

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

DECEMBER, 1904.

ART. I.—THE PRIMITIVE EXPECTATION OF THE
MESSIAH.

CRITICISM is the right observation and estimation of facts. Bishop Butler's rule of the advance in knowledge of God's revelation committed to writing is along the line of advance in knowledge of God's universe. "By particular persons attending to, comparing, and pursuing intimations scattered up and down the Scripture, which are overlooked and disregarded by the generality of the world; by thoughtful men's tracing on obscure hints, as it were, dropped by Nature accidentally, or which seem to come into our minds by chance," Bishop Butler anticipates that "truths as yet undiscovered" may yet be found in "a book which has been so long in the possession of mankind." Now, in physical matters, when any facts remain stubbornly outside an hypothesis framed to account for them, previous experience in the advance of knowledge induces the scientific inquirer to believe that labour directed to this point might lead to some important discovery. Over and over again it has done so. A moon of some planet, for instance, comes on its path a little later or a little earlier than mathematics would make it, and we are on the verge of the discovery of the exact time that light takes to travel. And the discovery is made. A planet itself diverges to a certain extent from what ought to be its mathematically ascertained path, and we are on the verge of the discovery of a new, unseen, very distant planet. And the discovery is made.

The present condition of Biblical science is discouraging to this attitude of mind. The tendency of its leaders is to trample rough-shod over every nice and particular bit of evidence which is in the way of any supposition, all too

fimsily grounded, to which they have given their adhesion. All sorts of hints and suggestions, archæological or historic, must bend before the prevailing hypothesis. And it does not matter whether they bend or break. The Old Testament is roughly handled. Nevertheless, a return to the temper of mind which Bishop Butler's wise and liberal words indicate to us is inevitable sooner or later. We could wish sooner.

The purpose of this essay is to point out that two sentences in the fourth chapter of Genesis have all along fitted uneasily into the explanations given to them. Each expositor has interpreted them according to a theory of his own; but all have left something that was discrepant and troublesome to the interpretation which has been given. And, further, I hope to show that the great light thrown chiefly by Assyriology on the thoughts and hopes of the earliest ages of mankind tends to strengthen an interpretation of these two verses which does away with the discrepancy and difficulty which attends the meaning commonly given to them. We will suppose that we are dealing with a very ancient writing and with a very ancient subject. Such an ancient document and such an ancient subject deserve the most careful, delicate, and attentive consideration. Even hints and suggestions are precious, and may lead to something important. I hope, therefore, that the reader will give a fair hearing to the subject and a lenient judgment to its proposer.

The first of the verses of the fourth chapter of Genesis to which I want to draw attention is the opening verse; the second is verse 26b. Lest silence should be attributed to ignorance, I should like to make clear that I am fully aware of the critical assignments of these two sentences to certain imaginary writers. Kautzsch assigns both to J, a Judæan writer, who drew upon Ephramite sources in the ninth century B.C.—shall we say two or three thousand years after the events to which he gave a historical form? Ball, in the polychrome edition of the sacred books of the Old Testament, assigns them both to J², the later strata of this account to about 650 B.C., while he gives 16b-25 to the earlier, about 850 B.C.; but Elohim, in verse 25, was put in by the redactor. Professor Kent, one of the latest exponents of the subject, assigns iv. 1 to the early Judæan prophetic source, but makes it apply to Enosh, Adam's grandson; and reads, "the man [Enosh?] knew Eve his wife; and she conceived and bore Cain, and said, I have got a male child with the help of Jehovah," for the reason that "the play on the name Cain, in 'I have got a man with Jehovah,' logically follows rather than precedes the beginning of Jehovah worship." The insertion of "Eve" is due to a supplemental and editorial

addition. I conceive that this fairly and exhaustively expresses the main views of the matter held by a certain school of critics much in favour. I have carefully traced out the complicated and prolonged maze of reasoning which produces this accredited result. I am aware of the formidable array of authority which is produced to back it. I am afraid that I have the opinion that this force of authority, divided on essentials in their own camp, has been brought about by abusively destroying the reputation of every man who even for a moment hesitates to accept the cogency of the reasoning. I know that the final result is to hand over the most priceless remains of the most ancient past to a region which has its nearest analogy in the historical novel, with its roots in antiquity—a novel which God Almighty has used for the education of the race, say some; which is only interesting as a branch of comparative mythology, say others.

Nevertheless, I cannot credit the incredible. There is every token of an amazing antiquity in these interesting, important, and pathetic recitals. If for any length of time they were committed to oral tradition, the memory of men, undistracted in any way by other interests than the simple retention of simple facts, must have been enormously stronger than at later periods. I believe the short, eminently characteristic speeches were spoken by those alleged to speak them; that the statements made relate to actual facts; and the genealogies are genealogies as actual as, and sometimes more actual than, those of the Heralds' Office. Why should I be more sceptical about this than about the sayings and names of the seven sages of Greece, and the names and tenets of her early philosophers, or the sayings and names of Confucius and Laotse and their followers?

But, again, the invention of writing is of tremendous antiquity. When in this chapter we find related in the most unadorned simplicity the invention of the elementary arts of civilization, it is difficult to think that some sort of writing lagged far behind. And the men who did not simply live in the careless enjoyment of the present, but had a reverence for the past and a great hope in the future, would be its probable inventors. Its first use would be to record the lessons of the past, the names of the forefathers, and the dawn of a hope which they were serious enough to treasure—all very simple matters. I can see no conceivable reason why these exceedingly precious things should wait thousands of years, till 850 B.C., before they were put down. The honour of the invention of these imaginary Biblical writers I know to be wholly due to scholars who plainly discard and wipe out all action or immediate revelation of Jehovah from the world.

And however improbable the result may be, the invention of some such imaginary writers is plainly a necessity to those who occupy such a platform. But when a whole school of reverent critics, who are desirous to retain all the known religious influences of the Old Testament on the changed basis of Biblical history, which is not strictly history at all, but has its nearest analogy in the historical novel, with its roots only in antiquity, one is tempted to exclaim of one and all, "Qu'allait-il faire dans cette galère?"

I believe, then, that Eve said the most characteristic words attributed to her in iv. 1, and that they were all the more certain to be remembered because they were mnemonically associated with the first man born into the world. This in itself was an event not likely to be forgotten in the small world which on all human analogy would have an interest in retaining it in their memory. I believe that iv. 26*b* records a fact of supreme interest to this small world. I believe that at this distance of time to attempt to assign with absolute and infallible precision the writer or writers who had a hand in compiling ancient documents into their present ancient form, and the unalliable and absolute dates at which this editing or re-editing took place, is a species of historical arrogance. But I believe that one thing is extremely probable, that the insertion of the name Jehovah, *not into speeches or direct statements*, but into the present narrative, must have taken place after the divinity and mediatorial office of Jehovah was fully established. If this supposition be a true one, it would follow that iv. 1 and iv. 26*b* are more ancient as they stand than the present form of the narration.

The way is now clear to ask the reader's attention to the meaning of these two short sentences of Holy Writ. To take the first. The usual and time-honoured translation is: "She conceived and bare Cain, and said, I have gotten a man *with the help of* Jehovah, or Yahweh." "I have gotten," we are taught, is not an etymology, but an assonance.

I cannot myself perceive why Eve should not have associated the meaning of Kanah with the meaning of her son's name. The present vowels, even, may be later than the primitive. A spear or lance, or smith or metal-worker, both before the time of Lamech impossible, are, however, given as the true meaning of the word Cain. Cain did not murder his brother with a spear. But that is a small matter. The thing which I submit is that this resemblance of sounds would be the strongest help to the memory in retaining exactly for ages, if need be, the very short speech attributed to Eve. This mnemonic association of names with events or prophecies is peculiarly agreeable to the Hebrew mind, to which was committed the oracles of God,

and very useful, to put it at the lowest, as a reminder of historic facts. But the thing is the translation. I submit, again, that, if no outside reasoning entered into, and if it were not supposed to be quite beyond possibility, the translation would be inevitable: "I have gotten a man, even him who is to be," the Hebrew mode of the double accusative. It is assumed that Jehovah *must* have its after-sense, as the name of the Most High, and then it is rightly reasoned that the words so translated are impossible to Eve. The word, which is translated "with the help of," and therefore a preposition, never has this sense in all its occurrences elsewhere.

The double accusative after transitive verbs is the rule. I will venture the attempt to prove this.

1. It is true that, following the example of the LXX., *διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ*, all translations apparently make it refer to the assistance or co-operation of Jehovah or God. The Syriac alone apparently takes it as a double accusative. This is ruled out by Tuch as "a dogmatic explanation, which finds here a reference to the supposed Messianic place (Gen. iii. 15)." But the explanatory, midrashic tendency of the LXX. is well known. The *διὰ* is a quite impossible translation of the Hebrew preposition. "Zwar kommt *ל* in diesem Sinn sonst nicht vor," says Dillmann. There is no other instance of the preposition being used in this sense. The preposition in all other passages in which it occurs has that of *proximity*—with, near, by the side of, in the possession of. The only parallel instance that can be found is once in another different but cognate preposition, *ב*, signifying combination or union—a distinct idea. The passage is 1 Sam. xiv. 45: "Shall Jonathan die, who hath wrought this great salvation in Israel? God forbid; as Jehovah liveth, there shall not one hair of his head fall to the ground, for he hath wrought *with* God this day." The LXX. misreads the passage. I conceive the parallel is not very strict. The sense that Jonathan had acted on the side of God, and not against Him, that day is not strictly equivalent. In Gen. ix. 1 the sense given to the supposed preposition is "exceptionally" given (Oxford Dictionary). And if there were no dogmatic, outside preconceptions in the matter, it would never have been so given at all. Notwithstanding the difficulty, the text has never changed. De Rossi gives no variant. The Samaritan text is the same without variant.

2. But with, as here, the sign Makkeph as not a preposition, the particle "eth," which has a certain tendency to definiteness, and the meaning "very," is the rule after transitive verbs as the Hebrew mode of the double accusative. A few instances will be enough. "And I took your father, even

Abraham" (Josh. xxiv. 3). "She saw him, even the boy" (Exod. ii. 6). "And Noah begat three sons, even Shem, even Ham, and even Japheth" (Gen. vi. 10). "Behold, Milcah, she also has borne children to Nahor, thy brother, even Uz his first-born, and even Buz his brother, and even Kemuel, the father of Aram" (Gen. xxii. 20, 21). There will be found few to dispute either of these two facts. And the natural and even necessary translation, if we do not force the meaning of a preposition, or refuse the ordinary usage of the Hebrew language, is, "I have gotten a man or male child, even Yahweh." I submit that this first occurrence of the word, as applied to a person, has not, and cannot have, its later connotation. It must mean, in Eve's lips, "I have gotten a man, the very one who is to be." Yahweh means "he will be."

