART. II.—HOW MANY ISAIHAHS ARE THERE?

Isaiah: his Life and Times, and the Writings which bear his Name.
By Rev. S. R. DRIVER, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. Nisbet.

THIS is one of a series called "Men of the Bible;" and we can well imagine the satisfaction with which the general editor must have put the work into the hands of Dr. Driver. The successor of Dr. Pusey in the Hebrew Chair of Oxford had already made his fame before entering upon this high position. He has been a careful Hebrew student from his youth up; in fact, it is currently reported that when he was a schoolboy he wrote purer Hebrew than is to be found in the Book of Genesis, though which of the various compilers thereof he took as his model has not been generally made known.

Much instruction may be gained from the volume before us. Dr. Driver writes reverently, modestly, and cautiously; he spares no pains to establish his position and to make his argument clear to the English student. The writings of Isaiah are arranged in chronological order, and Dr. Driver enters into the spirit of each part, exhibiting as far as he can the foreground, immediate occasion, and historic colouring of the prophecy, and not ignoring the predictive element. If he is somewhat fond of quoting Robertson Smith and certain German writers of the advanced school, he also makes frequent mention of Sir E. Strachey's interesting work on Jewish politics in Isaiah's times—a book which we think deserves to be better known than it is.

Here we would gladly lay down our pen; but there are reasons which make it desirable to go more fully into an examination not only of Dr. Driver's compact little volume, but also of that magnificent collection of inspired utterances which goes under the name of the Book of the Prophet Isaiah.

In studying any such book, the first thing is to ascertain, so far as practicable, the chronology and history of the period in which it was professedly written; the second thing is to consider what parts of the book are properly assigned to the writer, and how they may best be divided; the third thing is to investigate the claims of certain parts of the book which are supposed by some critics to belong to a later period, or at least to be the work of a hand other than that of the writer whose name they bear.

I. Dr. Driver prefixes a chronological table to his book; but it gives little more than a meagre outline of the Assyrian dynasties, and has omitted several dates which are of real importance, because of their bearing on the Babylonian history of the period. Thus he might have given 721 as the date of Merodach Baladan's ascendancy in Babylon, 720 for the overthrow of Hamath, 712 as the probable date of Merodach Baladan's embassy, 710 for the alliance between Merodach Baladan and the King of Elam, 681 for the conflict with Merodach Baladan's son, 668 for a further Assyrian conflict with Elam and Babylon, and 648 for Assarbanipal's great victory over Elam and Babylon.¹ The mere mention of these things reminds us that Babylon was occupying as conspicuous a position in Assyrian politics in and after the time of Isaiah as Ireland is occupying in English politics now. Nor will Isaiah be ever understood until we realize how the

¹ For particulars with respect to these events see Mr. Budge's useful little work on Babylon, published by the R. T. S.

prophet continually sees the rise and fall of Babylon behind the Sargons or Sennacheribs of his day. It must not be forgotten that whilst we have comparatively few Babylonian documents of the period, we cannot expect the Assyrian tablets to do full justice to the position of their ancient rivals and dangerous neighbours on the Euphrates. We know enough, however, to feel sure that Babylon and Elam, when in alliance, were able to exercise a most disturbing influence on Nineveh; and we cannot wonder, when we remember the position and ancient glories of Babylon, that the Assyrian King Esarhaddon should take up his abode there, and should carry Manasseh captive to the city which was still "the glory of the Chaldees;" nor can we be surprised to learn that when Nabopolassar, the father of Nebuchadnezzar, was sent thither by his Assyrian master to quell a disturbance, he elected to remain there and revolt from his sovereign. Besides, Babylon is Babel, and is always so spelt in the Hebrew Bible; and its primæval arrogance was not forgotten in Isaiah's time. Its rise and fall symbolized the rise and fall of pride and worldliness from the beginning of the Bible to the end.

All this is passed over by Dr. Driver. Of course he might fairly excuse himself by saying that he was writing a life of Isaiah; but things will be touched on a little further which seem to call for a fuller discussion of the state of things in Babylon than we have got. It is very probable that the mounds on the Euphrates will yet bear still further testimony to the position of Babylon in or after Isaiah's time, and will supply a foreground for certain prophecies which some writers wish to bring down to the days of Jeremiah.

Before passing to our second subject, it may be well to point out that Dr. Driver is inclined to believe that the first Assyrian king mentioned in sacred history, viz., Pul, is the same as Tiglath-Pileser, who is "mentioned elsewhere." But he does not point out that the "elsewhere" is not in some distant part of the Bible, but on the same page, one being mentioned in 2 Kings xv. 19, and the other only ten verses further down. It is not likely that the Hebrew compiler of Kings would have given the "shortened form" of the name first and the full title so soon afterwards; moreover, the Assyrian documents incline us to another supposition. Again, while assenting to the view that errors have crept into the Hebrew documents, especially with respect to figures, it must not be supposed that the Assyrian tablets are immaculate. Dr. Driver holds that these clay documents "fix" chronology, whilst the compiler of the Book of Kings arrived at part of his system through computation. Neither of these statements must be lightly received. The late Mr. George Smith, to

whom we owe the excellent edition of the Assyrian Canon published by Messrs. Bagster, points out, with some diffidence and with a candid acknowledgment that his chronological system was entirely open to revision, that the earliest known copy of the Canon¹ is 150 years later than the events with which it begins (æt. Benhadad), and that Sargon's cylinder differs by two years from the annals on the walls of his palace as to the date of his expedition to Palestine; and that there are errors as to names and other matters in the tribute-lists of Assarbanipal. Then, as for the chronology of the Kings, the only matter which the compiler "computed" was the adjustment of the dates of accession of the Kings of Judah with those of Israel, and *vice versa*. The *real* difficulty in arranging the Kings lies in the fact that we do not always know how long sons were associated with their fathers on the throne. If instead of giving us the comparative chronology of Judah and Israel according to Ussher, Wellhausen, and the rest (p. 13), Dr. Driver had arranged the Kings of Israel and Judah under the guidance of the Hebrew documents, having special regard to the conjoint reigns which are indicated, somewhat obscurely indeed, in these documents, we believe that he would have found the main outlines of the Hebrew chronology to be in distinct accordance with the Assyrian Canon. His treatment of Hezekiah's reign is obscured by the lack of a clear statement of the facts of the case, though the materials for drawing it out are not far to seek. But, as he rightly says, these points form no impediment to the study of Isaiah's life.

II. We now proceed to the second part of our inquiry. Dr. Driver allows Isaiah to be the writer of the first twelve chapters, of chapters xv. to xxiii., and of chapters xxviii. to xxxiii., so that he altogether allots to Isaiah twenty-seven chapters out of the sixty-six which go by his name. We have learnt to be thankful for small mercies. Considering that half a century ago such learned men as Gesenius, Rosenmüller, and Hitzig threw doubt on the 7th, 11th, 12th, 15th, 16th, and part of the 19th and 23rd chapters, all of which Dr. Driver accepts, we welcome his judgment to this extent.

Dr. Driver is inclined to follow in the steps of most students of Isaiah in putting the 6th chapter as the first chronologically, the preceding five, which he locates in the time of Jotham and Ahaz, having been prefixed by the compiler as forming an introduction to the book. In dealing with the 7th chapter, in spite of some obscurity, there is nothing in

¹ See also Smith's "Assyrian Discoveries," p. 293, and "Records of the Past," iii. 116.

Dr. Driver's exposition which would be likely to give offence. "The figure of Immanuel," he says (p. 42), "is an ideal one projected by him on the shifting future. . . . It is the Messianic King whose portrait is here for the first time in the Old Testament sketched distinctly."

If it had been possible, we would have gladly made extracts to show the spirit and style of Dr. Driver's treatment of special subjects, such as the destruction of Sennacherib's army, but our readers will expect to know something of the author or authors of the thirty-nine chapters of "Isaiah" which this "man of the Bible" is supposed by Dr. Driver not to have written.

III. We will begin with the historical chapters. These Dr. Driver dismisses with the following words (p. 86): "The compiler excerpted chapters xxxvi. to xxxix. from the Book of Kings, the composition of which evidently cannot be earlier than the close of the monarchy." There is a sweet simplicity about this statement; but it raises the question, From what source did the compiler of the Book of Kings "excerpt" them? The natural answer is, Either from Isaiah, or from some other contemporary writer whose works Isaiah uses. Dr. Driver must have written the notes just referred to off-hand, without full consideration. The fact is that the historical books bear the marks all the way through of being composed from ancient materials; and the section now under consideration is specially interesting. Let us look at it.

Let the reader "excerpt" from an old Bible the portion from 2 Kings xviii. 13—xix. 37, and put alongside of it Isa. xxxvi. 1—xxxvii. 38. He will find, whether he reads in English or in Hebrew, that he has the same document before him. There are some very slight additions in the way of supplementary words in Kings, and one important sub-section (2 Kings xviii. 14-16) which ought to be thrown into a parenthesis as a separate historical event, chronologically distinct from what follows. Let the reader then take 2 Kings xx. 1-19 and put it by the side of Isa. xxxviii. 1—xxxix. 8; he will be confronted again with the same document, except that Isaiah retains the hymn of Hezekiah, which the compiler of the Kings has not given us. Thus we have the defiant messages of Rabshakeh, the prayers of Hezekiah, the promise made by Isaiah, with the sequel; also the sickness and recovery of Hezekiah, and the mission of the Babylonian ambassadors, told in the same words in both these books. Who wrote them? Dr. Driver says it is doubtful (p. 75), and we have seen the unfortunate slip by which he considers that Isaiah's compiler cannot have fallen in with them till the time of the Captivity. But long before Dr. Driver came into

the world a book was written which is called the Book of Chronicles. Usually this book gives very full accounts of the ups and downs of Judean history, but for this period it gives the most slender abstract, and adds for the benefit of all posterity (2 Chron. xxxii. 32): "Now the rest of the acts of Hezekiah, and his goodness, behold they are written in the vision of Isaiah the prophet, the son of Amoz, and in the book of the kings of Judah and Israel." The Revised Version follows the Hebrew more exactly, but the general conclusion is the same. The chronicler does not think it necessary to give a full account of the most remarkable events in Hezekiah's reign because they are already extant in two books, the Vision of Isaiah and the Book of Kings. Now, Isaiah was a well-known historian as well as a distinguished prophet. He had composed a life of Uzziah (2 Chron. xxvi. 22), and the natural conclusion is that he also put down the most notable events connected with Hezekiah's life, nor can we see anything either in the substance or language of these chapters to remove them from their position as part of the writings of the prophet Isaiah.

We now have a harder task before us, and must beseech our readers' attention a little longer, whilst we try to exhibit the case concerning the other chapters which Dr. Driver will not assign to Isaiah. The theory which he holds, in common with many others, is that the remaining chapters or sections are anonymous documents which fell into the hands of some compiler or compilers who grouped them with Isaiah's writings as being in some respects of the same class, though of widely different dates. It is perfectly allowable, indeed necessary, to hold that an historical book, such as Kings or Ezra, may be a compilation, or that a volume of sacred poetry, such as the Psalms, may take its name from the most notable of its contributors, or that a chapter may be appended to such a book as Deuteronomy or Jeremiah without affecting our judgment as to the authorship of the book as a whole; but when it is proposed to cut off more than half of Isaiah and distribute it among several later anonymous writers, we may be excused if we demand very convincing proofs. Here is a Jewish book accepted as the work of one author by our Lord and His Apostles, referred to as Isaiah's by the Apocryphal writers considerably earlier (see especially Ecclus. xlvi. 24), and apparently quoted by prophets who lived within a century of the supposed author (see, for example, Isa. xlvii. 8, compared with Zeph. ii. 15, and Isa. lii. 7 compared with Nahum i. 15). On what grounds is such a book to be disintegrated?

This, fortunately, is not a case, like that of some of the earlier books, where verses are subdivided between Elohist, Jehovist

and later editors. We are dealing with considerable sections, not with fragments of verses. Putting the matter shortly, the whole case is made to rest on two main arguments—one of which is theoretical, and the other linguistic. Dr. Driver holds a theory which is excellent, and which the celebrated writer Davison expounded in his lectures on Prophecy with convincing power years and years ago—viz., that prophecy has a foreground and a background. This may be called a general proposition, but Dr. Driver makes it a universal proposition, and argues thus: Every prophecy has a foreground; there was no suitable foreground for certain prophecies contained in "the Book of Isaiah;" therefore these prophecies were not written by him or in his time. "Whatever the prophets announce, it is *always* brought into some relation with the age in which they live" (p. 3; see also pp. 117, 126, 186). But a universal rule can only be based on an examination of instances, and it looks like a *petitio principii* to make a general rule into an absolute one, and then cut off all passages and prophecies which do not fall in with it. Dr. Driver argues as if Isaiah must have seen everything from one point of view, and must have constructed all his prophetic addresses or poems on the same lines. In pressing this view we believe that Dr. Driver has undervalued Isaiah's natural powers, the changing spirit of the long period through which he prophesied, and the creative force of God's Holy Spirit by whom this wonderful man was inspired. We candidly state our conviction that the man who could write such chapters as Dr. Driver assigns to Isaiah could write anything. There is a wealth of language, a force of style, a power of imagination about Isaiah which makes one feel unable to deny him anything—except tameness.