Now, iv. 26*b* supports this rendering. The difficulty, always more or less felt, as to its meaning disappears if we agree to it. My argument is cumulative. The translation, which alone agrees with the expression "call upon the name of" (which is only used in a good sense), and with the context and whole tenor of the narration, is that given by the Revised Version, and supported by the great majority of moderns and apparently all ancient versions. The literal rendering is, "Then it was begun to call upon the name of Yahweh"—*i.e.*, then began men to call upon the name of Yahweh.

This at once creates a great difficulty, if Yahweh has its after connotation, in the minds of all who consider it a preliminary to the understanding of an ancient writing to think it means what it says. The worship of God, of Jehovah, is the subject of the first part of the chapter. Evil-doing drove Cain from the presence of Jehovah. Worship passed out of his life and the life of his children, and they settled down to make the best of *this* life. But the evident intention of the record is that it was treasured in the line of Seth, till that line, too, became spotted by the world. This difficulty was felt from early times till now.

Notwithstanding the difficulty, there is no variant in reading in any MS. known to De Rossi, and the Samaritan has no variant reading in its MSS.; but it *may* be read "then he began." The difficulty has been variously got rid of. Ball cuts the Gordian knot by altering the text. He strikes out "then" altogether, and reads instead "he" emphatic. He says the present text is "an attempt to soften the contradiction of P's statement (Exod. vi. 3)." Kent has a still freer mode, as above. He reads, "He was the first to call on the name of Jehovah," wiping out the testimony of the first

part of the chapter, and transposes iv. 1 to read after this of Enosh, giving Eve to the editor—a very curious editor, desirous of raising insuperable difficulties in a plain account. The Septuagint is explanatory, and ignores the word “then” altogether and mistranslates the verb. “This man set his hope in calling upon the Lord God”—continuing “the Lord God” of chaps. ii. and iii.—as one would think evidently with no underlying text. Compare “God” for Jehovah in the LXX. of iv. 1, where it is generally agreed there is no underlying text. The Vulgate translates, “he began.” Luther translates, “At that time they began to preach of the Lord’s name,” a meaning doubtless involved, but an inaccurate rendering of a well-accustomed phrase. Others translate, “Then began men to name themselves by Jehovah’s name,” a mode of rendering which forces the phrase still more, and is strictly impossible. The Hebrew doctors got rid of the difficulty by translating, “Then men profaned the calling upon the name of the Lord,” and see in it the beginning of idol worship. This, but by no means clearly, may have the support of Josephus, probably not of Philo. But this introduces an idea which is foreign to the context and inconsistent with the neighbouring usage of the verb, which means “to begin.” *Alii alia.*

Now, all these attempts to explain or elude the difficulty are, as I hope to be able to show, only valuable as pointing to a difficulty which has always been felt. The abler commentators tend to retain both the text and the meaning. The fact that the text has stood, the difficulty notwithstanding, seems to me a striking testimony to its integrity.

Let us see whether the context hangs together in an interpretation which does away with the difficulty altogether. Eve was promised a seed who, though suffering himself, should restore all things and finally destroy evil. The promise, though enigmatically expressed, is clear, and very generally recognised as the protevangelium. Her first child, very naturally, as no time was given, was triumphantly received, not only with the general joy of womanhood, but with the specific joy that “he who is to be” is born into the world. That has been generally recognised. Now, there is a world of pathetic, deeply-moving, unwritten history in the names given by these ancient parents to their children. Compare the names given by Moses in exile to his two men children. The early infancy of Cain, probably displaying more of the despondent brooding and rebellious pettishness of the Fall than the character of a redeemer, gave Eve a chill of disappointment. She gave the name of Abel to her second man-child—“a breath,” “vanity.” Cain turned out, not a redeemer, but a murderer, and a great

and lasting schism began in the family of man. But again hope renewed in the birth of another man-child. She called his name Seth, for, saith she, "God hath appointed me another *seed*" (Gen. iii. 15) "instead of Abel, for Cain slew him." Notice she speaks of God as Elohim. But Seth, it soon became evident, was not "He who should come," and though many unrecorded births were coming into the world, the emphasis of disappointment is recorded in the name Seth gave to Eve's grandson Enosh. They were now possessed by experience of the essential weakness and frailty of human nature. Redemption was not to be expected from mere human nature. Enosh is indeed only a man. It equals Adam as a proper name, but it adds the idea of weakness and failing (Dillmann). It points in itself to its antithesis, God. Then first began men more strictly to be familiarized with the difference between man and God (Ewald). And the relation goes on in strict conformity to the evolution of the ideas: "Then it was begun to call upon the name of Yahweh." They did not give up the Messianic hope, but they transfigured it. They held to the promise of God, but it became the subject of an inspired inference. "Then began men to worship and approach with prayer Him who is to be." They became confident that no mere man could accomplish the restoration of all things. They saw—near or from afar, they did not know—an incarnation. The seed of the woman must be Divine to be able to do this—the Son of God as well as the Son of man, to be able to bring any hope at all.

The idea of a Divine Redeemer had become part of the heritage of the *race*, in the hope of which the serious and godly of them, with more or less distinctness, lived and died. It was the priceless treasure of Noah and his sons when they founded a new world. The inevitable proleptic use of the name Yahweh in its after connotation in the narration has obscured what the difficulty in other explanations of two difficult passages of the record still reveals. This use may have occurred in documents far earlier than Moses. My argument is still cumulative. This tradition pours a clear light upon the rest of the Old Testament. Again, lest silence should be taken for ignorance, I may be allowed to say that I am aware of the learned researches into the origin of the tetragrammaton, which more or less set aside the Hebrew account of it, which is very plain and distinct. But I prefer to believe that the Hebrews knew best what its origin was.

Moses asks by what name he is to speak of God the Revealer to the children of Israel. He is answered: "I am about to be what I am about to be." Say to them, "I who am He who is to be hath sent Me unto you." Now, this name is given to Moses as a credential to the children of

Israel, as something which would stir them by touching their deepest faith and hope. If there was nothing in their treasured traditions—already, I am persuaded, written down—if there was nothing which these words touched or stirred in the deepest degree, the name of the messenger of the bush so given was no credential at all. That it was a credential, which served Moses in good stead, proves that it touched the Divine Messianic hope which was committed to them. They were feeling keenly human impotence. The name of the Divine Redeemer revived their hope. When, again, Yahweh (“He who is to be”), the one Mediator between God and man. Divine Himself, says to Moses again (Exod. vi. 2), “I am He who is to be; and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob as God Almighty: by My name He who is to be I was not known unto them,” I cannot understand that something perfectly new and strange was introduced. The object was to comfort Moses in his bitter disappointment by the announcement of the beginning of a promised redemption. The Fathers were subject to death and homelessness, under Almighty protection, with nothing but a promise “greeted from afar.” Now the promise grows nearer. The coming one is near, as His wonderful works declare (Ps. lxxv. 1). Now the slow process of eternal redemption was beginning; the hope of Eve in the slow evolution of God’s plan was to be forwarded a step onwards. The redemptive action promised was beginning. The name itself was—is not this the implication?—familiar and comfortable to Moses and his people.

That the name Yahweh was unknown is difficult to understand without the most unreasonable scepticism with regard to the truth of the Hebrew record—a scepticism we should not have with regard to Homer or Herodotus. Yahweh is part of the composition of the name of Moses’ mother, Jochabed. “Yah, or Yahweh, is glory.” It was common in the speech of Laban and Bethuel. The idea of the Divinity of the coming one was kept before the minds of the Fathers by the repeated manifestation of Jehovah, or Yahweh, in the likeness of a man—*proludia incarnationis*. “Abraham exulted that he should see My day, and he saw it, and was glad. Before Abraham was, I am.” The expectation of a Divine Redeemer, “He who is, who was, and who is to be,” as St. John is inspired to translate the name, was bound up in the tradition of the men that walked with God. It was once part of the common heritage of the race. When non-Israelite Job therefore says—or, if you will, is made to say by the poet—“I know that my Redeemer liveth, and in the latter day shall stand upon the earth,” he simply alluded to something well known. That this is so is very strongly borne out by

the context and right exegesis of the whole passage. I venture to translate this difficult place (Job xix. 25) as follows: "I, too (I is emphatic, I, as well as you orthodox people), know that my Redeemer liveth, and late in time He shall stand upon the earth. And after my skin (which has so suffered), though they strike off this (poor body altogether, this, which you see), even freed from my flesh, I shall see God, whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another, (with my individuality unchanged) even though my reins are consumed in my breast."

Whether living on the earth or numbered among the dead, he should see his Divine Redeemer incarnated. Job protests his orthodoxy in the ancient creed of the fathers, which suffering has not destroyed in him, but rather raised to its highest pitch of elevation. He goes on: "For ye should say, for what reason are we persecuting, when also the root of the word is found in him?" Rosenmüller, a quite unprejudiced witness, says: "Quibus (of his detractors) objurgationibus jam solennem fidei suæ professionem opponit." Job sets against the insinuation that he does not really know God a solemn profession of his orthodox faith. It is the first *credo* extant.

When Micah says He shall be born in Bethlehem "whose goings forth are from old times" (alluding to the *præ-ludia incarnationis* of the ancient times of his race), "from the days of eternity" (alluding to the Divine hope of it); and when Isaiah gives to Him the new name "God joined with us," and says, "Unto us a child is born" (κ. τ. λ.), they introduce no sudden new hope, but are only faithful to the ancient one, and expand it. Yahweh—the coming one—was the Son of God, of whom kings and deliverers were faint and transitory representations. All Nature rejoiced at His coming to establish truth and righteousness in the round world and for all the peoples. Yahweh was coming as a shepherd to care for each individual of His flock with a Divine care. And the partial deliverance that He wrought at the Exodus should be forgotten in the greater work which was before Him.

The view here advocated of the meaning of Genesis iv. 1 and 26b is not exactly new. It has been held and receded from. But I am confident that it receives so strong a reinforcement from the restored remains, chiefly cuneiform, of the most ancient times, as to go far to establish it as a settled piece of exegesis. The cumulative proof of my position, derived from this source, I hope to give in the next issue of the CHURCHMAN.

F. ERNEST SPENCER.

(To be continued.)

ART. II.—STUDIES ON ISAIAH.

5. *THE Curse of Discord* (chap. viii. 9-15).—Faction (see last paper) naturally leads to discord and confusion. The people of the land (ix. 19-21), under dishonest leadership, are led to rob and oppress their brethren. And therefore, whether the dissensions are local or social, disaster is the result. Where there is no solidarity, no mutual trust, there can be no success. "Make an uproar [R.V.], O ye peoples, and ye shall be broken in pieces." In other words, "Allow angry passions to arise among you, and secession and separation are the natural result." Civil discord prevents a nation from playing the part in the world's history for which God intended it. It is therefore a serious danger. No "counsel" (ver. 10) is of the slightest use if it is dictated by this spirit. Parliaments, intended to be the voice of a people, are paralysed if they permit themselves to be the instrument of party animosities. Each man who is actuated by the spirit of party accuses his brother of being a "conspirator" (ver. 12) against the national welfare. No man is credited with patriotism or public spirit by his antagonists. The unworthiest motives are attributed to him, however clear it may be to impartial persons that he is only seeking the public good; and the public is often only too ready to believe his evil report. Aristides is ostracized, though he has won the name of "the Just." Temple retires into private life because he will not pander to the factions of his day. Pitt is driven by overwrought nerves into the retirement of a sick chamber because he will neither flatter King nor people, but persists in standing up for the rights of free men against the passions of aristocrats and the interests of traders.

Beware, then, of belittling unfairly our public men. The task of government of so vast an Empire is difficult enough. Let us not make it impossible. A people in whom the fear of God dwells will take public matters seriously and conscientiously, and not treat its statesmen as our great poet represents a wilful and satirical woman as treating the opposite sex :

"I never saw a man,
How wise, how noble, young, how rarely featured,
But she would spell him backward : if fair-faced
She'd swear the gentleman should be her sister :
If black, why Nature, drawing of an antic,
Made a foul blot : if tall, a lance ill-headed ;
If low, an agate very vilely cut ;
If speaking, why, a vane blown with all winds ;
If silent, why, a block moved with none.
So turns she every man the wrong side out,

And never gives to truth and virtue that
Which simpleness and merit purchaseth."

"Much Ado About Nothing," Act III., Scene 1.

In this spirit of wanton and childish detraction a country is too often wont to deal with its greatest men. The prophet warns his countrymen, and through them ourselves, not to deal with public matters in such a spirit.

Do not, he says, "fear the fear" (ver. 12) of those who conjure up spectres of ruin whenever a nation attempts to do its duty to those who form part of it. "Sanctify Him"¹—that is, recognise His eternal and unchangeable holiness. "Let the Lord of Hosts, and Him only, be your fear, and let Him be your dread." In other words, do what is right, let the consequences be what they may. Remit the tea tax rather than violate the law which has been held sacred by the Anglo-Saxon race for many centuries. Emancipate the slaves sooner than allow the curse of injustice and cruelty to lie heavy upon the British Empire or the American Republic. But if you choose to do otherwise, then He who would fain be thy defence will become thine enemy (*cf.* chap. liii. 10). He desired to be thy "sanctuary," but ye would none of Him. Therefore, (ver. 14) He hath become a "stone of stumbling and a rock of offence," a gin and a snare to those who do not first seek His will, and then do their best to perform it.

6. *The "more Excellent Way"* (vers. 16-18).—As a specimen of the unfair interpretation of the Scriptures to which modern criticism delivers us, we may take the interpretation of the "Cambridge Bible for Schools" here. "Both words"—*i.e.*, "testimony" and "law"—are, we are told, "here used of the contents of the revelations communicated to the prophet during these months of danger and anxiety." In other words, it is first assumed that the Law as we now have it was not given till long after Isaiah's death, and then a non-natural sense is given to words with the true sense of which Israel had long been familiar. The prophet is here obviously appealing to the principles of Israel's religion, as opposed to popular opinion, just as he does once more (in ver. 20) in opposition to the resort to sorcery. The appeal is forcible if we put this interpretation upon it; it is feeble and unconvincing if the prophet has only his own opinion to put against that of other men. For, as we have seen in the introductory remarks, the inspiration of the prophet is regarded by the modern critic as nothing beyond that to which any good and intelligent man could attain. We have had many curious

¹ Literally, "make Him holy"—*i.e.*, regard Him as such.

interpretations of the word *torah* (law) of late, but it is somewhat new to find that it here means no more than a more or less authoritative revelation of things to come. Besides, the "law" and the "testimony" stand in close connection in the Pentateuch as we have it. Is it not more natural to see here an allusion to the ancient institutions of Israel than to the exhortations, however earnest and impassioned, of a seer who enjoyed no special privileges of Divine guidance but such as were shared by other men as earnest as himself? We are told, on the authority of a scholar, the belief in whose trustworthiness and accuracy have, however, been a good deal shaken of late, that the *torah*, or law, meant originally nothing more than the oral instructions of the priest. This is, however, a simple assertion on his part, and is due partly to the notion, which recent discovery has exploded, that the Israelites had no written literature till a comparatively late date, and partly to the fact that the assumption is necessary to the establishment of his theory. That the word *torah* (law) is used in the Bible in the sense of *written* instruction is plain enough to anyone who studies the Scriptures. It is only needful here to refer to the expression "*book of the law*," so frequently found in Holy Writ. And it is a wholly unscientific method of criticism, however frequently it may be resorted to at present, to declare that every passage in which the word *torah* is used in the sense of *statute law* must necessarily be of later date. As to testimony (*t'udah*), if it be not the word applied in the Pentateuch to the Ark, it is closely kindred with it. The word is only found in this chapter and in Ruth iv. 7, where it certainly has not the signification of prophetic intimation, but of definite attestation of a fact. Therefore it is safe to conclude that Isaiah here is not appealing to his own utterances in the past as a confirmation of his words in the present, but, as a Christian is wont when addressing his brethren on solemn occasions to appeal to the teaching of his Master, so the prophet here is solemnly adjuring those to whom he is speaking to return to the "statutes and judgments" given to them from Sinai, which they had so shamefully and rebelliously set at nought.¹ "Bind up"—*i.e.*, gather together—the precepts of the Divine law. "Seal the testimony"—*i.e.*, add your own solemn acceptance to the standing evidence of its truth. "Among my disciples"—*i.e.*, among those who have hearkened to the prophet's message.² "Wait, as I do, for the Lord, whose face your disobedience to His behests has caused to be hidden

¹ See Bishop Perowne, "Sermons," p. 371.

² I have followed Bishop Perowne in the interpretation of this passage.

from you." The children born of the prophet (chap. vii. 14-17; viii. 1-4) were given as a witness of the speedy fulfillment of his words. They are "for signs and for wonders in Israel from the Lord of Hosts, who dwelleth in Mount Zion."

7. *Recourse to Sorcery.*—Why, if the modern critical view be correct, should Israel *not* have recourse to sorcery? In Isaiah's time, as we are given to understand by the critics, none of the more stringent prohibitions of sorcery which the Pentateuch now contains were in force, perhaps not even in existence. Magical incantations of the kind described were common in every nation and under every religion. Why should the pious Jew refuse to resort to them? The answer is that in no religion are they so strictly forbidden as in that of the Jews. "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live" (Exod. xxii. 18) is, it is true, a statute found in the portion of the Pentateuch assigned by the more moderate of the modern school of critics to Moses. But on this point "scholars" are not "agreed." And at least it must be admitted that this prohibition does not cover the whole ground. To justify Isaiah's remonstrances we require the far stronger and more specific prohibitions which are only to be found in Lev. xix. 26, 31; xx. 27; Deut. x. 10, 11, all of them declared by the critics to be later than Isaiah. Moreover, the existence of sorcery, common as we have just declared it to have been in every race and country, appears to have been altogether absent from the history of Israel, with one exception, during the whole of the period throughout which modern criticism has supposed it to have been occupied in emancipating itself from the influence of "fetichism," "animism," and polytheism. The one exception proves the rule. It is that of Saul, who himself acted rigidly on the statutes contained in a law which was not, we are told, in existence till some six centuries after his time (see 1 Sam. xxviii. 3, 9), and who is only recorded to have resorted to the acts the practice of which he had so strictly forbidden when he has been told by the prophet of Jahveh that he must no longer rely on His protection, and when his requests for counsel were no longer heeded (1 Sam. xxviii. 5). Here, once more, as on countless other occasions, we meet with the fact that the critical reconstruction of Israelite history, shadowy and incomplete as it is, involves us in more difficulties than does the history as it stands.

True to his calling as a prophet of the divinely given law, Isaiah rebukes these practices. He recalls the Israelites once more (ver. 20) to the law and to the historical evidence on which it rests. In the midst of things living—the Eternally Self-Existent and His living statutes—will His people turn unto the dead? to these gods who have no existence? There

is "no dawn" of hope (ver. 20) for those who thus forget themselves. The wizards that "peep" (R.V., *chirp*) and "mutter" are of the tribe of ventriloquial impostors so well known in ante-Christian times. Such were the priests who concealed themselves in the statue of Memnon in Egypt. Such were the priests who hid themselves in the famous Ear of Dionysius, which still exists at Syracuse, and whose voices were conveyed from its recesses to the worshipper at its mouth. We read that in the period of religious unbelief and anarchy which synchronized with the origin and infancy of the Christian Church men once more began to resort largely to these (as they believed) *audible* evidences of Deity. Lucian, in the second century B.C., ridicules and exposes some of these impostors. But Isaiah's condemnation is grander and nobler by far. Those who turn aside from the Divine law to such miserable substitutes shall pass their lives (vers. 21, 22) in distress and misery. For they are guilty of want of faith in the Most High. Therefore their self-chosen helpers shall fail them in their need. The nation which goes aside unto superstition shall lose its place among the nations. There is no moral strength among those who seek what is beneath rather than that which is above. They may be dissatisfied and angry with themselves, but that will do them no good. Like the Italian peasant or the African fetish worshipper, who curses God and Jesus Christ, beats the statue of his patron saint, heaps all possible indignities on the fetish which fails him in his need, these Israelites will curse their king, who has encouraged their superstition, and their God, who has left them to themselves, but that will not help them. The "weariness" (or perhaps "anxiety") of perpetual distress and calamity shall encompass them on every side. If they look up to heaven, the God whom they have flung aside has no comfort for them. If to earth, the gloom of anguish does but increase and multiply around.¹

¹ It is not easy to translate this passage. Nearly every commentator takes a different view of it. It is full of grammatical puzzles, which neither the Hebrew scholar nor the textual critic has as yet been able to solve. Sometimes, as in ver. 20, the LXX. has a different reading (*gifts* for *dawn*, by the change of *Resh* into *Daleth*). More frequently it gives up a difficult sentence in despair. We sorely need a more careful study of supposed Hebrew synonyms and of their true idiomatic meaning. One striking explanation of the last word in chap. viii. 22 has been suggested. It is separated from the rest of the verse, and treated as an introduction to chap. ix. "Behold, distress and darkness, the gloom of anguish and dimness. IT IS DISPELLED. For there shall be no more gloom to her who was in anguish," etc. But striking as this is, it is certainly an unusual construction in Hebrew, if it is ever to be found at all. So it will be safer, if less spirited, to render: "Behold, distress and darkness, the