Besides, if Assyria is usually in the foreground in this book and in Isaiah's age, Babylon is in the middle distance, sometimes more in the front, sometimes towards the horizon. Dr. Driver must frequently have been struck with the words of Micah, Isaiah's contemporary and co-worker, who says to the daughter of Zion (iv. 10): "Thou shalt go forth out of the city; thou shalt go even to Babylon; there shalt thou be delivered." What was Micah's foreground when he uttered these words? We happen to know the date of this prophecy of Micah's, for it is referred to in a later book as having been in the time of Hezekiah (compare Micah iii. 12 with Jer. vi. 18). It seems difficult in the face of this fact to accept Dr. Driver's theoretical argument.

Take the doubtful sections in their order. Chapters xxiv. to xxvii. were written (according to Dr. Driver) on the eve of the Babylonian Captivity, and the hymns which they include are

“penetrated by a deeper and more delicate vein of feeling than the one in chapter xii.” (p. 125). This is a matter which anyone may judge for himself. To our mind, the connecting links in thought and the use made of earlier formulæ in each case tend all to show that these chapters are Isaiah’s. We see no reason to bring them later.

The Babylonian chapters (xiii. 1—xiv. 23) are supposed by our author to have been written during the exile (p. 127); and in order to make the theory work, the 24th and three following verses of the 14th chapter, being Assyrian, are cut off, and assigned to Isaiah himself. But take the whole as Isaiah’s, and you have Assyria in the foreground and Babylon in the background. Dr. Driver calls the little Assyrian section an “artistically finished prophecy” (p. 75). It may be artistically finished, but it can hardly be said to be artistically begun; for it opens thus: “The Lord of hosts hath sworn, saying,” etc. But this is by no means the ordinary way in which prophetic artists do their work.

We next come to the chapters on Edom (xxxiv., xxxv.). Dr. Driver is not quite certain what to do with them, but—“Isaiah addresses Edom in a very different strain” (p. 131). The passage referred to is in chapter xxi. 11, which contains “the burden of Dumah.” But is Dumah Edom? Our author thinks that Dumah is an anagram for Edom. This seems a slender argument: Dumah stands for Edom, and is dismissed in half a verse in Isa. xxi., therefore Isaiah did not write chapters xxxiv. and xxxv. The logic is hardly convincing. We invite our readers to study the two chapters for themselves and draw their own conclusions.

So far Dr. Driver can hardly be said to have succeeded in shaking the integrity of the book. But we now come to the remaining section (chapters xl. to lxvi.), which is certainly unique. We may regard it as a vast prophetic drama which is still in course of being fulfilled; and in coming to this conclusion we are entirely guided by the use made of it in the New Testament. The foreground is the experience of God’s faithfulness to His word and purposes in the past, from creation onward; the background is the inspired conviction that His plans, still future in Isaiah’s time, would all be fulfilled. We believe that the work is Isaiah’s; we see the same grandeur of conception, the same fondness for reiteration and alliteration, the same brief disconnected sentences, the same sudden changes of person and number, the same use of the singular for the plural, the same remarkable affinity with the Book of Job, the same power of illustration from horticulture and agriculture, the same fervid appeals to God, and, in a word, the same style and spirit.

Still, we acknowledge that the whole is marvellous—like Nebuchadnezzar's dream, Saul's conversion, the Apocalypse, and a thousand other things in the Bible. Jerusalem is addressed as in a state of desolation, its temple needing to be rebuilt, its sanctuary is trodden down by adversaries, it is suffering violence at the hands of Babylon and the Chaldees, and no man is going through its streets. It is a captivity period. And yet intermingled with these things are indications that the violence, oppression, and idolatry of the time of Manasseh are in full swing, and alongside of it, oblations, incense, fasts, and Sabbaths of the old covenant are apparently being kept up. The Messiah takes the form of a servant in these chapters, and while the final triumph of God's people and the incorporation of the Gentiles is in the background, Cyrus, who lived above 150 years after Isaiah, is described as if shortly to be engaged in the work of restoration.

Dr. Driver gives up these chapters, and assigns them to the close of the Captivity period, not only because of the absence of any relationship between them and Isaiah's time, but also on linguistic considerations. He considers that chapters xl. to lxvi. (which for convenience we will call B) differ from the Isaiah proper (whom we will call A), inasmuch as they possess new ideas, new ways of putting things, and fresh terminology. We assent to these three statements at once, but not to the inference which Dr. Driver draws from them. The chapters in question have nothing personal in them; they have hardly any contemporary "foreground," or local colouring. It seems a question even to Dr. Driver whether they were written by a captive in Babylon or whether by one of the remnant who went down with Jeremiah into Egypt.

Certainly the writer has projected himself to an unheard-of degree into the exilic period; and yet there are in these chapters occasional hints that the land and the people were in very much the same condition as when the 1st, 5th, and 11th chapters were written. In fact, the state of things described in the last three chapters is singularly like that which existed in the time of the first three. The real key of the position probably lies in the early part of Manasseh's reign, when he undid Hezekiah's work, was invaded by Esarhaddon, and carried captive to Babylon. The city probably suffered greatly at the time; hence the subsequent repairs (2 Chron. xxxiii. 14-16). We sometimes wonder what Dr. Driver, and others, would accept as sufficient proof that these chapters are Isaiah's. If we show points of resemblance, we are told that they prove nothing; they may have been quoted, as Jeremiah quoted his predecessors. If we show that the same word is frequently used for the same thing, we are told that

this is to be expected in the prophetic Scriptures; and we cannot deny it. Tradition and repute count as nothing. Some critics have no difficulty in supposing that these magnificent chapters should have been written by a nameless personage during the exile, and appended to writings which were a hundred and fifty years older, and passed under his name. In vain we point out that parts of A have certain germs of thought which are fully developed and portrayed in B. In vain we remind the critics that there is nothing more extraordinary in Cyrus¹ or his dynasty² being named by Isaiah than there is in Josiah being named by the man of God who went to Bethel. The matter finally becomes a sort of "word-game." Lists upon lists have been made of words and expressions which are in A and not in B, or which are in B and not in A; and the gist of Dr. Driver's argument is, that there are a great many words in B which are not in A, and that therefore the writer of A did not write B. In dealing with such an argument, we need much care and skill lest we should prove too much. Had Isaiah got to the end of his vocabulary when he had written A? The case may fairly be put thus. Here are certain passages in B which have a general resemblance to passages in A; we should therefore expect the same set of words to be used in each; but we do not always find them; in fact, the differences are so marked that, taken in connection with the lack of Assyrian foreground, the presence of the names of Cyrus, etc., we come to the conclusion that we have a distinct document, and that written at a much later time. To put it in Dr. Driver's words, "The accustomed marks of Isaiah's hand cease, and new conceptions and new phraseology make their appearance . . . the difference is one of mental habit—in other words, of personality" (pp. 208, 209).

One would not like rashly to oppose any conclusion which has been arrived at by so patient and candid a student as Dr. Driver; but it seems curious that he illustrates his position from St. John and St. Paul, of whom he says that they preserve each, in all that they wrote, the same individualities of conception and expression (p. 209). We should have thought that, having in view the linguistic peculiarities of the Pastoral Epistles and the Apocalypse, the conclusion would have been otherwise.

¹ Dr. Driver follows Mr. Sayce in believing that Cyrus was a polytheist because he repaired heathen temples. We hope he will abstain from drawing a similar conclusion from the former policy of our Government in India.

² Cyrus' grandfather was named Cyrus. He may have had a predecessor of the same name in the time of Isaiah.

Dr. Driver's views of the linguistic differences between A and B do not satisfy us. To our mind he has unconsciously undervalued not only the linguistic but also the structural relationship between A and B, and, above all, he has underestimated the wealth of language and thought with which such a man as Isaiah was endued, and which he could pour out when under the special elevating influence of the Holy Spirit. This point was well worked out by Professor Stanley Leathes some years ago.

If, indeed, it could be shown that the Hebrew of B was considerably later than that of A, the case would have been different. Dr. Driver says that "the language of B is relatively free from the marks of a later style, but not so free as the language of A." We have not enough of contemporary literature to speak decidedly as to the dates of expressions. Even aramaisms do not always prove a late date; they may be provincialisms. Curiously enough, Dr. Driver only gives us one sample of an aramaic word in B, viz., the word **כֶּחָד** (*Ke-echad*), in Isa. lxx. 25. But this is a good Hebrew word; the aramaic form is to be found in Daniel, and is spelled differently. What Dr. Driver meant to say is probably that the word given above does not happen to be found in the extant writings of any author earlier than this book, unless indeed the Book of Ecclesiastes may be so reckoned. It is found, however, with a slightly different punctuation and sense, as far back as Gen. iii. 22; and in its adverbial sense it is only a condensation of a common expression which may be seen in Numb. xiv. 15.

But we must draw to a conclusion. It is possible that Dr. Driver is right, and that the writings of some later prophets have been incorporated with those of Isaiah. But it is not probable. It is far more likely that such writings, if discovered at about the time of the return from captivity, would be connected with other works of the same date. There would be absolutely no reason for appending them to Isaiah rather than to one of the later prophets; in fact, the probabilities would be all against it. Certainly it would not be easy to find any lines of argument more likely to influence the general reader than those given in Dr. Driver's book; but after all the student may venture at least to keep his mind in solution, and to wait. Some people think that Shakespeare's works are not his. Possibly three hundred years hence they will be ascribed to Mr. Gladstone. If works of so late a date are thought by some to be of uncertain authorship, we must not be surprised that the integrity of Isaiah should be doubted; but at the same time it would be folly to throw overboard the traditional view of a book which has travelled down intact

through more than 2,000 years, except on the strength of facts and arguments (linguistic or otherwise) which carry absolute conviction with them.

Even Canon Driver's book may be discovered hereafter to be the work of two authors, one a D.D. (as on the title-page), the other an M.A. (as on the cover of the book); one giving positive expositions of the text, the other criticising the authorship; one under the influence of Assyrian inscriptions, the other inspired by a Hebrew concordance. It has been said of some heretics that they are right in their affirmations and wrong in their negatives; and it is true of some critics also. We trust that Dr. Driver will throw the weight of his name and fame into the scale of positive truth, and not allow himself to be tempted further into the paths of destructive criticism.

R. B. GIRDLESTONE.

ART. III.—NEW EVIDENCE AS TO THE ORIGIN AND MEANING OF ἘΠΙΘΥΣΙΟΣ IN THE LORD'S PRAYER.

AFTER the exhaustive treatise upon ἐπιθύσιος by the present Bishop of Durham in the Appendix to his work, "On a Fresh Revision of the English New Testament," published in 1871, it would be mere presumption to enter the arena of the controversy respecting this important word without having fresh evidence to adduce as to its origin or meaning. In that treatise Dr. Lightfoot did break fresh ground and did adduce fresh evidence, but the importance of this fresh evidence does not seem to have been duly appreciated, consisting as it does of a single, isolated, interjectional expression in a Greek comic author. I hope that the new evidence which I have been enabled to discover, and am about to adduce, will place the conclusions at which he has properly arrived upon an absolutely certain and impregnable basis.

But it will be desirable first to give a slight sketch of the present condition of the controversy, as, probably, it is not every reader of the *CHURCHMAN* that has made a special study of it, with all the stores of learning that have been lavished, and indeed thrown away upon it, simply for want of *evidence*, which has been all the while close at hand, but has been most unaccountably overlooked.

As to its origin, ἐπιθύσιος has been derived (1) from ἐπίτιναι, either through its participle ἐπιτών, or through the feminine of that participle, ἡ ἐπιτιύσσα, which had become practically a substantive; (2) from εἶναι, through the preposition ἐπι and the substantive οὐσία. This latter derivation admits of any

amount of theological subtilizing, but cannot be traced to any source earlier than Origen (de Orat. 27), who gives it the preference over (1), which he also mentions to reject later on in the same chapter of the same treatise.

The objections to (1) are purely subjective and theological.

The objections to (2) are purely objective, grammatical, and historical.

As to history and tradition, Bishop Lightfoot proves conclusively that the earliest authorities and versions give translations which unquestionably connect the word with ἡ ἐπιούσα ἡμέρα. The Apocryphal Gospel according to the Hebrews, whose weight in the controversy consists in its early date, even goes so far as to use the word *Mahar*, "to-morrow," in its paraphrase. The Curetonian Syriac translates Matt. vi. 11: "And our bread continual of the day give to us;" and Luke xi. 3: "And give us the bread continual of every day." Of the Egyptian versions, the Memphitic in Matt. vi. 11, neglecting the contradiction in terms, has "Our bread of to-morrow, give it to us to-day," but in Luke xi. 3, "Our bread that cometh, give it to us daily." The Thebaic version translates Matt. vi. 11, "Our bread that cometh, give Thou it to us to-day." The Old Latin version renders ἐπιούσιον by *quotidianum* in both Evangelists, and this rendering has happily been preserved in our own Church and to our own day, and will ere long be proved to be as correct, both theologically and grammatically, as any that can be furnished by either the Latin language or our own.