Is there no need for such exhortations now? Twenty centuries of Christianity have not expelled the superstitious spirit from the Christian Church. In our own land it stood its ground firmly—at least, among the less enlightened, for many centuries. Students of history remember how in the reign of Henry VI. the wife of Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, Protector of king and realm, was compelled to do penance for sorcery and sedition combined.¹ The murderers of Sir T. Overbury, we are told, resorted to sorcery to attain their object.² The hideous details connected with the burning of witches show how such superstitious ideas lingered on in England and Scotland long after the Reformation. Has this superstition left us even now? Do not even those who refuse to betake themselves “to the law and to the testimony,” in whose souls there is not even the glimmer of true spiritual life, fly for refuge to the deceits of “spiritualism,” the follies of palmistry, and the vain imaginations of the “Christian scientist”? *Naturam expellas furca, tamen usque recurrit.* Loquacious expositors of science—not its truest and most thoughtful students—have claimed to have destroyed revelation and reduced everything to a materialistic level. But, do all we can, we cannot eliminate the supernatural and spiritual. Abolish Jesus Christ; explain away all the prophecies of Him; convert His Incarnation into a commonplace incident and His Resurrection into a myth or symbol, and immediately a cloud of fanaticism and superstition arises, to take the place of the living God Whom He revealed and Whom men have chosen to disbelieve. If driven from such delusions by repeated discoveries of the knavery lying beneath them, then people fly to pilgrimages to Lourdes, or invoke the aid of “blessed medals,” and of “scapulars,” or avail themselves of the thriving business which the representatives of St. Joseph and St. Anthony of Padua are driving with those who vainly hope to get on the “blind side” of the Most High! Happily, the “sign of the Son of man” is too plainly written in the heavens for such delusions to be widely spread as yet in this land. But did those evil days which Isaiah has so strikingly depicted ever return to us again, they would assuredly be days of “tribulation and anguish;

gloom of anguish and dimness driven along [*i.e.*, extending itself in all directions]. But [the word may be either translated *for* or *but*] there shall not be gloom [any longer] to her who was in anguish.”

¹ See “Henry VI.,” Act I., Scene 4, Act II., Scene 3, for a dramatic representation of this. It is probably not Shakespeare’s.

² There is a vivid portraiture of the “wise woman,” Dame Ursley Suddlehop, in Walter Scott’s “Fortunes of Nigel.” David Ramsay, the father of Margaret, is an historical personage of the reign of James I., and was not himself free from the reproach of dealings with the black art.

of gloom and blackness spreading ever more and more widely around.

II. THE PROMISE OF THE DELIVERER.—This promise is, as we have just seen, so closely interwoven with chap. viii. 9-22 that it cannot but have been part of the same prophecy. The word “gloom,” ver. 22 (A.V., *dimness*) is repeated in chap. ix. 1. It runs thus: “Behold distress and darkness, the gloom of anguish and dimness driven onward. Yet the gloom shall not be as was her anguish in days gone by.” We have already seen that there is a continual swing of the pendulum throughout the writings of the prophets generally, and especially in Isaiah, from the beginning to the end of the prophecy which bears his name, between denunciation and promise, between the vision of punishment to come and that of ultimate hope and joy. This prophecy must be taken with that in chap. vii. 10-16; viii. 1-8. It is repeated in another shape in chap. xi. This, and not dependence on human contrivances or superstitious fancies, is the true remedy in hours of disaster and gloom such as the prophet has so vividly depicted. Have faith in God. Raise your eyes to the heavens, and see the sign of the coming Deliverer. Let nothing induce you to faint or waver, or be untrue to your calling as the child of God. For “he that endureth to the end, the same shall be saved.” So the prophet now points to a time when present anxiety and distress shall have passed away. “The gloom shall not be as was the anguish at a former period. Then God made vile the land of Zebulon and the land of Naphthali. Hereafter he shall make it glorious.¹ Beyond Jordan,² in the direction of the sea, Galilee of the nations³—the people who were walking in darkness have seen a great light.” The reference to the “making vile” the land of Zebulon and Naphthali is explained by the Assyrian invasion of Naphthali by Tiglath-Pileser, recorded in 2 Kings xv. 29. The “light” which, as Isaiah predicted, was to shine, is nothing else than the teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ. By that light God will “multiply the nation, and

¹ The Hebrew word usually translated *glory* means literally *weight*. Our translators misunderstood it here, supposing it to mean that Jahveh should add heavy burdens to those formerly borne by the tribes here mentioned. The LXX. here is most confused. The translator seems to have had a different text before him, and not to have comprehended even that.

² All kinds of conclusions as to the authorship of the Pentateuch have been drawn from the words “beyond Jordan.” But, as may be seen from this passage, as well as others, they apply to either side of the Jordan, quite independently of the side of the Jordan on which they were written.

I.e., in contact with the Gentile peoples beyond.

make its joy great."¹ The overthrow of the oppressor shall be as signal as when Gideon smote Oreb and Zeeb, and drove Zebah and Zalmunna in headlong flight before him—a day well remembered in Israel (see Ps. lxxxiii. 11; and *cf.* chap. x. 6). But it will be a spiritual, not a material triumph. "For the booted warrior is ever found tramping in the midst of the tumult, and his garment is rolled in blood. But the deliverance of which the prophet speaks shall be through a burning of devouring fire."² For a child has been born to us, a Son has been given to us. Upon His shoulder shall the princely burden rest, and His name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor,³ Mighty God, Eternal Father, Prince of Peace." It must be obvious to all reasonable thinkers that this grand prophecy has been fulfilled to the letter. And Jesus Christ, and He only, answers to its terms. Even the Jew of Isaiah's day could hardly have looked on Maher-shalal-hash-baz, who was no doubt, though obviously only in a most restricted sense, a type of the Redeemer, as rising in any way to the majestic level of its requirements. But in Him, and in none else, all is literally fulfilled. The wondrous wisdom of Jesus Christ has guided the ages ever since He appeared among us. He is in truth Immanuel, "God manifest in the flesh," and "mighty" in deed and word has He been, and is He still, upon the earth. The term "Eternal Father" has involved some difficulty to those who have but a feeble grasp on the doctrine of the Incarnation and its effects. The prophecy speaks, let us bear in mind, of Jesus Christ "*come in flesh.*" It has nothing to do with the relations of the Persons in the most holy Trinity. But as St. Paul speaks of Jesus Christ as the "second Adam"—the source, that is, of a new and recreated humanity⁴—so does Isaiah prophecy of Him as the author of a regenerated order of things on the earth; not only the Founder and Preacher, but the Inspirer and Sustainer of the

¹ The "not" (of A.V.) is a mistake for "to it," which has the same pronunciation, though not the same spelling.

² The literal translation is: "For every boot is tramping in tumult, and the garment is rolled in blood. And (the garment) hath been (*i.e.*, it is decreed to be) for the burning of devouring fire." The "but this" of the Authorized Version has been condemned. But it is probably a happy guess. The verse is all through a *constructio prægans*, and demands at least *some* interpreting words.

³ As all the other epithets are in couples, it has been thought that the two first should be translated "Wonderful Counsellor." There is no reason save one against this rendering. But with Handel's magnificent chorus ringing in one's ears, it is, and will continue to be, impossible for many of us.

⁴ *Καὶνὴ κτίσις.*

new and final dispensation of truth and life, the "devouring fire" which shall burn up all that is worthless and despicable. And as the prophets were ever dreaming of a time when they should not "hurt and destroy" in God's "holy mountain"; when "Ephraim" should not "envy Judah," nor should Judah "vex Ephraim," so when He came, whose birth was heralded by the angels' song, "Peace on earth, goodwill among men," the era of perpetual peace was inaugurated. It is daily nearer at hand; and the more His kingdom spreads, the more certain the advent of that era becomes.

J. J. LIAS.

NOTE.

I cannot refrain from commenting on the utter inadequacy of the modern critic when face to face with so clear and unmistakable a prediction of great, eternal, and spiritual truths such as confronts us at the opening of chap. ix. Dr. G. A. Smith utterly refuses to see in the names in chap. ix. 5 any reference to the divinity of Christ or to the plan of salvation as unfolded by Him in the Fourth Gospel and the Epistles. Though "we firmly hold that Jesus Christ was God," we are somehow bound not to allow to our belief the support of prophecy. In Professor Driver's "Isaiah and his Times" this magnificent prophecy is passed over as "a few brief but pregnant sentences." The "Cambridge Bible," intended, as its title informs us, for young people in "schools and colleges," is less definite, but is, nevertheless, studiously vague where it ought to have been warmly inspiring. The "birth of the Messiah," it admits, is here foreshadowed. But instead of rising to the "height" of Isaiah's "great argument"; instead of seeing here a detailed prediction, under the guidance of the Divine Spirit, of the person and work of Jesus Christ, it leads the young student aside to "the high-sounding titles" of "Egyptian and Babylonian monarchs" disinterred by "Guthe and others"! The "Mighty God" of Isaiah is dwarfed into a "God-like hero, or Hero-God." The "Everlasting Father" shrinks up in its pages into one who "continually acts as a father to his people." In other words, the prophecy was never fulfilled at all, for there was no one in the after-history of Judah to whom it could possibly apply; and all the grand traditions of prophecy handed down in the Jewish and Christian Churches, embodied as they are in the services of the Church of England, are contemptuously flung aside, the great predictions of the Evangelical prophet are evacuated of all their force, and nothing is left us but the lamest and most impotent conclusions. What is to become of the pulpit teaching and the general belief in the Church of England, if nothing is left to us but this miserable remnant of what the whole Church of Christ once possessed and enjoyed?



ART. III.—THE PARABLE OF THE TEN VIRGINS.

AN ADVENT STUDY.

THERE is a very remarkable difference between the New Testament description of our Lord's return and modern sermons upon the Second Coming and the Resurrection Day. In the first place, the New Testament writers never speak of "the Second Coming." The only phrase like this is found in Heb. ix. 28 (Revised Version): "Christ also, having been once offered to bear the sins of many, shall appear a second time, apart from sin, to them that wait for Him, unto salvation"; from which it appears that this Second Advent is only "to them that wait for Him." Nor does the phrase "the general resurrection" occur in Scripture. We are familiar with it from its occurrence in the Burial Service, "that at the general resurrection in the last day we may be found acceptable in Thy sight."

But it is not merely in phraseology that we have departed from Scripture in our Advent preaching, but, what is of far greater importance, in the spirit and motive. The New Testament idea is that for Christians the Lord's return is a joyful rather than a solemn event. Many devout Christians regard the Lord's return as they regard death—a solemn event connected with the Judgment Day; they no more welcome the thought of His coming than they welcome the thought of death; they try to think as seldom about the one as the other. Contrast with this the tone in which St. Paul and St. Peter speak of the attitude of the believer towards the coming of the Lord Jesus: "looking for a blessed hope;" "a glorious appearing;" "the revealing of the sons of God;" "hastening the coming." The explanation of this difference is to be found in the gradual merging of the different comings of our Lord into one great day. Historical events in the future, separated by intervals of months or years, look to us like a cumulation of events in one day. The popular idea of the Second Advent is probably something like this: That on some future day the world will be startled by the sudden blast of a trumpet, all the graves will open, the dead will come forth, Christ will appear with the angels, a judgment-seat will be set up, books will be opened, every person will be summoned separately to stand before Christ whilst his sins are read out of the book, the Judge will pass sentence either of acquittal or of condemnation, the great crowd of humanity will be separated for ever, some going to hell, the others to heaven, and then the deserted earth will be destroyed by fire,

all taking place in about twenty-four hours, "the last day." There is nothing in this popular notion that is unscriptural, yet it is contrary to Scripture. It brings into one day the events spread over a long period. The coming of Christ for His people is as clearly separate from His coming to judge the world as His coming "in great humility" is separate from His coming "in His glorious majesty."

The New Testament speaks of His coming in different characters at different times for different purposes. First He comes a Saviour—as man to live and die for men—the Lamb of God. We know that He came thus many centuries ago, and fulfilled many of the types and prophecies of the Old Testament, but not all. These spoke of His sufferings and the glory that should follow. The prophecies of suffering have been fulfilled; those of glory are still awaiting their fulfilment. Both sets of prophecies refer to events in this world's history. As the suffering was on earth, so must the glory be.

His Second Coming will be to fetch His chosen ones. "Behold, the Bridegroom cometh" (Matt. xxv. 6). This is "the marriage of the Lamb" (Rev. xix. 7). He who was the Lamb is now the Bridegroom. The Bible contains frequent references to the union of Christ and His people under the similitude of marriage. In the Psalms we have marriage songs, and in the parables we have the marriage of the King's son, the unworthy guests, the wedding garment, and the Ten Virgins. The Epistles and the Apocalypse carry on the same idea of "the union that is betwixt Christ and His Church." This marriage is something more than the spiritual affinity between Christ and Christians; it is an event which takes place at a definite time: "the marriage of the Lamb is come" (Rev. xix. 7). That time is the day on which the Lord will appear in the air accompanied by the souls from paradise (which must not be confused with heaven): at that moment will take place the first resurrection, which is limited to "the dead in Christ." There are three resurrections spoken of in the New Testament (1 Cor. xv. 23): "every man in his own order—(1) Christ the firstfruits [at the first Easter Day]; (2) then they that are Christ's [which is definitely stated to be "at His coming"]; (3) "then cometh the end." A long interval has elapsed between the resurrection of Christ and the still future resurrection of His people. There will be an interval also, called "a thousand years," between the rising of them that are Christ's and of them that are not His. This resurrection of the saints is the marriage of the Lamb. The same adjective, *blessed*, is applied to both events. "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrec-

tion." "Blessed are they that are called to the marriage supper of the Lamb." At this time will take place the great sifting, when one shall be taken and another left. The resurrection of the dead is not to be confounded with the resurrection from (among) the dead. Our Lord rose from among the dead (*ἐκ νεκρῶν*); the first resurrection also is to be from the dead; but the last resurrection is to be a resurrection of the dead. When our Lord pointed out to His Jewish host that the hospitality which should receive the Divine approval was that which he might show to the poor, the maimed, and the blind, He promised that this should be rewarded at the resurrection of the just (Luke xiv. 14): no general resurrection at the last day is here spoken of, but a particular resurrection of the just alone.

But this sifting will take place among the living as well as among the dead. At the coming of the Son of man (Matt. xxiv. 40, Revised Version) "shall two men be in the field; one is taken, and one is left. Two women shall be grinding at the mill; one is taken, and one is left." And St. Luke adds the striking fact that, whereas it is in the daytime that the men are working in the field, at the antipodes it would be night: "In that night there shall be two men in one bed; the one shall be taken, and the other shall be left" (Luke xvii. 34). This sifting process comes out most strikingly in the parable of the Ten Virgins. Five were wise, and five were foolish; five were admitted to the marriage feast, and five were excluded.

In studying this parable, the first point that strikes us is the unusual phrase at the beginning: "Then shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins" (Matt. xxv. 1). No other parable begins thus. All the others are in the present tense: "the kingdom of heaven is like" this or that. The use of the future tense shows us that the kingdom of heaven is not now to be compared to these ten virgins. The word "then" throws us back to the previous chapter to ascertain the time, which we find to be the coming of the Son of man. This coming was regarded by the early Church as being in the very near future. The absence of the Lord might last a few months, but surely then He will come, they thought. St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians, the earliest of all his Epistles, were specially written to correct this mistake. The Church then realized that her Lord's absence might be prolonged into years, and when the years became centuries she "slumbered and slept." All idea of the Lord's return as a Bridegroom to fetch His Bride the Church died away. With it died away missionary zeal. The only thought of the Lord's return that survived was that of the coming of the Judge. Not that the Bridegroom's coming was forgotten by all.

The lamps carried by the Bridegroom's friends were not quite extinguished — only "going out." The mystics and the Roman Catholic nuns still cherished the idea of the marriage of Christ to His people, but it was to a select and devoted few.

In our days the cry has gone forth, "Behold, the Bridegroom! Come ye forth to meet Him," and the Church is waking up. "Then all those virgins arose, and trimmed their lamps." With this revival of the expectation of the Bridegroom is connected that revival of missionary zeal which is such a striking feature of the Church life of to-day when compared with the indifference of many centuries past.

The foolish virgins are not fools in the Old Testament sense of that word. They are not *ungodly*, but stupid, silly, or thoughtless. They are sincere friends of the Bridegroom. They are no hypocrites. Nor are their companions merely mocking when they bid them go and buy oil for their lamps, which are not gone out, but going out. The lamps are not actually extinguished, but are burning so feebly that they are not fit to take their places amongst the brilliant lights of the procession. Surely they are not sent on a fool's errand when they are told to go and buy oil. They go to buy oil. Did they succeed in obtaining a supply? We may assume that they did, for their exclusion from the feast is not attributed to the lamps being extinguished, but to the virgins not being ready.

We drew attention to a remarkable difference in the beginning of this parable. There is also a striking difference in its conclusion. The parable that precedes this (the Evil Servant, Matt. xxiv. 51) ends with "weeping and gnashing of teeth"; the parable that follows this (the Talent, Matt. xxv. 30) ends with "weeping and gnashing of teeth"; but this of the virgins does not end with condemnation, but with a solemn warning, "Watch, therefore." Though they are shut out from the feast, they are not sentenced to weeping and gnashing of teeth. *They are late, but not lost.*

The marriage supper of the Lamb is not eternal life in heaven. When the Bridegroom has gathered His elect from amongst the dead and the living, and they have been caught up to meet Him in the air, He takes them away to some prepared place. "I go to prepare a place for you. . . . I will come again, and receive you unto Myself." At this marriage feast in this prepared place, perhaps in one of the stars, a judgment is held, for "we must all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ." Not a judgment of sins, for they were forgiven during our lifetime at our conversion, and forgiven sin is forgotten sin with God. There is no opening of books of judgment, but of the Book of Life. It is a judgment for

rewards. The cups of cold water given out of love to Christ are now to have their promised reward. The faithful in small things are now to be promoted to great charges. The earthly stories of the parables of the Pounds and the Talents are now to have their heavenly meaning fulfilled. In thus standing before the judgment-seat of Christ, there is no fear, no condemnation, no judgment, to them that are in Christ Jesus. It is part of the joy of the marriage feast. It is exclusion from this that is the punishment of the five foolish virgins. They remain outside. "One is taken, and one is left." They are left. Upon them will fall "the great tribulation" (Rev. vii. 14), but through it they will come purified and strengthened. It is for their unreadiness that they are punished with exclusion from the joy of welcoming the Bridegroom; they do not have a part in the first resurrection, but are condemned to wait until the resurrection of the last day.

The Third Coming of the Lord will be in the character of King of the Jews. "The door was shut" as He passed with His Bride to the marriage supper. When next it is opened (Rev. xix. 11), He is seen coming forth as a warrior. The future of the Jews is closely connected with this third stage of the Advent. The Jews will then be back in their own land, Antichrist will be attacking Jerusalem, and be on the point of overpowering the Jews, when the Lord shall suddenly appear as a warrior, and save them by the destruction of Antichrist. Then will the Jews look on Him whom they pierced: they shall mourn because of Him. He was born King of the Jews: they had said, "We will not have this man to reign over us"; He was crucified as the rejected King of the Jews. Yet the purposes of God cannot be frustrated by man, though they may be delayed by him. The angel had said to the Virgin Mary: "The Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David, and He shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever" (Luke i. 32, 33). This has not yet been fulfilled, but it must be; and it can only be fulfilled by His being accepted by the Jews as their King.

The millennium follows upon the rule of Christ in Jerusalem, with a widespread preaching of the Gospel, through which probably far more will be converted than during all the years of Christ's absence.

The Fourth Coming of the Lord will be as Judge, when the graves shall be opened and cast forth their dead, when the sea shall give up the dead that are in it, and all, both small and great, shall stand before the great white throne.

SELWYN BLACKETT.

ART. IV.—MIRACLES.

SIR OLIVER LODGE lately delivered at Birmingham an interesting lecture on "Science and Religion, with Especial Reference to the Question of Miracles." The audience was so large that it was necessary to adjourn to the theatre of the Midland Institute. The importance of the occasion, the eminence of the lecturer, and, above all, the greatness of his subject, call for earnest consideration. If in any way I fail to do justice to the lecture, it must be borne in mind that a newspaper report, however careful, of public utterances cannot always be relied upon exactly.

Before going on to what Sir Oliver said on miracles generally it may be observed that his fourfold classification of particular cases of "the so-called miraculous" is rather confusing. "In some cases the argument will turn on the question whether such things are theoretically possible. In other cases . . . whether they have ever actually happened. In a third case . . . whether they happened or not on some particular occasion. In a fourth, under which category any occurrence is to be placed." But it is unscientific to assume impossibility *a priori*, or to base a universal law on an induction necessarily imperfect. The third and fourth questions are what must be answered, if possible, in any case of "the so-called miraculous." Did the thing actually occur? How is it to be understood?