In the *Journal of Philology* there appeared (vol. v.) in 1874 an article on ἐπιούσιος with the signature "W. Kay," which is manifestly intended as a reply to Dr. Lightfoot's treatise, and deals with his conclusions in an extremely arbitrary and authoritative manner. Mr. Kay attempts to meet the argument that, though περιούσιος is correctly formed from *περι* and *εἰμί*, the form from ἐπι and εἰμι would be ἐπούσιος, not ἐπιούσιος, by bringing forward the co-existence of such words as ἐπίοπτος and ἐποπτος, ἐπιανδάνω and ἐφανδάνω. But he entirely neglects Lightfoot's incontrovertible statement that "all these words, without exception, were originally written with the digamma ἐπίφοπτος, ἐπιφανδάνω, etc., so that elision was out of the question, and even when the digamma disappeared in pronunciation or was replaced by a simple aspirate, the old forms maintained their ground." He moreover neglects the known existence of the word ἐπουσιώδης, which goes far to disprove the possibility of the compound derivative of ἐπι and οὐσία being ἐπιούσιος rather than ἐπούσιος.

But Mr. Kay goes on to take what he unfortunately terms "stronger ground":

It is unquestionable (he says) that no such form as ἐπών is anywhere to be found. Consequently we must admit that the present participle of ἐπεῖναι is ἐπιών, unless some very good reason can be produced for leaving ἐπεῖναι destitute of a present participle. For, when we find in actual use the following correspondent sets of phrases :

- (1) τὸ παρόν, ὁ παρῶν νῦν χρόνος, ἢ παροῦσα νῦν ἡμέρα,
 (2) τὸ ἐπιόν, ὁ ἐπιών χρόνος, ἢ ἐπιούσα ἡμέρα,

it seems little short of a certainty that the participles of the latter set, no less than those of the former (with which they stand in sharp contrast), are to be taken as coming from εἶναι.

Here it may be remarked that it is equally hard upon ἐπεῖναι to take its acknowledged participle ἐπιών from it, and hand it over to ἐπείναι, thus leaving it destitute of a participle; or, if Mr. Kay does not intend to go so far as that, but means ἐπεῖναι and ἐπείναι to have a common participle, ἐπιών, that it is cruel to ἐπείναι to force it to be in continual hot water with ἐπεῖναι, with whom it has hitherto lived on amicable terms, respecting which of the two the participle ἐπιών belongs to in each particular case.

But the real fact is that ἐπεῖναι does possess a participle, ἐπών, well-known to Plato and Demosthenes, though unknown to the controversialists upon ἐπιούσιος. Plato has it twice, in the "Lysis," 217 C., οἷον τὸ ἐπών, where ἐπών is a certain correction of Heindorf's for ἐπι δν'; and in the "Parmenides," 132 C., ὁ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἐκείνο τὸ νόημα ἐπὸν νοεῖ. Demosthenes has it in the "Oration against Meidias," p. 517, line 15, ἐπόντος τοῦ φόβου τούτου.

I think the false analogy between περιούσιος and ἐπιούσιος may now be dropped, and the claims of ἐπὶ and εἶναι to have originated ἐπιούσιος set aside for ever.

But the second grand point that Mr. Kay makes against Dr. Lightfoot's view that ἐπιούσιος is derived from [ἡ] ἐπιούσα [ἡμέρα] is this:

There is a serious reason against this derivation. Such a prayer as "Give us this day the bread of to-morrow" is both harsh in itself and at variance with what Christendom generally has understood by the petition.

But why has Mr. Kay neglected the evidence, which Dr. Lightfoot has been the first to bring forward, in proof that ἡ ἐπιούσα does NOT in itself signify "to-morrow"? This first piece of evidence is contained in a speech in the "Ecclesiazusæ" of Aristophanes, in which, very early in the morning (καί τοι πρὸς ὄρθρον γ' ἐστίν (line 20), "'tis close on daybreak") Praxagora exclaims, line 105 :

τούτου γε τοι, νῆ τῆν ἐπιούσαν ἡμέραν,
 τόλμημα τολμῶμεν τοιοῦτον οὐνεκα.

On this account, I swear by the on-coming day,
 We are venturing upon this great enterprise.

There νῆ τῆν αὔριον would have been clearly out of place, and it

is manifest that *ἡ ἐπιούσα ἡμέρα*, "the on-coming day," is something different from *ἡ αὔριον*, the morrow.

But possibly Mr. Kay considered this passage by itself to be evidence too slight and isolated to be worth dealing with. I do not think anyone will be able to entertain any such opinion with regard to the passage, which (secondly) I am now about to adduce from the "Crito" of Plato, p. 44, A. In this, very early in the morning (*ὄρθρος βαθεύς*), Crito is represented as coming to Socrates and informing him that the fatal ship had arrived at Sunium, and that on the morrow Socrates must end his life. The dialogue then proceeds:

SOCRATES: "Well, Crito, with good luck may it be! If so it pleases the gods, so let it be. I don't, however, think it will arrive *to-day* (*τῆμερον*)." CRITO: "Whence do you infer this?" SOCRATES: "I will tell you. I presume I am to be put to death the day after that on which the ship arrives." CRITO: "At any rate, so say the authorities in these matters." SOCRATES: "Well, I don't think it will arrive on the *on-coming* day (*τῆς ἐπιούσης ἡμέρας* = *τῆμερον*), but on the *next* (*τῆς ἐτέρας*). And I infer it from a vision, which I have seen this night a little previously; and it seems that you forbore to wake me very opportunely." CRITO: "And what was the vision?" SOCRATES: "Methought a lady, handsome and comely, dressed in white, called me and said, 'Socrates, on the *third* day thou wilt come to fertile Phthia.'"

Three days are here mentioned. The first is termed both *τῆμερον* and *τῆς ἐπιούσης*, the second *τῆς ἐτέρας*, and the third *τῆ ὑστεραία* [*τῆς ἐτέρας*]. Hence it is clear that in the early morning, the day, of which the major part is yet to come, is represented by *ἡ ἐπιούσα*. This makes it manifest that *ἡ ἐπιούσα* is not in itself equivalent to *ἡ αὔριον*, although very often the context allows it to be so used.

Thirdly, there is also a passage in the Acts of the Apostles in which, if the usual punctuation and syntactical arrangement be retained, *τῆ ἐπιούσῃ* is led by the following *τῆ ἐτέρα* to bear the same signification as in the above-cited passage from the "Crito" of Plato. In Acts xx. 15 we read: *κάκειθεν* (from Mitylene) *ἀποπλεύσαντες, τῆ ἐπιούσῃ κατηγήσαμεν ἀντικρὺ Χίου, τῆ δε ἐτέρα παρεβάλομεν εἰς Σάμον, τῆ δ' ἐχομένην ἤλθομεν εἰς Μίλητον*. The Revised Version translates: "And sailing from thence, we came the *following* day over against Chios, and *the next day* we touched at Samos, and the day after we came to Miletus."

This translation gives us, according to the common acceptation of *τῆ ἐπιούσῃ*, FOUR days from Mitylene to Miletus, two of which are taken up in getting "over against Chios," which seems an unconscionable time by the map. We have (1) the day of starting; (2) the following day, *τῆ ἐπιούσῃ*; (3) the "next" day, *τῆ ἐτέρα*, which ought to have been *τῆ τρίτῃ*, but which cannot be equivalent to *τῆ τρίτῃ*; and (4) *τῆ ἐχομένην* (*τῆς ἐτέρας*).

But if St. Luke—the ship having, as a matter of course, made an early start—has used *τῇ ἐπιούσῃ* in the same way as Plato and Aristophanes, we have only *three* days for the voyage, with *τῇ ἐτέρα* in its proper place and with its proper signification. Thus, comparing the three days expressed as above by Plato with the three days of St. Luke, we have:

Plato (1) $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{τῆμερον.} \\ \text{τῆς ἐπιούσης.} \end{array} \right.$ (2) *τῆς ἐτέρας.* (3) *τῇ ὑστεραίᾳ [τῆς ἐτέρας].*
 St. Luke (1) *τῇ ἐπιούσῃ.* (2) *τῇ ἐτέρα.* (3) *τῇ ἐχομένῃ [τῆς ἐτέρας].*

But I admit that if *τῇ ἐπιούσῃ* of St. Luke be taken, contrary to the rhythm of the passage and the general agreement of commentators, with the preceding *ἀποπλεύσαντες*, the days come out correctly, and my reasoning falls to the ground.

Fourthly, let us consider the passage in Proverbs (xxvii. 1) in which *ἡ ἐπιούσα* occurs, and see whether the expression does or does not fall under the signification above established from Plato. The English translation corresponds so nearly with the Hebrew that it would be mere pedantry to refer to the Hebrew original. The proverb runs: "Boast not thyself of to-morrow, for thou knowest not what a day may [or will] bring forth." Now what day is here indicated by *a day*? It cannot well be the morrow, for it simply spoils the proverb to paraphrase: "Boast not thyself of to-morrow, for thou knowest not what to-morrow may bring forth." Surely *a day* must be used—the general for the particular—with special reference to the day's space between now and to-morrow. Thus the meaning, as deduced from the Hebrew, will be: "Boast not thyself of to-morrow, because thou knowest not what may or will happen between now and to-morrow." Now let us take the LXX. of the verse: *Μὴ καυχῶ τὰ εἰς αὔριον, οὐ γὰρ γινώσκεις τί τέξεται ἡ ἐπιούσα.* Here we have no choice between *may* and *will*, but the translation must run: "Boast not with regard to to-morrow, for thou knowest not what the on-coming day will bring forth." Is it not preferable, and much more corresponding to the spirit of the proverb, to understand *ἡ ἐπιούσα*, "the on-coming day," in the sense established from Plato and Aristophanes, and perhaps St. Luke also, than to consider it a mere synonym of *ἡ αὔριον*? Thus the Greek of the LXX. will be not a literal translation, but an extremely vivid and correct gloss upon and paraphrase of the original Hebrew.

Fifthly, there is a passage in Xenophon's "Anabasis" (i. 7, 1 and 2) in which the two senses of *ἐπιούσα* appear to exhibit themselves in very close proximity. It runs as follows:

At the third halting-place Cyrus holds a review of the Greeks and the Asiatics in the plain at midnight, for he thought that *at the oncoming dawn* (*εἰς τὴν ἐπιούσαν ἑω*) the king would arrive with his army to fight. And he ordered Clearchus to lead the right wing and Meno the Thessalian the left, but arrayed his own people himself. And after the review, *with*

the *oncoming day* (ἄμα τῇ ἐπιούσῃ ἡμέρᾳ), deserters from the great king began arriving and giving Cyrus information respecting the king's army.

Here Cyrus considers overnight that the king would probably attack him at dawn the next day. So that the sense of ἐπιούσα in εἰς τὴν ἐπιούσαν ἔω is equivalent to its ordinary explanation of "the morrow." But, after holding the review, which would take up a considerable time, and after dawn—for ἡμέρα clearly implies a period in the day later than ἔως—ἡ ἐπιούσα ἡμέρα is used for the *oncoming day*, the day of which the dawn is already past. Of course, the translation "oncoming" dawn or day will suit both places; but in the first case the day in question is not yet come, while in the second it is already somewhat advanced, and the major part of it is yet to come, thus agreeing with the quotations above given from Plato and Aristophanes.

And now what is the practical outcome of all this, over and above the establishment of Dr. Lightfoot's view of the origin and meaning of ἐπιούσιος? Even this, that we have in the sense of ἡ ἐπιούσα, as thus established, the ground and reason of the alternative formulæ of St. Matthew and St. Luke in the Lord's prayer.

In Matt. vi. 11 we have: "Give us this day (σήμερον) our daily bread, τὸν ἄρτον τὸν ἐπιούσιον, τὸν ἄρτον τῆς ἐπιούσης, the bread of the on-coming day, of the day, the major part of which is yet to come. This, then, is the proper formula for a *morning* prayer, or a prayer said at the beginning of, or early in the day.

In Luke xi. 3 we find: "Give us day by day (τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν) our daily bread." Here, τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν being allowed to have its full distributive force, we must be supposed to ask at any time for the bread of the on-coming space of a day, reckoning from the moment of using the prayer.

A. H. WRATISLAW.

26, Market Place, Rugby.

ART. IV.—"TEACHING OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES."

THIS book may now be considered as fairly settled in its proper place among our literary possessions. The story of its discovery, its subjects and character, and the period to which it is to be assigned, is now pretty generally understood. A fresh accession to the documents of a most interesting and most obscure stage of Church history, and to ecclesiastical literature in its scantiest and feeblest stage, is not only an important fact in itself, but suggests the possibility that other

like treasures may lurk in Eastern monasteries which another Bryennius may hereafter bring to light.