Speaking generally of miracles, the lecturer gives "four possible categories" to one or other of which any alleged miracle is to be assigned: "(1) An orderly and natural though unusual portent; (2) a disturbance due to unknown live (*sic*) or capricious agencies; (3) a utilization by mental or spiritual power of unknown laws; (4) direct interposition of the Deity." If by "capricious agencies" are meant the fairies or wizards of demonology, the second of these hypotheses need not be taken into account seriously. The first and third may be taken together as signifying an extraordinary result produced by laws known to us or unknown, and the fourth as signifying an arbitrary interference of the Deity with the order of the universe. For those, then, who believe that all things move by law, and who believe also in an omniscient, omnipotent Lawgiver, directing all things, the question is simply, Is the alleged miracle, supposing the fact to have been ascertained, a violation of law or in accordance with it? The Supreme Ruler of the world can so control the action of His laws, by adjusting and regulating their

coincidence, as to produce a result, such as human ingenuity cannot, by the concurrence of various forces.

The lecturer speaks of a possible explanation of a miracle as "a utilization of unknown laws by mental or spiritual forces." The word *mental* is hardly needed here, if physical science indicates more and more clearly that mental processes can be resolved into physical, and that in reality the will is the only spiritual energy. Anyhow, the utilization of laws, known or unknown, so as to produce a "portent" seems the true explanation of what is meant by "miracle" or "miraculous." The very term speaks for itself; it is something wonderful, awful, portentous. Instead of ontological guessings, what we have to do is to regard the miraculous in its bearing on those who are affected by it. The relativity of things, as Aristotle taught long ago—the *πρὸς ἡμᾶς*, not the *ἀπλῶς*—is what we are concerned with, unless our philosophy is to lose itself in the clouds. This is within our cognizance; the other is not. The effect of a miracle is obvious. It arrests attention; it startles indifference; it awakens the dormant consciousness, otherwise impervious to the message; it opens the way for truth, which might otherwise fail to win a hearing. "Law in the universe is irrefragable." But by coming to men as abnormal, a miracle quickens and incites. An essential test of the miraculous is the congruity of it or the incongruity with what the general (not universal) consent of mankind deems to be right ethically. Here at least we have sure footing; this at least we can know, even if other things, by their perpetual flux and reflux, baffle and defy our knowledge.

If, then, miracles are to be regarded subjectively rather than objectively, it follows that what is miraculous at one time, in one place, to one set of persons, may be explicable in itself as with time advances experience. Thus, the miracles of one age may be no miracles to another. If at the time when it occurred the incident was awe-striking, because inexplicable to those who were aware of it, it was miraculous, even though a wider, deeper insight can discover that it happened by the operation of natural laws. Fuller knowledge discloses more and more the *modus operandi* in things; and if not in this life, yet beyond it, the incessant permeance of law, and the unsleeping vigilance of the Lawmaker through all the wonders of the universe, will surely manifest themselves completely.

The crucial question is: Whether we are to believe in a stupendous machine, self-working, or in a machine guided and controlled by the Machinist. To this questions of detail are altogether subordinate. "The origin of life," for example,

“on this planet”—whether it was by instantaneous fiat or by slow, patient development—matters little. If the progress of physical science shows that “creation” in its precise sense is a misnomer, this involves no contradiction between science and religion. Rather, the forethought implied by evolution is more consonant with the attributes of Omniscience. The wisdom which can evolve by the interaction of many conflicting laws a result unattainable by the wisdom of man is super-human. The revelation from outside himself which man needs, and which comes to him in proportion to his need, is not of what he can discover for himself by his investigations, but a revelation of God in His power, holiness, love, and of man in his actual limitations, his potential illimitability. And this revelation is found, not in the surmises of natural religion, but in the Person of Christ.

I. GREGORY SMITH.



ART. V.—SCIENCE AND REVELATION.

THE fine thought of Shakespeare, that “reverence is the angel of the world,” whilst it harmonizes with those minds which instinctively look to and rest upon authority in all things, contains a caution and a reminder to others which our present leaders of thought would surely do well to keep before them. Though a great deal of modern criticism of Christian religion is not irreverent, there is an increasing tendency, and a growing temptation, to pass out of the liberty of free inquiry into the license of a destructiveness of criticism and restlessness of speculation which may be truly said to know no bounds. Seekers after truth, from whatever quarter they come, may well stand bewildered at the incessant ferment of thought as one sacred subject after another is cast into the crucible; and that word, “carried about with every wind of doctrine,” may fitly be held up to them in warning and encouragement.

This tendency to excess may be seen in two distinct and almost opposite directions, both perennial, no doubt, but none the less compelling attention in our own time, and requiring at least the same constant watchfulness as in any previous generation, because both are congenial to human nature.

One part of the religious world, denying many of its own fundamental articles of faith, has revived Roman doctrines, which it seeks to defend and establish by the union of Scripture with tradition. Another part, by the admixture of

rationalism with Scripture, is attempting reinterpretations of the same revelation, which shall make it harmonize with the partial and tentative theories of science. And, lastly, scientific men themselves are now striving to pierce the realm of the spiritual, and to feel after what they confess they cannot attain to or account for by the material scheme of things.

There is a call for a new Protestantism, which, abandoning some obsolete outworks, and using its weapons with not less courage, but perhaps less intolerance, than of old, shall contend against the errors peculiar to the second of these tendencies, as hitherto it has done against the first of them. Its stand must be taken, as in time past, upon that impregnable rock of Holy Scripture by which it stands or falls; yet it may avail itself, not only of the wider knowledge of that Scripture which modern research and criticism have opened up, but likewise of new arguments which science itself is now rendering available. For the reconciliation between religion and science must be accomplished by some conflict in so far as it is ever to take place, and not by the surrender of fundamental doctrines.

It is at least as much with the desire to contribute, however humbly, towards this reconciliation, as with the purpose of protesting against certain views of religion in vogue among scientific men, that the writer has ventured, as a student of both science and religion, on this essay. In this connection the following words of the late Bishop Philpott may be quoted, though it is twenty years since he delivered the charge in which they occurred:

“I am disposed to look with hope on the prospect of our men of science becoming the best and truest supporters of the Church of the future. Such persons know better than others, if they have really succeeded in deserving the name of men of science, what are the limits which divide what is true from what is false. They have learnt, and see, and feel a little, of the mysteries of Nature and of life. They are qualified above other men for adoration of the Infinite and the Eternal; and, if the Holy Spirit of God once touch their hearts, they are qualified above other men for devout submission to the teaching of the Word of God.”

The reconciliation of science with religion, it is submitted, is not to be sought in the reconstruction of religious doctrine, but in the recognition of the rational basis of revelation. Such a rational basis is constituted by a comparison of the possible modes of discovering and apprehending the facts and laws of the spiritual world.

These modes are:

1. By probability.

2. By revelation from God : (a) Written ; (b) personal.
3. By "spiritualistic" intimations through a "medium."

The first, which serves more largely in physical science itself than is generally realized, includes those arguments and inferences from the analogy of Nature on which Butler dwells, and with respect to which he justly reminds us that "probability is the very guide of life." Of the many arguments of this kind to which scientific men should give weight, surely one of the most cogent is that the beauty and order of material systems, great and small, which they are accustomed to contemplate, testify to the existence of a Divine government, which in the spiritual world may be expected to appoint ways and means, duly constituted, orderly, central and executive ; and that amongst these agencies a definite revelation of the Divine will is highly probable. Two other reasons for this probability will appeal with force to scientific men of the day. One is that, by its own confession, natural science is blind to things outside the material universe. Another is because that department of modern science, known as psychical research, which claims to have succeeded in obtaining intimations of the spiritual world, is so perilous for general purposes, that the presumption appears strong that Divine wisdom would prohibit such methods, and appoint a safer, more salutary, and more universally accessible mode of knowledge, even if it did not do so on moral grounds.

We may cite here the words of one of our foremost natural philosophers, whose mind, ranging along the confines of our knowledge of the material universe, and touching nothing therein which it has not simplified, is now straining its searching gaze into the realms of the immaterial and spiritual, and seeking to harmonize both in a "completer science." "Let science," he says, "be silent, and deny nothing in the universe, till it has at least made an honest effort to grasp the whole."¹ And again : "It may be that science sees only one half because it is blind to the other half." And again : "The region of religion and the region of a completer science are one."

This confession of the incompetency of the unaided human understanding to grasp the truths of the spiritual world at once demonstrates the probability of a revelation, and is at the same time endorsed by that revelation. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him ; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things

¹ Sir O. Lodge, "The Outstanding Controversy between Religion and Science," *Hibbert Journal*, vol. i.

which God hath prepared for them that love Him. But God hath revealed them unto us by His Spirit."

Here, then, we pass to the second mode of the discovery of spiritual truths—namely, by the operation of God's Spirit revealing them, whether through the medium of a written or of a spoken word, or by an inspiration of thought independently of either. Psychology has rendered to modern thought the service of calling attention to the reality of spiritual experiences so efficiently, that to speak of this revelation by the Spirit is now perfectly intelligible to scientific men. Moreover, the laws regulating it are similar to those which govern the natural world, and in order to meet science they may be expressed in its own terminology. Thus, in order to enter into communication with the spiritual world, the recipient of its intelligence must be "tuned" to perceive its radiations, like a wireless telegraph receiver. He must have an eye to see the light, or an ear sensitive to that order of harmonies which are to be heard; as Christ so often repeated: "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear." And the method of attaining this condition of receptiveness is equally definite. As daily demonstrated by religious experience, this adjustment of the spiritual sense consists in prayer, spoken, or written if need be, but essentially a spiritual action, a communing of spirit with spirit. So that it is true in terms of scientific theory, as well as in Christian practice, that whilst we speak to God in prayer, He speaks to us by His Word in one and the same way.

The power of prayer as a definite, practical thing is now being admitted to be highly probable, on psychological grounds, by, at all events, one of our leaders of scientific thought. Many will have felt grateful to Sir O. Lodge for the following passage, in which he infers the reasonableness of prayer:

"We can operate on each others' minds through our physical envelope, by speech and by writing, and in other ways, but we can do more. It appears that we can operate at a distance, by no apparent physical organ or medium: if by mechanism at all, then by mechanism at any rate unknown to us [*i.e.*, by telepathy].

"If we are open to influence from each other by non-corporeal methods, may we not be open to influence from beings in another region or of another order? And, if so, may we not be aided, inspired, guided, by a cloud of witnesses—not witnesses only, but helpers—agents like ourselves of the immanent God?

"How do we know that in the mental sphere these cannot answer prayer, as we in the physical? It is not a speculation only; it is a question for experience to decide. Are we

conscious of guidance? Do we feel that prayers are answered? That power to do, and to will, and to think is given us? Many there are who, with devout thankfulness, will say 'Yes.'