The five years which have passed since publication have given space for all the suspicions, debates and searching criticisms which such an apparition from the distant past must excite. It has been recognised as the book mentioned by Eusebius and Athanasius in the enumeration of sub-apostolic documents; and by a general consensus of competent opinion it has been assigned to the earliest part of the second century, possibly even to the close of the first. As a book of instructions and directions, it may properly bear the title of “The oldest Church Manual,” which Dr. Schaff has given it in his useful published account. The main questions being thus settled, those who could contribute nothing of consequence to their settlement have now scope to make their observations, and take part in estimating the character and value of the new acquisition.

The library of the Church is a grand and imposing spectacle, and the history of its formation is a study in itself. There seemed no promise at first of the immense intellectual activity and culture which it now represents. Let us take the literary survivals of successive periods as exhibited on its successive shelves. On the highest shelf stand in solitude the Holy Scriptures, compact and solid, pregnant with the ideas which have made the life of the Church, and dominated the thought of the world, condensing materials to be utilized in the labours of ensuing ages. These labours do not appear at once. In the next line a little narrow shelf represents the generation between the Apostles and the Apologists. That second shelf contains but very few and very slight productions, marked with the names of Clement, Barnabas, Hermas, Ignatius, Polycarp, and some fragments secured from later quotation or report. It is on this shelf that we now place another thin little volume, lettered as “Teaching of the Twelve Apostles.” We look with some surprise on this small collection, which gives such faint reflection of the writings which preceded, and are far from being an earnest of those which will follow. It is not at this time in literature that the intellect of Christians finds vent. It even seems that it is still true that “not many wise are called.” But if the Church is not writing, it is growing. The knowledge of Christ, mighty for the conscience and the life, mighty to convert and sanctify, to spread from heart to heart and city to city, mighty to create pure examples, bold testimonies, and noble martyrdoms—this knowledge, as knowledge, could not in the nature of things be intellectually mastered at once. In the presence of “unsearchable riches” the mind is for a time arrested before the real

search begins, and such possessions are at first appropriated in fragments and developed by the impulses of controversies or occasions. We are too much accustomed to think of primitive Christians as advanced in spiritual knowledge, and as explicitly conscious of all that their faith implicitly contained. But this is to ignore the natural conditions of mental growth, and to ascribe to communities in different stages of formation a common possession of the entire New Testament, of a settled canon, and of a mature theology.

There are thus two thoughts which arise in our minds in passing from the apostolic to the sub-apostolic remains. First, the divine stamp on the canonical Scriptures stands out in strong relief from the contrast with works so near in time, so incalculably distant in character. The clearness and the depth, the fulness and the force of the apprehension of the things of Jesus Christ in St. Paul, St. Peter, and St. John, are felt as communications from the Lord Himself, made to them and through them for universal and perpetual information. The origination of our Gospels and Epistles from ordinary human motive, on the level of thought with which we soon become familiar, is seen to be a supposition impossible to entertain.

In the second place, we are reminded that, as a matter both of natural probability and of historic fact, time was needed for these writings themselves to be collectively known and recognised, and for their teachings, when known, to be thoroughly understood and assimilated, in the various mental habits which men had "received by tradition from their fathers."

These observations have their bearing on the present subject, modifying our criticism of this little book as well as of its companions on the same shelf. Unreasonable expectations naturally entail unreasonable disappointments, and tend to depreciate the estimate we may form below what is just or fair.

The book is by an unknown author, apparently in a Jewish-Christian community, and its disappearance in later time may be attributed, partly to this special cast and colouring, which connected it with a swiftly vanishing element in the Church, partly to change of times, which made some of its ecclesiastical directions no longer applicable, and partly to the reproduction and expansion of its moral teachings in larger works, notably in the Apostolical Constitutions, which retain the language as well as incorporate the matter of the Didaché.

The name *Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων* is enlarged by a second and fuller title, as "Teaching of the Lord by the Twelve Apostles to the Gentiles." This represents the Apostles not as

authors of the book, but as channels of the instruction which it contains. As reproduced in a later book, "The Canons of the Holy Apostles," the several parts of the teaching are assigned to the several Apostles, as was also the case with the sentences of the Apostles' Creed. But there is no such fiction here. The teaching is that of the Lord Jesus. It comes through the Apostles whom He had chosen. It is here presented as instruction for the Gentiles—who are afterwards spoken of as coming to baptism, and so having to learn the character of their new life. The specification of "the Twelve" on the one side, and of "the Gentiles" on the other, is quite suitable to the atmosphere of a Jewish-Christian community; of which the whole tone of the little book is redolent. This character is fully exhibited in Dr. Taylor's lectures before the Royal Institution; and the rabbinical learning of the Master of St. John's has made him the most competent commentator from that point of view. There is even an appearance of its being a Christianized form of an accustomed Jewish teaching to proselytes, which would account for the line taken, as well as for many separate expressions. Dr. Salmon, in his valuable "Introduction to the New Testament," has, I think, exaggerated the effect of this impression:

If [he says] the *Didaché*, as we know it, was a work of very limited circulation and influence, which spread but little and slowly outside the purely Jewish section of the Church, it ceases to be of much importance in the history of the Christian Church: but it even gains in importance when regarded as a contribution to the history of Judaism, exhibiting the religious training received by pious Jews before the Gospel was preached to them (p. 614).

I cannot see that this is a reasonable conclusion. Admitting that the use of the book was limited, and (for reasons already given) soon superseded, its value as testimony remains, and any contemporary testimony which we can obtain of the mind and habit of the Christian Church in that obscure period of its history must be precious information. Testimony from any section of the Church is important, and not least from a section which lies nearest to the original stock, though cleaving to it as a partially developed offset. Thinking thus, we feel that we have come, not upon a fruitless discovery, but upon one that makes substantial contributions to our knowledge of doctrinal and ecclesiastical history at that most interesting stage of it of which least is known.

The little book is continuous, but has been divided by Bryennius into sixteen chapters. The larger divisions, according to subject, are adopted differently by different writers. But there is one distinct and obvious division at the end of the sixth chapter. There ends the teaching called "the two ways,"

being instruction in Christian morals, incorporating much of the Sermon on the Mount. This is a charge addressed to the individual catechumen in the second person singular, and in certain parts as "my child" (τέκνον μου). The rest of the book is a liturgical and ecclesiastical directory addressed in the second person plural to the Church or its members, ending with a high-toned warning on the Lord's coming and intimations of the last things.

FIRST PART.

This is described as the Teaching of the Two Ways, the way of life largely, and the way of death briefly, set forth; meaning the moral habits and characters which belong to these two opposite conditions. It is to this division of the book that the title of the Didaché seems properly to belong, for which opinion I would give three reasons. 1. All that is found in it may justly be described as "Teaching of the Lord by the Twelve Apostles," whereas the next section reports no teaching of the Lord Jesus, and deals with contingencies of later time than that of the Twelve. 2. It seems that the word *διδασχί* early acquired a recognised meaning as applying to Christian morals rather than to ecclesiastical directions. This is the tone in which it is largely used in the later Epistles, *e.g.*, the Bishop appointed by Titus must be a man "holding fast the faithful word, which is according to the teaching"—*τοῦ κατὰ τὴν διδασχὴν πιστοῦ λόγου*; and this is said to be a word which will qualify him both to exhort in healthful doctrine and to convict the gainsayer. Here, *κατὰ τὴν διδασχὴν* is plainly a reference to some recognised scheme of instruction which would have these effects; and it would be known in different Churches with various modifications, but in substantial identity; and I think such a form as we have here would be a fair representation of a certain aspect and a certain portion of it. 3. The document itself seems to appropriate the title to this first portion. It commences, after reciting the two great commandments, "Now of these words *the teaching* is this:" and it closes, "See that none lead thee astray from this way of *the teaching*." For these reasons it seems to me that the authoritative title is proper to this first section, and the rest of the book is not the Didaché, but an appendix to it.

With regard to this section it will be enough to say that it is based on the second table of the Decalogue, as interpreted in the Sermon on the Mount, the very words of which are largely adopted and repeated; and that its own developments of this Christian law are spiritual, in the sense of dealing with inward dispositions as well as outward acts, and practical, in

the sense of various applications, and also of distinct bearing on the surrounding state of morals, as is evident in such additions as *οὐ παιδοφθορήσεις, οὐ μαγεύσεις, οὐ φαρμακεύσεις, οὐ φονεύσεις τέκνον ἐν φθορᾷ, οὐδὲ γεννηθὲν ἀποκτενεῖς*. It is practical also in the checks and modifications which must attend, and are meant to attend, the application of principles to facts. Thus, after the charges about the receiving a blow on the right cheek, the being compelled to go a mile, the taking away of the cloak, and the giving to everyone that asks, there follow words precautionary against mischievous consequences that may be allowed to ensue :

Blessed is he that giveth according to the commandment, for he is guiltless ; but woe to him that taketh ; for, if indeed one taketh, having need, he shall be guiltless ; but he who hath no need shall give account why he took, and for what purpose, and coming under arrest, shall be examined concerning what he did, and shall not go out thence till he pay the last farthing. But concerning this also it hath been said, Let thine alms sweat into thine hands till thou know to whom thou shouldest give (chap. i.).

These warning words to those who might encroach on the large charity of Christians, and these admonitions to those who administer to be considerate, are evidence that the divine principles were taken as real obligations, and were being acted out in the community.

I read also a proof of the same practical spirit in the closing words of the whole first section, the "teaching" properly so called :

See that no one lead thee astray from this way of the teaching, for apart from God does he teach thee. For if indeed thou art able to bear the whole yoke of the Lord, thou shalt be perfect ; but if thou art not able, what thou art able this do. But concerning food, what thou art able bear ; but of that which is offered to idols beware exceedingly, for it is a worship of dead gods (chap. vi.).

Many have remarked on the tolerant spirit which lays on the disciple only such burdens as he is able to bear, while no compromise is allowed in regard to the *εἰδωλόθυρα*. Nor can anyone fail to observe the relation to the discussion in Acts xv., in verbal coincidences as well as in the spirit of the conclusions arrived at. It is generally assumed that the ceremonial law of the Jews is in this place intended by "the yoke of the Lord." We know how familiar was the expression "the yoke of the Law ;" but "the yoke of the Lord" is surely another thing. It may not have the free spiritual meaning with which the Lord Himself applied it in "Take *My yoke* upon you ;" but it must, I think, represent a Christianized code of "the customs" (Acts xx. 21) of life and devotion, which is here recommended to the disciples as a godly rule and counsel of perfection. To impose it in its old form and stringent obligation

would be to "lead them astray from this way of the teaching."

In the "teaching," taken as a whole, the chief disappointment and main defect is the absence of motive. Spiritual and practical in the senses already indicated, in this respect it is neither spiritual nor practical. We must take it for what it is, a code of Christian morals; and we have no right to complain because it is not an exposition of doctrine, or an expression of devotion. But in the point now mentioned the contrast with the moral teaching of the New Testament is too striking to be passed without notice. If we compare it with the Sermon on the Mount (so much of which it reproduces)—where the living relations with the Father in heaven are kept in continual play upon the soul—or, again, with the *διδαχή*, or practical teaching in the latter part of St. Paul's Epistles, in which the powers of the faith in Christ mingle with every charge and steal into every precept, we feel at once how powerless the very law of Christ appears when not pervaded by the truths and vitalized by the spirit of His Gospel.

SECOND PART.

In passing from the Teaching on the Two Ways to the directions which follow, we find ourselves in a region of less authority but of greater interest, as casting light on liturgical and ecclesiastical history at a period on which information is most scanty, and therefore most welcome.

We begin from chapter vii.: "Now concerning baptism, thus baptize ye." Baptism is to be administered in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, in running water; but allowance is given for other water, and warm if necessary, or by effusion thrice upon the head; and a fast is to be kept for a day or two before.

Fastings and prayers are to be so appointed as to distinguish the Christian from the Jewish observances. The Churches to which the document belongs are evidently in contact with a Judaism, from which they have at no distant time emerged, and the separation of the days observed by the two communities would be a fence between them, and a prevention of reabsorption. The fasting-days in the week are not to be the second and fifth, which are kept by "the hypocrites," but the fourth and the preparation day (the Jewish name for Friday as preceding the Sabbath—"ἡν Παρασκευή ὅ ἐστιν προσάββατον," says St. Mark, speaking of the Lord's burial; and the name occurs six times in the Gospels). The reasons for the observance of these days in connection with our Lord's Passion are not stated, being plainly there understood, though in later writings fully

explained. The adoption of our Lord's denunciatory words, "the hypocrites," is a further evidence of the nearness of the Jewish element, and of the shrinking from it.

Prayer also is not to be "as the hypocrites, but as the Lord commanded in His Gospel." Then follows the Lord's Prayer, with two very slight variations, ending with the doxology, "For Thine is the power and the glory for ever," and with the direction, "Thrice in the day pray ye thus."

In what follows, "concerning the Eucharist," there is nothing systematic, the purpose being only to give suggestions of some short liturgical forms, and some directions about those who may minister at the celebration; and this leads to further treatment of the subject of the ministry, and to orders and cautions which were then and there required concerning it. After this, in chapter xv., the keeping of Sunday brings us back to the Eucharist again. Nothing is said in either place about the reason or meaning of the act, nothing of the truths which it testifies, nothing of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, nothing of the Body and Blood. Neither is there any intentional account or distinct evidence of the order of celebration. All is taken as understood by those who knew their own customs, but by us can only be inferred from the expressions used, and from the order in which they occur. The inference appears to be this: 1. The whole celebration includes the Eucharistic meal (the *κυριακὸν δεῖπνον* of 1 Cor. xi. 20, the *agapé*, as it was also called), and closes with the sacramental act. 2. The course of proceeding keeps very nearly on the lines of the Paschal Supper, as celebrated by the Lord and His disciples, and as ended by the act of institution.

There is surely a great interest in this close adherence to the original type and to the Lord's own act, and through it in this perpetuation of the organic connection between the Eucharist of the old covenant and the Eucharist of the new. A Jewish-Christian Church had an advantage in this respect, which the Churches of the Gentiles did not and could not share. To the former the old associations of the sacred history, the inherited sweetness and solemnity of the Paschal feast, passed naturally into the Eucharistic meal, and made it a distinctly religious act, and an introductory part of the celebration. To the latter such connections of feeling did not come naturally. To them the meal was simply an act of brotherly communion, an idea which had not sufficient practical power for its own sustained realization, as appears from the scene depicted 1 Cor. xi. 20-22. It was only an *agapé*: it could be displaced from before the sacrament and used after it; it could be laid aside altogether. The Apostles brought the custom from the Jewish into the Gentile Churches; but it had not for

them the same significance; it had not the roots in the one soil which it had in the other.

I have said that the order supposed is matter of inference. The following are grounds for it: the first prayer given is "about the cup," the second about the broken bread (*κλάσμα*). So it was in the Paschal meal: first, the cup and its benediction,¹ then the bread broken, a part eaten, and a part reserved to the close, which latter part was the material which the Lord, at the close of the supper, broke and distributed in the act of institution. The prayers supplied for the cup and the *κλάσμα* are interesting:

We thank Thee, our Father, for the holy vine of David Thy servant (or child, *παιδός*) which Thou madest known to us through Jesus Thy servant: to Thee be the glory for ever. We thank Thee, our Father, for the life and the knowledge which Thou madest known to us through Jesus Thy servant: to Thee be the glory for ever. Just as this broken bread was scattered over the hills, and having been gathered together became one, so let Thy Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into Thy kingdom: for Thine is the glory and the power, through Jesus Christ, for ever.

The formula for the cup seems a mystical enlargement of that for the first cup of the Passover, "Blessed art Thou, Jehovah, our God, Who hast delivered the fruit of the vine." The holy vine of David made known by Jesus, may represent the life of the Church existing in Israel and concentrated in the line of David, but now revealed in Jesus the root and offspring of David, "the True Vine," from which the branches draw their life. The gist of both these thanksgivings is to make the eucharistic meal an act of participation in the life of the corporate Church, viewed in its stock and descent, in its gathering from the ends of the earth and in its final entrance into the kingdom. Perhaps we, in our day, have something to learn from this. That the supper is here intended appears from the words "after that ye are filled," by which the next devotions are introduced. These are followed by voices which sound as an introduction to the sacramental act itself:

Let grace come, and this world pass away! Hosanna to the God of David. Whoever is holy let him come: whoever is not let him repent! Maran-athá. Amen.

The Aramaic word for "our Lord cometh," with which St. Paul closes the first Epistle to the Corinthians, as a kind of Christian watchword sealing the exclusion of those "who love not the Lord Jesus," here, on quite another side of the Church, where probably St. Paul's Epistles are unknown, breaks in

¹ The cup in the supper is distinguished from the cup in the institution (Luke xxii. 17-20).

with the like force, immediately (as I suppose) preceding the act which “shows the Lord’s death till He come.” It is observable also that the combination of the two pregnant words, *Hosanna Maran-athá*, preserves the continuity of the Messianic Psalm used in the Jewish Liturgy for the Feast of Tabernacles, in which the *Hosanna* verse “Save now, we pray,” is followed by the words, “Blessed is he that *cometh* in the name of the Lord,” or (as in Dean Perowne’s note) “according to the accents the rendering would be “Blessed, in the name of the Lord, be he that cometh.”

In this chapter x. the eucharistic subject is treated as following on that of baptism. In chapter xiv. it is resumed in connection with the Sunday. “On the Lord’s Day of the Lord, *κατὰ κυριακὴν δὲ κυρίου* (so it is expressed), being assembled together, break bread and give thanks, *εὐχαριστήσατε.*”

The name for the day, which occurs once in Scripture (Rev. i. 10), here appears as in common use in a formula which (Dr. Taylor observes) “is both Jewish and anti-Jewish; since it is framed on an Old Testament model, whilst it deposes the Sabbath from its ancient place as the day to be specially dedicated to the Lord. ‘Sabbath of the Lord’ occurs Lev. xxiii. 38, but the Christian no longer celebrates a Sabbath of the Lord; but a ‘Lord’s Day of the Lord.’”

The main purpose of the assembly on this day is the Eucharistia, which, as appears from the former section, is the whole act of thanksgiving-worship; but in this place the character of sacrifice is made prominent, in connection with the passage, Malachi i. 11, so often cited by early writers: “In every place incense shall be offered unto My name, and a pure offering for My name is great among the Gentiles.” The “offering” here is not *zebach*, representing death and atonement, but *mincha*, the meat-offering, with its libation which followed upon it, as expressing thankful communion, and this character naturally connected it with the Christian sacrifice of praise made after commemoration of the one propitiatory Sacrifice, in which a like sense of thankful communion was expressed, and in which even the like material elements were used. Here the passage is introduced as demanding that the offering shall be *pure*—a purity which is to be secured by previous confession of sins to God, and by a precedent reconciliation among neighbours wherever controversy may exist.

There is another subject of much interest on which light is thrown in the course of these directions. We find ourselves in a transition stage of the order and ministry of the Church. After the prescribed thanksgivings, it is added, “But suffer the prophets to give thanks as they will.” Then follow

directions which suppose the arrival of Apostles and Prophets, whose recognised office and inspiration give them a right of action independent of the regulations of the churches which they visit. It is expected that they will pray and give thanks as they are moved, that they may do abnormal and parabolic acts like the prophets of old, and may order special eucharistic feasts or other celebrations. The instructions to the Church with regard to the treatment of these visitors present a curious and, I think, inevitable mixture of confidence and suspicion. Every Apostle who comes is, according to the ordinance of the Gospel, to be received as the Lord; but he is only to stay a day or two. If he remains three days he is a false prophet: and when he goes he must only take food for his next stage, and if he ask money, he is a false prophet. "Every prophet who speaks in the spirit ye shall not judge," and the danger of the unpardonable sin is hinted. "But not everyone that speaketh in the spirit is a prophet, but only if he have the ways of the Lord." If he orders a meal in the spirit and eats of it, he is a false prophet. "If in the spirit he says, 'Give me money,' ye shall not hear him; but if for others in need he bids you give, let no one judge him." Christian travellers in like manner are to be carefully dealt with. Such a man is to be helped; but if he stays he must work. "Let no idler live with you as a Christian: such a one would make a gain out of Christ." If, on the other hand, a true prophet *settles* in the Church he is worthy of support, and is to receive the first-fruits of everything as under the Law, for the Prophets "are your High Priests."

The first observation I make on all this is that it is entirely in accordance with the state of things revealed in the later Epistles—St. Paul's words about those "who made a gain of godliness;" St. Peter's about "false prophets and teachers;" St. John's about "not believing every spirit," and about "those who say they are Apostles, and are not, but do lie;" St. Jude's about those "who in your love-feasts, when they feast with you, feed themselves without fear"—these words immediately rise to our minds, and in this document we find ourselves still in much the same state of things in which those Epistles had placed us. It is strong evidence of the date.

My second observation is upon the evident unfitness of such a system for continuance, and on the Divine wisdom which brought it gradually to an end. The recognised existence of immediate commissions and inspirations, taken in connection with the ease with which they could be alleged or simulated, must have created an ever-increasing anxiety, uncertainty, and embarrassment. Consider the power of mysterious spiritual influence, the uses to which it may be turned, and the strange

attraction which it has for a certain order of minds; consider the excitements and strong impressions which border on spiritual possession, and may sometimes become possession of a questionable kind; consider the readiness of men and women to become adherents of persons who make bold pretensions, and of doctrines which suit their feelings or their fancies, and you will understand the difficulty and anxiety of discrimination, and the hesitation that must often have been felt between implicit deference and indignant rejection. Thankful we may be that the methods fitly, and indeed necessarily, used at the opening of the kingdom of God dropped insensibly away as it assumed larger extension and more organic form.

My last observation shall be that transition to the permanent system is here in progress, as a later direction shows. After the provisions for the purity of the eucharistic worship, it is said:

Elect therefore to yourselves bishops and deacons worthy of the Lord, men meek, and not lovers of money, truthful and approved; for they too minister to you the ministry (*λειτουργοῦσι τὴν λειτουργίαν*) of the prophets and teachers. Therefore despise them not, for they are those that are honoured among you with the prophets and teachers.

The Apostles and Prophets belong to the initial stage of the Church; the Bishops and Deacons to its permanent form. The first have a general commission, the second a local charge. The Apostles are plainly not of the company of the Twelve whose name gives authority to the document; but of the larger class, to which the title is extended, in a secondary sense, in a few passages of Scripture—men who are recognised as having a mission with credentials not by us easy to be traced, and whose name here appears as almost interchangeable with that of the Prophets. These unattached ministers of the Church at large were needed in early communities which scarcely supplied persons qualified for teaching and holy offices; but as the local ministry became qualified and settled, this would take the place of the occasional and special visitor—whose passing work of public ministry and teaching would thus be locally and regularly supplied. These offices, by the identification of their work with that of the Prophets and Teachers, and by its immediate connection with the Lord's Day and the Eucharistic Service, are vindicated here from the secular and financial character which recent theories have assigned to them.

Here, too, as in the New Testament writings, we see the joint existence of these two ministries; the one unattached and specially empowered, the other local and systematically appointed. Apostles, Prophets, and Evangelists on the one

side ; Bishops and Deacons on the other. We see also that the second order, as it becomes qualified to do so, is intended to fulfil the functions of the first, and that the difficulties attending special commissions and inspirations may naturally lead to their cessation. Attempts from time to time have been made for their supposed recovery, as in the Montanist heresy, as it has been called, though it was no heresy, but only an extravagance that became schismatic. It has lately been vindicated as a return to the primitive system. So it was, but at a time when the return was not permitted. It was out of date, and therefore untrue in its pretensions, and unhappy in its effects. The same must be said of the like attempts made under the same ideas, though in very different directions, by the Irvingites and the Plymouth Brethren. They have not understood the Divine wisdom which ordered that the early growth of the Church should have the assistance of provisional aids, which were to drop away, and did drop away, from its permanent form.

The directions close with the words : " But your prayers and your alms and all your acts so do ye as ye have it in the Gospel of our Lord." Then follows a conclusion like a sudden trumpet-note, warning of the Lord's coming, with its signs and antecedents. Well-known words, which appear in our written Gospels and Epistles, are here heard as if everywhere sounding through the Church.

Chap. xvi. : Watch for your life ; let not your lamps be quenched, and let not your loins be loosed, but be ready : for ye know not the hour in which our Lord cometh. But often shall ye be gathered together, seeking the things that befit your souls ; for all the time of your faith shall not profit you, unless in the last time ye be perfected. For in the last days the false prophets and the corrupters shall be multiplied, and the sheep shall be turned into wolves, and love shall be turned into hate ; for when lawlessness increaseth they shall hate and shall persecute and deliver up one another : and then shall appear the world-deceiver (*ὁ κοσμοπλάτης*) as Son of God, and shall do signs and wonders ; and the earth shall be delivered into his hands, and he shall do unlawful things which have never been from the beginning. Then shall mankind come into the furnace of trial, and many shall be offended and perish ; and they that endured in their faith shall be saved by the curse itself.

And then shall appear the signs of the truth ; first a sign of expansion in heaven, then a sign of a trumpet's voice, and the third a resurrection of the dead ; yet not of all, but as it is said : " The Lord shall come, and all his saints with Him." Then shall the world see the Lord coming upon the clouds of heaven.