Also the following :

"We do not know the laws which govern the interaction of different orders of intelligence, nor do we know how much may depend on our own attitude and conduct. It may be that prayer is an instrument which can control or influence higher agencies, and by its neglect we may be losing the use of a mighty engine to help on our lives and those of others."¹

Such admissions are full of hope for the reconciliation of religion with a completer science, provided only that they be permitted to lead to their own logical conclusions. Given this faith in the power of prayer, all the rest follows—namely, that the mightiest of human philosophers should humbly employ that agency for the definite purpose of obtaining the guidance and illumination of God's Holy Spirit, by which to perceive the meaning of that Word of His, which will assuredly unfold to them more than they had dreamed; but which, without this preliminary adjustment of the seeker, will ever be to a large extent meaningless. This, indeed, is one of the manifold evidences of its Divine origin, that so truly does the key of prayer unlock this book that passages which may have been studied a hundred times over, with the same utter want of significance, flash out their depth of meaning the first time they are read with prayer. This interpretation of the Scriptures by studying them in the spirit, and not merely in the letter, in which they were written—the realization that "the words I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life"—contains the answer to much Biblical criticism.

Another principle which meets many of the objections raised by that criticism may here be noticed as forming part of the scientific basis of revelation—namely, that of evolution or development. If it be granted as highly probable that a revelation has been made in Scripture, it is not less reasonable that it should proceed by stages. Thus the Old Testament possesses a partial and provisional character suitable to the earlier education of mankind. God, not only "at sundry times," but also "in divers manners," spoke "to the fathers by the prophets." These, moreover, spoke darkly of things which they saw but darkly, "searching what, or what manner of time, the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the

¹ Sir O. Lodge, "The Outstanding Controversy between Religion and Science," *Hibbert Journal*, vol. i., pp. 222, 227.

glory that should follow." Again, in Christ's ministry, whilst unfolding much of the truth, He told His disciples that He had many things to say to them which they could not yet bear, but which flashed upon them after the gift of the Spirit, and shine in their writings. And, going a step further, we are to hope for still further measures of insight into truth from the same source, "in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge."

Whether we consider the growth of a plant from its seed, of a child from the womb, or the development of mankind through lower types of life, we have the same principle of the working out of a plan from an origin which, at first inscrutable, gradually more clearly unfolds that which was to be made. Similarly, in revelation we have the germ of a Divine purpose foreshadowed in the promise to Abraham, gradually growing clearer throughout the prophecies, fulfilled in Christ's death and resurrection, further developed in the descent of His Spirit and in the spread of Christianity, and yet to be consummated by a second Advent, foretold, though shrouded in mystery, as the earlier stages once were.

It is here that the advocates of a more scientific reinterpretation of Scripture would claim, that the present age may be witnessing, and they themselves taking part in, this very development of the revelation. It is a claim which demands most careful examination. There is unquestionably a great expansion of the philosophical knowledge of religion, plenty of acute and scholarly intellectual criticism of Scripture, more than enough of ingenious speculation as to the reconciliation of its teaching with certain theories. Now, the condition to which all such assumed advances in religion must be subject, and the test which must be applied to them, is quite scientific—namely, that no part of the revelation may be so construed as to make it contradict other portions of which the meaning is manifest. This is a principle which in the interpretation of natural phenomena is fundamental. And where apparently irreconcilable inconsistencies present themselves, surely the dictum of Origen is just, that "he who believes Scripture to have proceeded from Him who is the Author of Nature may well expect to find the same sort of difficulties in it as are found in the constitution of Nature." Let us observe that this does not preclude the fullest expansion of religious truth out of both Scripture and spiritual experience, but limits and governs it in accordance with the laws of its own being.

Take, for example, that modern view of the idea of sin which tends to minimize its importance by explaining it as a relic of man's bestial predecessors, which the march of evolu-

tion is leaving behind. This theory should, one would think, be sufficiently refuted by the facts of history, which show that the progress of civilization apart from Christianity left man's moral nature very much where it was. It is a view contradicted flatly by the teaching of Scripture; and the rational explanation why this teaching is ignored is that it is precisely one of those spiritual truths which, without the spiritual perception alluded to above, are meaningless. Sin in its Scriptural sense is not recognised by philosophic reasoning, but by the conviction of a soul awakened to the vision of the holiness of God. Again, the discredit which is sometimes thrown upon the Atonement by philosophers obviously follows from this partly natural, partly willing, blindness to sin. Yet the same revelation which shows sin discloses its remedy, and discovers thereby a depth of redeeming love which again throws sin into yet more striking relief, as something indeed to be left behind, but never to be ignored. The criticism which assails such fundamental doctrines as these tends to leave nothing at all to revelation, and to make no distinction between the dimly shadowed and the terribly emphasized portions of Scripture. Against this a protest must be made. It is not by abolishing the letter of revelation, but rather by re-illuminating it with its own original inspiration, that a true reinterpretation of doctrine is to be gained.

The next to be noticed among the possible modes of discovering spiritual things is the unwritten revelation of that nature, which has been justly denoted as experimental religion. Those scientists who have been approaching religion through the data of "spiritualism" are now prepared to admit as rational the reality of the experiences of Christian believers, on the grounds of the experimental facts of psychology. Those who know the facts of the joy and peace of this communion with, and constant guidance from, their Lord, have indeed little need for such corroboration of their experience. It is for them rather to point out to the earnest student of psychology the possibilities to which his researches have given him a clue, and to bid him to abandon them for that beside which they fall into their justly subordinate and circumscribed bounds.

This is that personal guidance of the Spirit of Truth which, definitely promised in response to prayer, is within the reach of all seekers after truth; that Spirit who, having inspired the Scriptures, now unfolds and applies them to the daily life. It is His special function to reveal thereby Christ as the Saviour, as expressed in the words, "He shall testify of Me," and "He shall glorify Me." Nor is the guidance only through Scripture, but by manifold intimations of

Divine things, and by an inward voice, which in the daily experience of many Christians is a demonstrable experimental fact. In this revelation, the moral as well as the intellectual sense receives illumination; and the phrase "knowing by heart" becomes—in a truer sense than commonly belongs to it—a reality, transcending and supplementing mere mental knowledge.

Here, again, the scientific notion of attuning the receiver of the knowledge to the source from which the latter proceeds is enunciated by Christ: "If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God or whether I speak of Myself"; that is to say, the condition of receptiveness of spiritual truths is the attuning of the will. It is similarly the condition of Communion: "If a man love Me, he will keep My words; and My Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." At this point we pass from knowledge to the higher plane of love, which is a more perfect mode of knowledge, into which the latter is to merge indistinguishably.¹

The remaining mode of a revelation of the spiritual world consists in communication through the agency of a "medium" with human or superhuman spirits, as distinguished from the communion with the Spirit of God of which we have spoken. Psychologists assert that in this there is involved an act of will on the part of the unseen spirit, as well on the part of the seeker. Hence follows the inference that guidance may be sought from and given by these spirits in very much, if not in identically, the same way as by prayer to God. It is here that the danger of such intercourse lies from the religious point of view. For although guidance by spirits harmonizes with the beautiful and Scriptural idea of a ministry of angels guarding children, sustaining and succouring in trial and danger, yet to seek the guidance by going to these or any other ministers instead of to their Lord Himself is as certainly contrary to the teaching of Scripture. And though this may be recognised by some enlightened psychologists, the tendency of human nature runs in the opposite perilous direction. Witness, for example, the extent which devotions paid to saints has reached in the Church of Rome. It is certain that, under the dispensation of the Old Testament, communications with departed spirits were expressly forbidden by Divine command. From the fact that they are much less explicitly referred to in the New Testament, it might be argued that, with the spread of knowledge, researches into the psychology of spirits were to be permissible. But they

¹ 1 Cor. xiii. 8.

are clearly contrary to the spirit of the Christian dispensation, in so far as they minister to the tendencies of that spiritual idolatry, which in New Testament teaching takes the place of the material idolatry mainly dealt with in the Old Testament.

Leaving aside the abuse into which even scientific spiritualism is liable to fall, it can be argued with some force that to certain persons it furnishes a more convincing proof of the reality of spiritual things than they have discovered elsewhere. The fact, however, must be that such persons have never had sufficient faith in prayer to make use of it properly; and the question is whether they begin to do so after having admitted the nearness of the spiritual world. In some instances the reply to this question is in the affirmative. In one of which the writer has immediate knowledge, the seeker at a séance was irresistibly led through the medium to a prayer to God. May it not be that in these cases it is His Spirit Himself who answers? On the other hand, may it not be that on some other occasions it has been one of the evil spirits? How are they to be discerned? St. John gives a simple test, doubtless truly scientific if science were wiser: "Believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they be of God. Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: and every spirit which confesseth not Jesus is not of God."

Whatever service psychical research may be rendering to science by demonstrating the existence of a spiritual universe, its application to the discovery of truths about God and His dealings with man surely somewhat resembles the procedure of one who should set out for a country a few degrees of longitude eastward of him by sailing westwards round the globe. And granting the further application of the analogy, and that scientific and religious knowledge must meet somewhere, the writer submits that all which psychical research can do is to conduct us to the confines of a region where we must humbly and gratefully resign scientific guidance for the higher light of the appointed revelation which Divine wisdom has given in Scripture, remembering its ancient warning with regard to this subject: "When they shall say unto you, Seek unto them that have familiar spirits, . . . should not a people seek unto their God? On behalf of the living should they seek unto the dead? To the law and to the testimony! If they speak not according to this word, surely there is no morning for them."

JULIAN ELTON YOUNG.

ART. VI.—BERNARDINO LUINI AND RELIGIOUS ART.

THE relation of art to religion is a theme which has often occupied a conspicuous place in English literature. It would still supply material for countless volumes. But it may be questioned whether at the present time the subject is one which would be likely to evoke general interest. The gradual spread of ecclesiastical sentiment has, indeed, done much to encourage good taste and refined workmanship in the material appointment of Anglican churches throughout this land, and many of them (including, of course, some of our cathedrals) contain examples of modern sculpture, mural painting, and stained glass which reflect high credit on the artists who designed them. But such objects are probably regarded by the great majority of each congregation as so many conventional appurtenances which might be replaced, at any time, by others entirely different in style, provided they were sufficiently ornate, and fulfilled their ostensible purpose. To the architect, antiquary, and clerical amateur we are indebted for that affinity of character which, as a rule, pervades all details associated with our English Gothic Revival. To the mere devotee the question, no doubt, seems one of minor importance.

Ruskin once went so far as to say that in his own personal experience he had never met an entirely religious-minded person who cared much about art at all. Without endorsing this opinion, it may be generally admitted that those works which, either in illustration of sacred or of Divine precept, most deeply move the pious observer do not necessarily commend themselves to a cultivated taste. The moral purpose of a picture may be excellent while its æsthetic value is third-rate. Most of us have seen commonplace prints, published within the last few years, which, from an artistic point of view, are absolutely devoid of merit, but which, nevertheless, have become immensely popular as the presentment of some obvious allegory appealing to simple-hearted sentimentalists.