The document which we have reviewed leaves at first a disappointing impression. The great facts of the Gospel are not mentioned, nor are its main doctrines referred to, save in the baptismal formula, and elsewhere by implication only. From this fact, and from its Judaic tone, one commentator (a

Roman Catholic) has ascribed its origin to an Ebionite community at a later date. But there is no token of the Ebionite spirit, opinions, or practices. There is nothing against its orthodoxy but simply silence. There must be grounds on which Jesus Christ is acknowledged as Lord, on which the teaching rests its authority, on which men seek and receive baptism in the triune Name, on which they keep the Lord's Day and celebrate the Eucharist. But it is not within the purpose of this document to state them; and the brevity and reserve of its language accords with the early habit of treating the articles of the faith and the significance of the mysteries as matters for oral communication. It is a short manual of instruction to be given on the moral law of Christianity, with directions for guidance of the Churches to which it belonged, on points on which such guidance was needed then and there. These things it does clearly, and it is not to be depreciated because it does not do something else. It indicates the cast of religion in a certain region of the Church, and that, so far as it goes, is a contribution to the history on the whole. It shows the Christian code marked by a practical adaptation to surrounding morals, but with a certain character of externalism, savouring of Jewish descent. It confesses Jesus Christ as Lord to the glory of God the Father. It appeals to the authority of "His Gospel," to which it makes frequent references, implying that a written form of it is known or accessible to all. The Gospel of St. Matthew, proper to Hebrew Christianity, appears to supply the great mass of these references, and thus we have fresh evidence of its existence. Single expressions which we find in St. Luke, and some instances of the special language of St. John, are no proof that they are extracted from written Gospels.

The book also testifies to the administration of baptism in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; to the habitual use of the Lord's Prayer by all members of the Church, and to the recognised sanctity of the Lord's Day as taking the place of the Sabbath. It exhibits initial specimens of liturgical forms to be used when no prophet is present whose inspiration gives the right to supersede them. It shows "the breaking of bread," and the whole eucharistic celebration as proper to the Lord's Day, and as the central act of devotion, having the character of a sacrifice of thanksgiving, and expressing communion with the entire Church. In regard to the organization of the Church, it exhibits a transitional stage, in which provisional inspirations and commissions are passing into the permanent ministry and order, and it clearly intimates what the character of that ministry is in respect to worship and to teaching. Finally, it is a fresh evidence of the ever-present

expectation of the coming of the Lord which had such living power for the early Christians, which for us the lapse of time has made more faint, while it has, in fact, brought us nearer to its fulfilment.

So early and independent a witness of these points is surely a distinct contribution to theological information, and an appreciable accession to historic evidence.

T. D. BERNARD.



ART. V.—"ROBERT ELSMERE."

IT is curious, as well as instructive, to note the varieties of attack which in one age or another are made on the Church of Christ.¹ Now it is complained that she is indifferent to the wants of humanity, and the moral evil rampant in the world is charged upon her. Now it is affirmed that her continual interference with men's spiritual lives drives them to rebellion, when they would otherwise obey. It is complained at one time that she claims to exercise an authority which she does not possess; at another, that she possesses an authority which she will not exercise. According to one assailant, she fails because she does not preach the true Gospel committed to her; according to another, she fails because, though she preaches the Gospel committed to her, that Gospel is untrue.

The authoress of the book under review maintains the last-named of these objections. Mrs. Ward nowhere appears to deny that the clergy honestly discharge the duty they have undertaken, but argues that it is impossible to discharge it with effect, because it is in itself falsehood. It is no error belonging to the present times of which she complains, no evil arising out of the ignorance, neglect, or sinfulness of previous generations. Christianity, as it has always been known to men, is, according to her view, *radically untrue*.

This will seem to most men a bold thing to say. A creed which has existed for more than eighteen hundred years, which has been accepted as true by the intellects of the wisest, and has satisfied the inward cravings of the holiest, men whom the world has produced, is hardly a thing, one would have thought, to be assailed by a lady in a three-volume novel. While considering it, we cannot altogether divest ourselves of the frame of mind, with which Lord Exmouth's

¹ It may be said that "Robert Elsmere" is an attack on Christianity, rather than on the Church. But as the whole teaching of the Church, which is identical with Christianity, is assailed, this distinction is here of no consequence.

sailors regarded the unhappy Turks in the harbour of Algiers in the memorable bombardment of 1816, when they put to sea in a few shore boats, cutting crabs at every stroke, to board the admiral's 120-gun ship!

The eager interest with which the book has been received has been appealed to as an evidence of the truth of its main assertion, viz., that the world generally—the intelligent world, at all events—is beginning to discard Christianity as a failure. We are told that vast numbers of persons have ceased, and are ceasing, to believe in Christ. It may be so; but the avidity with which anything that is very strange and very shocking is caught at is evidence of nothing but that the world is ever craving after novelty and excitement. And it may further be remarked that no assertion has been more frequently put forward, than that men were abandoning the Christian belief. This was affirmed by sceptics and worldlings of the times of Charles II., and the literature of that day accords too well with the statement. It was affirmed of the generations that lived during the reigns of George I. and George II.; and they who have studied Lord Hervey's Memoirs and other contemporary writings will hardly question the assertion. It was affirmed of the last years of the eighteenth century, and the Socinianism and infidelity with which that period was largely leavened lend some support to the charge. Let us call to mind again the empty churches and thin communions of the earlier part of the present century. Faithful men of all those eras were loud in their complaints of the neglect of Christian ordinances, and in their warnings of the consequences to the nation which must ensue. But men still profess belief in Christ, notwithstanding the dismal prophecies uttered in those unhappy times. Nay, the churches in this present day are, as a rule, thronged with worshippers, and the ordinances of the Church well attended.

Nor is it on this subject only that wholesale assertions of this kind are habitually put forward. Listen, for example, to what one class of writers assert, and you will be told that the social evil is making such terrible advances that it will destroy all purity in man or woman; listen to others, and you will hear that the demon of drink is fast sweeping away whatever remains of temperance and sobriety may have been left in the world; read what is written about trade and commerce, and you will learn that integrity and fair dealing are things of the past. The men who tell you these things are honest enough; but their excited feeling, which makes them over-keen of sight as regards the faults of their own generation, renders them blind to those of the past.

We think, then, that Mrs. Ward's novel, though a remark-

able sign of the times, is not likely to do serious injury, and the interest felt in it will not be long maintained. But no less is the Church bound to meet the challenge it contains; and the unquestionable ability of the writer to enlist the sympathies of her readers renders this the more imperative. It may be considered in two lights—first, as a simple work of fiction; and, secondly, as a designed and elaborated attack on Christianity.

As a work of fiction, it has great merits and great defects. The authoress has considerable powers of humour and pathos. Mrs. Thornburgh and the Vicar are amusing enough. Lady Charlotte is cleverly drawn. Rose Leyburn, with all her faults, is very lovable and bewitching. Catherine is a noble character, the beauty of which is enough in itself to assign a high place in fiction to the writer who conceived it. The entire history of the fever at Mile End—the gallant and determined struggle against disease and death, in spite of every possible discouragement and opposition—cannot fail to stir every reader's heart. On the other hand, the male characters of the story have little force, and less beauty. Robert himself, though persistently represented as a man of commanding ability—as, indeed, Mrs. Ward is bound to make him out to be—is singularly weak and shallow, and, as it appears to the reader, at all events, capricious. He adopts the opinions of a man whom he loves and reverences, but it is only to abandon them as soon as he is challenged by another to do so. The Squire is an impossible man, made to play his part to suit the exigencies of the writer, but at the sacrifice of all reasonable likelihood. He has neither heart nor imagination. He views everything through a halo of misanthropic scorn and distrust; and yet we are told that he was a follower, and, it is implied, an attached one, of John Henry Newman! It is hard to say whether he would have been more repelled by contact with Newman, or Newman by contact with him. He poses as an earnest and devoted seeker after truth, though the authoress does not conceal the fact that the only thing he does care for is destroying the faith of others. Mr. Langham is a still more unpleasant personage. He, too, is described as a man of powerful intellect and strong character. Yet nothing can be weaker or more contemptible than his conduct. Mr. Grey is better, and if there were more about him in the book, he might redeem the masculine characters from the low estimate which the reader must form of them. But Mrs. Ward kills him when the time comes at which he ought to take a prominent part—apparently for the same reason which is said to have induced Shakespeare to kill Mercutio: because, if he had not done so, Mercutio would have killed *him*. Another fault of the book is that the canvas is too much crowded with

figures, which distract the reader and withdraw him from the main interest of the story. Nor should the authoress's grievous, and, it may be added, wanton, display of the worst possible taste in the interview between Robert and Madame de Netteville be passed over without censure.

It is only fair to say that the main reason why the masculine actors are so uninteresting, or rather disappointing, is that they are made to do things in themselves inconsistent, and sometimes absurd, because these are necessary to carry out the writer's extraordinary programme. Thus the Squire, described as a man utterly indifferent to public opinion, and inflexible in carrying out any purpose on which he had resolved, is made to change his entire course of action, and eat his own words, in a matter which he had fully weighed beforehand, apparently because it is imperative that he should again acquire a strong influence over Robert. Robert himself, having fully counted the cost of what he was undertaking, having put his principles to a severe test which proved, as it is granted to few men to prove them, their truth and blessedness—such an experience as might have brought the coldest-hearted sceptic to believe in them—suddenly abandons them altogether, because the Squire has propounded a theory to him which startles and overthrows his faith. This theory, of which we shall have occasion to speak presently, might indeed startle anyone. But that it should overthrow their faith will surely be to most men a matter of wonder.

But it is as an attack on the Christian faith that the book most concerns us. The two main objections which Mrs. Ward raises to the truth of Christianity appear to be—first, that after eighteen centuries of its teaching, it has failed to convert the world—even the so-called Christian world—to genuine faith and holiness of life; and secondly, because it is based upon, and closely interwoven with, miracle; and miracle being, according to her view, radically false, that which is built upon it must be radically false also. Let us consider these two indictments separately.

Christianity, we are told, is to be regarded as “a failure,” because its object being to make mankind the faithful followers of Christ, it has not in eighteen hundred years succeeded in doing so. But did its Founder ever promise that it would? The generation to which He preached hated and rejected Him. Was *His* mission, then, a failure? Did He, again, lead His disciples to expect anything else themselves? What were the words He spoke to them? “If the world hate you, ye know that it hated Me before it hated you.”¹ “Think not

¹ St. John xv. 18.

that I came to send peace on earth ; I came not to send peace, but a sword."¹ "It *cannot be* but that offences will come."² "When the Son of man cometh, shall He find faith on the earth?"³ These sayings, and many others, were not intended to apply to that generation only to which the Apostles would preach, but to all after-time. Man does indeed make advance in intellectual knowledge as the world goes on. He profits by the labours of previous generations, and the goal reached in one age becomes the starting-point of the next. But it is wholly different as regards his moral and spiritual nature. The victories gained by faith over the world, the flesh, and the devil belong to the victor in that strife, but to the victor only. The fruits of the victory cannot be transferred to another. Every age, every individual born in that age, has the same battle to wage, the same enemies to encounter, the same helps and hindrances, as his predecessors in all previous generations. Temptation may take a different form, but the difficulty of the struggle is the same. The corruption of man's fallen nature is equally strong in the man born in the nineteenth century as it was in the first, and every man must overcome it by Divine grace for himself. Therefore in every age will there be the same warfare, the same loving mercies, the same fallings away, the same blasphemies. Still to the end, because iniquity shall abound, will the faith of many wax cold.

There is no clearer proof of the truth of our holy faith than these predictions of its Divine Author, uttered eighteen hundred years ago ; which assure us that He could indeed read the distant future as clearly as the present. But men will not see this. Impatient spirits are for ever calling out for the reign of truth and peace and perfect love, for ever predicting its appearance, and lapsing into discontent and rebellion, when their fancies prove abortive. They are like children watching eagerly for the blue sky and the bright sunshine on one of those misty, drizzly summer days, which we know so well, when, though the sun is eclipsed, a feeble glimmer of his light is occasionally seen above the clouds. In spite of the warnings of the weatherwise, the cry ever is, that he is coming out in all his fulness. But the gleam disappears ; the mists gather thicker ; the rain holds on ; the children have to give up their vigil. Not till the evening is the sky clear again. Nature has many parables. None truer than this.

The office of the Church is to help men in this protracted strife—to be the channel of grace and help to those engaged in it. If her ministrations are rejected, as by many they ever

¹ St. Matt. x. 34.

² St. Luke xvii. 1.

³ St. Luke xviii. 8.

will be, that is only an additional reason why she should exert herself the more vigorously. But she will never subdue all men to her. Mrs. Ward apparently calls her a failure, simply because she is the Church militant, not the Church triumphant. Does she forget that the tares are not to be rooted out until the Harvest Day?

But the other ground of attack, viz., that Christianity is based on miracle, and that there being no such thing as miracle, Christianity must be fundamentally false, is Mrs. Ward's great point. And here we must *in limine* remark that she seems after all to have but a very inadequate idea of how close the connection between revelation and miracle is. She represents Mr. Grey as being unable to take orders because he does not believe in miracles. But she appears to regard him, and he appears to regard himself, as a sound member of the Church, notwithstanding this unbelief. Yet Christianity is absolutely nothing without miracle. It is founded on the stupendous miracle of the Incarnation. It is built up by the miracles of the Atonement, the Resurrection, the Ascension, the Session at the right hand of God, the Descent of the Holy Ghost. Without these Christianity is a mere morality, no way differing from the other so-called religions of the world, except in its greater purity and higher tone. The Scriptures plainly tell us that our hope is only through these things. Through the Incarnation only can man be reconciled to God. “In Christ Jesus,” writes St. Paul to the Ephesians, “ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh.”¹ Through the Resurrection only is there entrance to Heaven. “If Christ be not risen,” he tells the Corinthians, “then is our preaching vain, and your faith also is vain.”² The completeness of man's forgiveness is ensured by His perpetual intercession. “He” (Christ) “is also able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by Him, seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them.”³ But it is needless to multiply quotations. The whole New Testament, from beginning to end, teaches this, and nothing else, as the condition of discipleship and the ground of acceptance. A man who does not believe in the Godhead of Christ may call himself a Christian, if he will; but so might a Buddhist, or a Parsee, or a Mahommedan, or anyone who simply believed that Jesus Christ was a good man. Mrs. Ward appears to be very indignant at being driven to the alternative of believing Jesus Christ to have been either God or an impostor. But *pace* Mrs. Ward's indignation, He *was* either the one or the other. Hear His own sayings. Again

¹ Eph. ii. 13.

² 1 Cor. xv. 14.

³ Hebr. vii. 25.

and again in the Gospel history does He use the words "I am" of Himself—the expression chosen by Almighty God Himself to denote His Divine nature¹—directly claiming, as the Jews well knew, to be God and nothing less.² What were His words to the beloved disciple? "I am the first and the last. I am He that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore, and have the keys of hell and of death." Or, as St. John again reports Him, "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty."³ If this is not a distinct claiming of the Godhead, it would be impossible to put such a claim into words. Mrs. Ward may be assured that the idea of eliminating miracle from the Gospel history is as impossible as it would be to remove the vital organs from the human frame, and yet leave a living man.

But to pass on. We have two things now to consider—the historic testimony on which the Gospel miracles rest, and their intrinsic reasonableness. As regards the first, Mrs. Ward has, of course, to encounter the fact that the first ages of Christianity did accept as true the Gospels which are full of miracle. Attempts have indeed been made to prove that the Gospels were not written in the first century, but the attempt has been more courageous than successful. If they were not, a mass of testimony would have to be discredited, heathen as well as Christian, which it is bewildering to think of. So widespread and general a conspiracy to force forged documents on the world, so widespread and general a consent to accept them as true, has no parallel in history. But Mrs. Ward, if we understand her, does not take this ground. She admits that the men of the first century did accept the miraculous histories of Jesus Christ, but argues that this acceptance was worthless, because that was an age in which men were not only willing, but anxious and eager, to believe any marvellous tales that might be foisted upon them. Theirs was, according to the Squire's theory, a generation so voracious of miracle, that they greedily swallowed anything that partook of that character. It is a pity that this idea did not occur to Archbishop Whately, when he was writing his famous "Historic Doubts respecting Napoleon Bonaparte." It would have supplied him with an admirable additional reason for doubting the existence of the great French Emperor. The French,

¹ Exod. iii. 14.

² See St. John viii. 58. The phrase frequently occurs throughout the Gospels. Note particularly St. John xviii. 5, when its utterance caused the whole body of His captors to fall to the ground. It is, unhappily, rendered almost everywhere "I am *He*" by the E.V.

³ Rev. i. 8-18.

he might have argued, were so eager for military renown that they readily believed in the existence of a mythical personage, who satisfied all their longings! But on this point Mr. Gladstone's review, in the *Nineteenth Century*, is so full and searching as to leave little for anyone else to say. To represent an age in which mankind had lost all religious belief, "which did not like to retain God in its knowledge," as one so thirsting after spiritual revelations as promptly to credit any idle tale which professed to bestow them, does indeed require a courage which may well surprise us. But, as we have said, Mr. Gladstone's exposure of the Squire's theory is too exhaustive to require to be supplemented.

Then as regards the intrinsic reasonableness of miracles. We have, of course, no idea of entering upon a subject of this magnitude, except so far as is necessary to answer Mrs. Ward's attack. She adopts the old argument of Hume. Miracles, he affirms, are violations of the laws of nature, and as the laws of nature are never violated, there can be no such things as miracles. But here there is a twofold assumption—first, that there are fixed and immutable laws of nature; and secondly, that even God could not alter these. This is what the heathen believed. Destiny, according to them, was stronger than God. He could not Himself escape it, much less could He reverse it.¹ But the Christian does not allow that the world is governed by immutable laws, but by an All-wise and All-powerful God, Who is for ever at work in His Providence, Whose watchful care overlooks no portion of the universe, marking the fall of the sparrow, and numbering the very hairs of the head. The order of the universe is indeed harmonious and regular, but only because its Maker and Ruler is Himself both law and harmony. And we know that He does consent to vary it in accordance with that great source of miracles, human prayer. It would not be enough for Mrs. Ward to deny the Bible miracles, she must deny those of human experience also, when men seek and obtain, through Christ's intercession, some special mercy that would not otherwise be accorded them. Along with the destruction of an Incarnate and a saving Christ, there must be the destruction of an interceding Christ also. And then, without union *with* Christ, without worship *of* Him, without reliance *on* Him, without intercession *through* Him, what sort of a Christian life does she suppose would be left to men?

Again, even were we to admit the fixity of laws ordained by God for the government of the world, how does she know that these were violated when miracles occurred? The word

¹ Æsch., *Prom. Vinct.* 527; Herod. i. 91.

"miracle" does not imply the breach of any law. It simply denotes a wonder, and points rather to something unusual than something abnormal. There are beyond doubt occult laws in nature, rarely employed, imperfectly understood, it may be not even guessed at, by man, yet still existing, and brought into operation when there is need for them. When our Lord saw Nathanael under the fig-tree, he being out of the range of human sight, that is accounted as a miracle, yet why should any law of nature have been violated thereby? There is the clearest evidence that men have seen persons and occurrences by some strange, but real, faculty, when these were far beyond the bounds of human vision, or, it may be, long before what they saw actually took place.¹ Are men to doubt the truth of these occurrences, however well they may have been attested, because they would be "violations of the laws of nature, and the laws of nature are never violated"? Is it not a more reasonable belief that they take place in conformity with some law of which we have no knowledge, but which, nevertheless, exists? Such things must, of course, be matters of speculation, and we have no wish to press the argument. But when men claim to lay down absolute and unerring rules of their own, it may be well to remind them how little ground they have for doing so.

We have little disposition to criticise Mrs. Ward's *New Brotherhood*, which, of course, is having a brilliant and successful career, enlisting numerous and ever-increasing masses of adherents. It is simply the latest of a long series of similar experiments which have attracted large multitudes, have enlisted, for a while, enthusiasm and devotion, and then have perished and been forgotten as though they had never been. Christianity without Christ, the watch without the works, the body without the life, the flower without the root, is no new idea in the present age. Mrs. Ward's own description of her cherished institution contains the indisputable evidence of its speedy decay and dissolution.

There is one remark we should like to make before concluding, and that is, that the writer, though always professing to conquer by argument, is careful to employ argument as little as possible. We are told that Robert was a man of considerable ability and learning, that he had deeply studied the questions at issue, that he was warmly devoted to his clerical work, and found the most profound satisfaction in it; and yet when told that all that he had fully and earnestly believed was a baseless illusion, he had nothing whatever to say in its behalf. A novel and extraordinary theory of the Squire,

¹ 1 Kings xxii. 17.

which seems to most minds one of the craziest fancies ever broached, is sufficient to slay his belief at a blow. Why, again, if the Squire's arguments were so unanswerable as against Christianity, were they of no avail against the far weaker creed of Theism, to which the Squire is equally opposed, but to which Robert still continues to cling? So it is in the scenes with Mr. Grey; so it is in the scenes with Mr. Langham. The book is a curious contrast in this respect to Newman's tale, "Loss and Gain," written to prove—not the untenableness of Christianity, but of the position of the Church of England. There the arguments on both sides are given at considerable length, and without any evasion of difficult points. No doubt the author makes his own champion win the victory. But he is at least fair to antagonists, and states their case as clearly and forcibly as he can. Of course we cannot expect Mrs. Ward to write with Cardinal Newman's power, but she might have imitated his fairness.¹ If she was capable of arguing Robert's cause clearly and vigorously, she ought to have done so. If she was not capable of doing so, she ought not to have written the book at all.

H. C. ADAMS.

ART. VI.—HOME RULERS AND THE PAPACY.

AMONG the most pardonable of the ambitions which we may suspect Leo XIII. of cherishing is that of restoring the Papacy to the position of arbiter in the world's quarrels. The reference of the Philippine Islands dispute to his decision had quite a mediæval flavour about it, and the recent Rescript on Irish affairs, though ostensibly published only for the direction of the clergy in a case of morals, and with a distinct repudiation of any political bias, is a decisive condemnation of the methods essential to the success of the agrarian revolt in that country. Indeed, so long as political acts have their moral side, the infallible guide in morals cannot disclaim the political consequences which must flow from his decrees, and the more active the Pope becomes within the proper sphere of his jurisdiction, the greater must be his practical interferences in matters outside of it. But it is one thing to aspire, and another thing to achieve. The compliment paid by Prince Bismarck in the Philippine reference was graceful enough as an act of courtesy, but it did not really bring him a

¹ Especially we have a right to complain, when she handles matters of well-known controversy, but has not troubled herself to examine what controversialists of acknowledged weight and credit have said on the subject, or at all events has not noticed it.

step nearer the revival of his old prerogative. The Rescript to the Papal clergy in Ireland, though most commendable in substance, irreproachable in tone, and wholly justified by the occasion, is quite as likely as not to shatter a loyalty which never had a firmer basis than alliance against a common enemy.

If, however, we put aside general considerations for a moment, and regard the position as it affects the English leader of the Home Rulers, we find that time has brought about a singular revenge upon Mr. Gladstone. In 1874, the Liberal Premier, defeated upon the Irish University Question by a reactionary combination of Roman Catholic priests, and having failed to rehabilitate himself by an appeal to the country, retired for awhile into private life, with the immediate purpose of compounding thunders against the Vatican. The result was an admirably expressed pamphlet, in which, though by no means for the first time, the monstrous results which logically flow from an allowance of the Vatican claims were duly set forth; and Mr. Gladstone seemed to discover, what had long been a commonplace among Protestants, that a man who surrendered to the Vatican his moral and spiritual independence must virtually surrender also his civil allegiance. The Pope has waited fourteen years for an effectual retort, and now he has his opportunity. The former champion of an endangered civil allegiance has become the advocate of revolution, and those who have made surrender to him of their political independence have to follow him into encouraging dishonesty and outrage, against which even the Vatican protests in the name of religion and morality. The revenge is certainly complete. Who would have foreseen—we will not say fourteen, but even three years ago that Mr. Gladstone would so soon come to see with complacency, or, at least, without rebuke, the employment of such methods as the Plan of Campaign, and the cruel, pitiless boycotting, with all their hideous sanctions; while on the other hand, the Sacred College, so often identified with blurred and distorted moral teaching *ad majorem Dei gloriam*, comes forward unsolicited, and boldly proclaiming the evils by their English names, so that Latinity could give no excuse for pretending an ignorance of what was meant, condemns them for what they are—sins against God's law and human charity?

Of more practical importance, however, than any merely controversial advantage is the question, What will be the probable effect of the Papal Rescript upon those to whom it was addressed? In considering this we must remember that Roman interference, even indirectly, to check Nationalist aspirations in Ireland is a novel experiment. It is true that

at the time of the Norman invasion the authority of the Church was on the side of the invader as against the mere Irish, and so remained until the Reformation. Since that time the cause of rebellion against English domination has always found a ready ally in the authority of what has come to be called "the old religion;" Papal legates have encouraged revolt, and gloated over massacres of the heretics, whilst English Parliaments have visited Roman Catholicism with penal laws, which probably were not far wrong in identifying it with downright treason. Except so far as this identification of Romanism with disloyalty was mistaken, Irishmen have not had the sincerity of their devotion to their religion tested by their readiness to endure much for its sake. For aught that has ever yet appeared to the contrary, their affection for it may have been only proportionate to their reliance on it to back them against the Saxon and heretical tyrant. Until the publication of the recent Rescript, we do not remember an instance in which the action of the Vatican has been such as even to hint a suspicion of the safety of this reliance. It is not only historical considerations that dispose us to doubt whether the loyalty of the Irish people to the Papacy is capable of standing any very serious strain. Granted that there was a time when priests and people were alike sincerely attached to their religion, and would have submitted to Papal discouragement of disaffection with as good a grace as they display when the Holy Father compliments his children of the Isle of Saints, yet it must be admitted that for a long time past the tendency has been quite the other way. In most countries the Roman priests are a caste apart from the people, and it is in conformity with the Papal ideal to keep them so. But in Ireland the priests are daily more and more men of the people—by birth, by education, by surroundings and modes of thought, one with the very classes of the people from whom the enemies of the Saxon and the landlord are drawn. They have found their sacerdotal powers and privileges to be handy and serviceable weapons in the cause of their peasant brethren; will they now turn those same weapons of spiritual terror and compulsion to the destruction of all that they have been helping to build? We doubt it. And as with the priests, so with the people. Some there are, of course, who cannot be excepted—there are always the seven thousand who have not bowed the knee to Baal—with whom religious considerations will be paramount. But for the bulk of the disaffected, just as the Irish of the last century learned from the American War of Independence to cherish the idea of becoming a nation, and gathered from the French Revolution lessons in rebellion, so now steady

intercourse with America, coupled with the example of the nations of Europe renouncing Papal allegiance, has prepared the Irish laity to look upon Papal authority as a highly commendable thing when used on their behalf, but as possessing no terror when used against them.

It must not be supposed from the foregoing that we anticipate anything like an open revolt against the Papal edict. That would answer no man's purpose. From the Bishops we can expect no more nor less than a show of submission, sincere enough in some cases, palpably insincere in others. The Spanish Cortes had always too much respect for the Royal authority to refuse obedience to the King's decrees, but passed over such as were obnoxious with the curious phrase that they should be "*obedecidas e non cumplidas*"—obeyed, but not complied with. In this spirit the higher clergy will treat the objectionable Rescript, while the more obscure will have no great difficulty in setting it aside altogether. As for the Pope, he has liberated his soul, and has put himself right with conscientious Christendom, and nothing short of a very glaring defiance of his authority is likely to provoke him to further meddling. But no such outbreak is to be apprehended. The significance of the decree, and its applicability to Irish circumstances, will be subjected to a process of whittling down. The speaker of to-morrow will go as far as the speaker of to-day, and one short step further. His successor will the next day take for granted that all previous criticisms are admitted, and will himself carry the minimising process one degree further. After a little while, people will cease to talk about it, or even to think about it at all, and then, although the Plan of Campaign may not be revived, boycotting will remain too powerful a weapon to be lightly dispensed with. So far, then, as the Papal Rescript is concerned, little or nothing will have been done. The loyal will have been confirmed in their loyalty; the disaffected will refuse to be diverted from their conspiracy.

But while the Rescript of itself could effect little or nothing directly, its publication was none the less timely and indirectly useful. In Ireland, the steady and, at the same time, vigorous application of the law was beginning to have its effect. The power of the League was diminishing, and scheming Irishmen were beginning to ask themselves whether, after all, it might not be as well to be on the side of the law. Could they finally get rid of the notion that the English Government had in its extremity appealed for Papal aid, and obtained it, thousands of these self-seeking waverers would lose not a moment in joining the party of law and order. Even as it is, the effect has not been wholly trivial, as the anger of the Home Rule leaders sufficiently indicates. In England the results are

less easily traceable, but we are inclined to think they were considerable. The danger in this country was from the wholesale demoralization of the Gladstonian Party, who were rapidly following their leader into a toleration of every kind of excess. Crimes and acts of dishonesty, which would two years ago have shocked the consciences of all but some half a dozen of utterly abandoned politicians, were coming to be excused and almost applauded; and it really seemed as if, where the greater glory of Mr. Gladstone was the object, hardly any act could be pronounced immoral. That even the proverbially lax Roman Curia should be roused to protest against a state of things approved by the most Puritan section of this virtuous country could not but startle many amongst us, and we believe that it did lead at least some to consider to what mischievous lengths the tide of political partisanship can carry even respectable and God-fearing folk.

For ourselves, the conclusions to be drawn from a consideration of the whole episode are plain enough. The Pope may or may not be wise in his generation, but so far as we are concerned: *Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis, tempus eget.* We cannot do otherwise than praise Leo XIII. for taking such steps as his office or his conscience, or both, may demand of him. But whether he is losing or winning his own battle, he is not fighting ours. Our work is to persist in our own course, showing, in the first place, that we will have the law obeyed, order maintained, and the rights of property respected. After that, we may safely appeal to the enlightened sense of advantage of a people keen to perceive on which side the best bargain is to be made. If we are firm, the League can give them nothing; whilst they may look for our help in the better drainage of their rivers, the management of their railway system, and the revival of their fisheries. We are the natural purchasers of their products, and the natural market for their wares.

These are the considerations which move the modern Irishman, for whom, in a great measure, the ages of faith have passed, as to a great extent have vanished the chivalry, the manhood, the sense of humour, which till lately were so characteristic of the race. It is useless to shut our eyes to the fact that we have to deal with a demoralized people, and can, for the present, appeal only to such qualities as are left capable of being moved. But whatever be her government, or however kindly her seasons, Ireland can never recover her place among the nations till her people have learned that it is better to tell hard truths than easy lies, more profitable to toil than to remove a neighbour's landmark, and more manly to put a shoulder to the wheel than to sit by the roadside and call upon Hercules.

GILBERT VENABLES.

Review.

Memorials of the Hon. Ion Keith-Falconer, M.A. By Rev. ROBERT SINKER, B.D., Librarian of Trinity College, Cambridge. Deighton, Bell and Co. 1888.

THESE memorials will well repay reading. Ion Keith-Falconer, athlete, scholar, and Christian, was a man of no ordinary character. His father, the late Lord Kintore, lived, the biographer tells us, "in the faith and fear of God, and in the furtherance of every good work—'mente manu voce et exemplo.'" Reared by such a father, and trained "by a God-fearing mother," we can well understand that he should early exhibit the practical fruits of piety.

At the age of nine Ion Keith-Falconer came under the charge of a tutor, who first gave him daily lessons and then became resident at Keith Hall, the family seat in Scotland. He bears similar testimony to his religious character, and adds that "he was a thoroughly conscientious and noble-minded boy." At eleven years of age he went to the well-known school of Rev. R. S. Tabor, at Cheam, and two years subsequently successfully competed for a scholarship at Harrow, which he entered in 1869. His house-master tells us that from his first entrance his boyish life "was noticeable for his marked individuality and determination." He was "always high-principled and religious," but nothing "of a prig or a Pharisee." Mr. G. W. Russell, formerly M.P. for Aylesbury, his school-fellow, and for two years in the same house with him, writes, "Ion's was not the simple goodness of an un instructed but well-meaning boy—though that in its way is beautiful—he was already an advanced and, if the word is permissible in such a context, an *accomplished* Christian."

In 1874 Ion Keith-Falconer, after reading for a while with Mr. Hensley at Hitchin, entered Trinity College, Cambridge—noted for his many-sidedness. For the first year he read for mathematical honours, but then determined to read for the Theological Tripos. This change of front, as every University man knows, is very often fatal even to men of good abilities; but he threw himself into the work *con amore*, won one of the Jeremie Septuagint prizes, and finally obtained a first-class and the prize for Hebrew. He then proceeded to read for the Tyrwhitt Hebrew Scholarship, for which he was successful, and eventually for the new-established Semitic Tripos. In this he took up Hebrew, Rabbinic, and Syriac, leaving out Arabic, with which he had only a slight acquaintance, and obtained a first-class.

In our sketch hitherto we have exhibited Ion Keith-Falconer as a Christian and a scholar. We may now consider him as an athlete. In his Harrow days he does not appear to have taken any special interest in school sports, but bicycling coming into vogue it had a great charm for him, and he very rapidly came to the front. His fame whilst at Harrow and at Hitchin preceded him to the University, and he was elected vice-president of the Cambridge University Bicycle Club before he commenced residence. In November of that year he won, the biographer tells us, "his first race at Cambridge, doing ten miles of road in thirty-four minutes." He was also successful in the races against Oxford, and won numerous other distinctions. His crowning feat was the race against John Keen, which we cannot do better than give in his own words: "Early in the year," he writes, "I consented to meet John Keen, the professional 'champion of the world, in a five-mile bicycle race, on our ground at Cambridge, on October 23. But I forgot all about my engagement till 'I was accidentally reminded of it nine days before it was to come off.

"I immediately began to make my preparations and to train hard. The first great thing to be done was to knock off smoking, which I did ; next, to rise early in the morning, and breathe the fresh air before breakfast, which I did ; next, to go to bed not later than ten, which I did ; next, to eat plenty of wholesome food, and not too much meat and pastry ; and finally, to take plenty of gentle exercise in the open air, which I did. What was the result ? I met Keen on Wednesday last, the 23rd October, and amidst the most deafening applause, or rather yells of delight, this David slew the great Goliath, or, to speak in plain language, I defeated Keen by about five yards. The time was by far the fastest on record. The last lap—that is, the last circuit, measuring 440 yards—we did in 39 seconds : that is more than 11 yards per second. The people here," he writes, "are enchanted about it ; so that it is gratifying for me to think that, notwithstanding my other work and other business, I can yet beat with positive comfort and ease the fastest rider in the world. I am bound to say," he adds, "that smoking is bad—bad for the wind and general condition." In 1879 he again beat Keen in a two-mile race by three inches.

We must now follow our biographer, and touch upon another phase of Mr. Keith-Falconer's life, his evangelistic work at Barnwell and Mile End. The special work in Cambridge seems to have had for its starting-point the proposed visit of D. L. Moody, in connection with which it was determined to hire the theatre at Barnwell. Mr. Moody's visit was postponed ; but a vigorous effort was made by means of evangelistic services to reach, as our biographer tells us, "that still large element of the population which never by any chance went to any place of worship." This was a work after Keith-Falconer's heart. He threw himself into it with his characteristic energy, and in a great measure through his efforts the theatre was eventually purchased, and became the centre of new life. At the formal opening of it he delivered a very telling address, thoroughly appropriate to the occasion, which will amply repay reading. The work at Mile End was in association with Mr. F. N. Charrington, whom he zealously supported by personal help and liberal pecuniary aid. His rule was to do nothing by halves, and, once convinced the work was a worthy one, he backed it up with self-denying effort.

But, though much interested in this movement, he felt conscious that his Cambridge training fitted him for some other sphere of work. He therefore applied himself to the study of Arabic, first at Cambridge, subsequently at Leipsic, and afterwards at Assiout, in Egypt. In 1884 he married Miss Gwendolen Bevan, daughter of Mr. R. C. L. Bevan, and in due time brought his wife to Cambridge, where he occupied himself mainly in preparing and bringing out a translation from the Syriac of the "Fables of Bidpai." Of this work, the biographer tells us, Professor Nöldeke, one of the foremost of living Oriental scholars, writes : "We will look forward with hope to meet the young Orientalist who has so early stepped forward as a master many a time yet, and not only in the region of Syriac."

About this time his attention was very much drawn to Aden and to missionary work in its vicinity ; and in the latter part of 1885 he proceeded there for the purpose of taking a general survey of the place. It had this advantage : that it was British territory, and that the influence of the Government extended far beyond its own limits. In Shaikh Othman, some ten miles from Aden, with a population of about 7,000, he seemed to find a station in all respects suitable. It was on the high-road to Arabia, and, besides the resident population, there was a steady passage of people to and from Aden. A good doctor, to be associated with him, and animated by a missionary spirit, would, he

thought, soon give the cause he had at heart a good start; and a school for the native children would prove very useful, leaving him free for more direct missionary labour amongst the adult population.

Everything seemed to promise fair; a piece of land was offered him if he was in a position to take it up, and nothing remained for him to do but to return homewards, with the view of completing the necessary arrangements. He reached England in 1886, met the Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, with which body he desired the mission to be associated, though the expenses were to be borne by himself, and made diligent inquiries for a suitable doctor, whom he eventually found. During the summer the Bishop of Ely (Lord Alwyne Compton) offered him the Lord Almoner's Professorship of Arabic, which he accepted, as the duties were not onerous. He delivered his first and only course in the November of the year, and then proceeded to take up his work at Shaikh Othman.

Into the details of his work there space does not permit us to enter. It was full of promise for the future; but Aden fever laid hold upon him, from the effects of which he finally succumbed on May 10, 1887, after six months' residence there. Ion Keith-Falconer thus breathed his last in his thirty-first year. He was a man, as our readers will have seen, of rare gifts, and admirably fitted for the last work which he had taken in hand. He has left his mark behind him, which will not be effaced; and his work, we are glad to find, will be carried on, being taken up as a sacred legacy by his family and other friends. All we hope of our readers is that they will endeavour to become acquainted with the "Memorials" for themselves. The story of the life is admirably told by Mr. Sinker, and we do not know when we have read any memoir which has so pleased us.

W. E. RICHARDSON.



THE MONTH.

THE Clergy Discipline Bill was read a third time without a division. The Archbishop of York severely criticised the Bill.

At the Synod of the Roman Catholic clergy of Limerick Bishop O'Dwyer denounced the National League.

We record with regret the death of the much esteemed Archdeacon of Lewes, Ven. John Hannah, D.C.L. Of the Archdeacon's latest contribution to the *CHURCHMAN* the *Guardian* says:

. . . . A singularly clear and cogent essay on "Christianity without Christ" is a forcible analysis of the real character of Comtism, and of the views propounded in some "prominent English publications." We commend the article to the notice of those who dream that the pure morality of the Gospel and its beneficent influences upon human life and society can be retained whilst its supernatural basis is abandoned or subverted.

After a reign of some ninety days the German Emperor Frederick III. has entered into rest. "History records no nobler or more pathetic spectacle than is presented by the brief reign just closed." He is succeeded by his son, Emperor William II.

Prebendary Billing, Rector of Spitalfields, is appointed Suffragan Bishop of Bedford.