In bygone ages the Church was, of course, the chief patron of all art, and, as a direct consequence, the best pictorial work of those days was devoted to sacred subjects. But it is a popular error to suppose that altar-pieces of the fifteenth or sixteenth centuries, which seem to us imbued with a genuinely devotional spirit, were always executed by painters of saintly life or orthodox belief. If there were some who, like Fra Angelico, led devout and holy lives, there must have been many others who were Christians only in name. Among examples of the early Italian school none are distinguished

by a purer grace and deeper reverential sense than the Madonnas and saints of Perugino. Yet, if we may believe Vasari, the artist was—at least, for some years of his life—a confessed agnostic.

The designs of Fra Filippo Lippi are instinct with a saintly charm suggestive of austerity and religious fervour. But the painter, when a middle-aged priest, eloped with a nun who had consented to sit to him as a model.

Notwithstanding such cases, it is certain that nine-tenths of the chefs-d'œuvre in pictorial art which have won the admiration of mankind are closely associated with the history and doctrines of Christianity.

While I was Keeper of our National Gallery, one of my duties was to receive and conduct through the building any royal or otherwise distinguished visitors who wished to examine its contents. On one occasion a certain Oriental potentate came there with that object. On my inquiring what class of art most interested him, he at once intimated that he would be glad to see any remarkable works in the collection. "But," he added with great emphasis, "I don't like religious pictures." It need scarcely be said that, after the condition thus imposed, His Highness's visit was not a protracted one. To omit from notice every religious picture in the Trafalgar Square or any other national museum would assuredly be to miss most gems of a collection. Not long afterwards I had the honour of acting as official cicerone to a still more illustrious foreigner, noted among European Sovereigns for his intellectual culture, his modest bearing and affability. I soon discovered that he was familiar with the characteristic qualities of many great masters, but the one whose works most attracted him was unquestionably Murillo. He stood entranced before the "Pedroso" altar-piece, representing the Holy Family, and the picture of "St. John and the Lamb," which evidently moved him to emotion. In the course of conversation he expressed his opinion that Murillo was a greater painter than Raphael.

I ventured to inquire the reason for this judgment. "Because," replied the King, "when Raphael selected sacred subjects he humanized them, but Murillo, in adopting human subjects, made them divine!"

It was difficult to agree with this view, but, not presuming to differ from His Majesty, I merely said: "Sir, I shall remember that."

In the religious world there is no doubt that Murillo's art satisfies the taste of many humbler critics than this royal personage, though, I expect, on very different grounds from the one which he suggested. To the exquisite technique of

the painter's work, and his strong sense of physical beauty, may be traced much of the admiration with which his productions are regarded, but among ordinary amateurs their popularity may be ascribed to their realistic character.

There is no mystery to solve, no symbolism to unravel. St. Joseph is a superior-looking peasant in the prime of life; the Blessed Virgin a pretty village maiden; the infant Saviour a comely child. It is true that these figures are posed with a due regard for symmetry of composition which seems almost inconsistent with the simple portraiture of the group. But the dignity attained by earlier painters in dealing with similar presentments—that ideal spirituality of expression, the stately attitudes and traditional splendour of garb which belong to *quattro-cento* designs are absent here.

It would be impossible to guess which epoch or which class of art associated with the treatment of sacred subjects has been most successful in creating a sense of veneration. Among the uneducated we know that it may be evoked by works of very inferior merit. An Italian peasant kneeling before some tinsel-crowned figure of the Virgin in his village church is as much enthralled by its contemplation as if he were offering up his prayers before the San Sisto Madonna.

Even enlightened connoisseurs are not unanimous in deciding which painter appeals most strongly to what may be called the devotional instincts of our nature. Masters of the "primitive" schools record facts in sacred history with gravity and even reverence, but the grotesque forms in which such incidents are portrayed almost require the interpretation of an antiquary to invest them with interest.

The religious art of a somewhat later period, without offending the taste, is apt to tax the intelligence of experienced observers. Why, for instance, should St. Peter appear clad in the vestments of a medieval Bishop? To pious Protestants the Virgin Mary represented in queenly robes and wearing a jewelled crown seems grossly superstitious. Here is St. Sebastian, pierced by a dozen arrows, calmly gazing heavenwards, without a sign of physical pain! In one picture we find St. John the Baptist depicted as a youthful companion of the child Jesus. In another he appears as an adult, watching the infant Saviour as He lies on His mother's lap.

Lovers of ancient art are, of course, accustomed to these inconsistencies and anachronisms, which do not in the least degree detract from their admiration. But the critic of more realistic works, apart from the question of their technical merit, has still to deal with considerations of taste. Even those who fully appreciate the creative genius and extraordinary power of Michelangelo must confess that in his most famous con-

ceptions there is but little which reflects the modern spirit of Christianity. Titian and Rubens reached the highest pinnacle of fame in the practice of their art, but their quasi-dramatic treatment of sacred history is often repugnant to the purist.

An exquisite ideality pervades certain productions of the Venetian school, and in the altar-pieces by such masters as Giovanni Bellini, Basaiti, Cima, and Bissolo physical grace is generally combined with a saintly character of expression which seems almost inspired. Among Bolognese painters Francia stands almost alone in his capacity for infusing a deep religious sentiment into compositions tending to incite devotion. His "Pieta," representing Madonna mourning over the body of our Lord, is perhaps the most pathetic picture of its class in our national collection.

By common consent Raphael's name stands foremost among the great masters who devoted their talents to the service of the Church. Excepting a few works in the field of portraiture, his brush seems to have been almost exclusively employed on sacred subjects. He changed his style, as we know, more than once. His earliest pictures retain the simplicity and refinement of Perugino, though they lack something of the spiritual interest which that master's productions possess. In later life he attained an excellence that was all his own, and of its kind probably unrivalled, but it partakes of an academic character which, notwithstanding his consummate dexterity in draughtsmanship and the wonderful range of his conceptive genius, fails to enlist our sympathies in the same degree as the nature of other work, far less ambitious in aim and perhaps inferior in technical skill, but possessing qualities more consonant with humanity.

It is a strange fact that in the annals of sacred art the name of Bernardino Luini should have remained so long unhonoured. Vasari, who had reached manhood before the great painter's death, and who might have ascertained full particulars of his life and works, passes him over with a brief mention; and although Lanzi in the eighteenth century to some extent repairs this omission, posterity is still uninformed respecting the biographical details of Luini's career.

It is, indeed, only within the last fifty years that the merits of this gifted artist have been adequately appreciated. Yet North Italy abounds with examples of his genius. He is represented in the State galleries of Paris, Berlin, Munich, and Vienna, while several of his works have found their way to England.

The large and elaborate fresco, representing the Passion and Crucifixion of our Lord, which he painted over the chancel arch in the Church of Santa Maria degli Angeli at

Lugano has, unfortunately, suffered too much from restoration to indicate the exquisite refinement and tenderness of Luini's art. Numerous other specimens may be seen in the Brera Gallery at Milan, in the Ambrosian Library, and in the private museums and churches of the same city. But it is generally admitted that the purest and saintliest works from his brush are contained in the church known as "the Sanctuary of the Virgin" at Saronno. The town, a small and quite unimportant one, is within an hour's ride of Como. Luini's frescoes occupy several walls at the east end of the church. Two of them are in an ante-chapel, and represent respectively "The Marriage of the Virgin" and "Christ disputing with the Doctors."

In the former we see the high-priest standing between St. Joseph and his holy bride, while a group of friends is assembled on each side, the men on the left hand and the women on the right. All these figures are of life size, or nearly so. The head of St. Joseph bears a strong resemblance, both in features and expression, to the traditional portraiture of our Lord. He stands with downcast eyes and modest mien, clad in a blue tunic and a maize-coloured pallium. The high-priest wears a vestment of dark lilac over a robe of lighter shade. The Virgin's blue mantle is lined with a yellowish material over a white skirt; the whole dress simple in form, but cast in admirable folds. Madonna's face suggests a rustic type of beauty, with tresses of fair hair bound behind her head. The hands throughout this picture are daintily modelled, the flesh tones delicate even to paleness. The draperies are faultless in arrangement, but the blue colour used for some of them has been, unfortunately, fugitive. Otherwise the chromatic scheme presents a perfect harmony, and finds an excellent foil in the dark-brown wood of the chapel furniture.

With great ingenuity the painter has succeeded in avoiding a formal composition by giving variety to the action of his figures. On the left of the picture two youths, apparently rejected suitors, are breaking their symbolical rods, in accordance with an ancient Jewish custom, while the right of the foreground is occupied by the dignified figure of a woman picturesquely attired in a richly brocaded dress. Refined taste and deep reverential feeling are manifest throughout the work.

The companion picture appears on the opposite wall of the chapel. Our Lord, represented in youth rather than childhood, stands near a central throne, around which the Doctors are seated, and extends His hand to welcome His mother, who meets Him with a mingled expression of love and respect.

It is as though He had been interrupted in His discourse by her approach, but He greets her with filial affection. On the left of the picture are seen the Doctors disputing, their faces animated by varied expressions of doubt, earnest thought, and in some cases of pious conviction. Seated on a marble bench to the right of the foreground is a venerable man, said to be a portrait of Luini himself, with a flowing white beard. He holds a closed volume on his knee, and turns his eyes towards the scene of discussion with an interested but somewhat sad cast of countenance.

The draperies introduced in the picture are more defined by *chiaroscuro* than those in the companion work. Plum colour of various shades, maize-yellow, violet-blue, toned crimson, and pale green are disposed with the painter's usual skill and taste. Each of these frescoes occupies a mural space measuring about 7 feet by 10 feet.

The sacrarium of the church contains two frescoes of much larger size. The one on the left side of the altar represents "The Presentation in the Temple." Simeon, a venerable figure, clad in a robe of reddish-brown with a super-vestment of pale blue, holds the infant Saviour in his arms. Near him stands the Blessed Virgin, whose features are distinguished by more physical beauty here than in the pictures previously described. She clasps her hands, upraised in prayer, as she approaches St. Simeon. Behind her, bearing the traditional basket of doves, trips a fair-haired maiden, wearing a white-sleeved dress covered by an ample tunic, with sandals on her feet. The naïve, unconscious grace of this charming figure is worthy of Luini's happiest inspiration. On the left of the scene are a group of holy women accosted by St. Joseph, here represented in the prime of life. Another beautiful male head is that of the youthful attendant, who bears the high-priest's mitre. The architectural background of this picture shows the painter's thorough knowledge of perspective, and is extremely interesting. Under an arch of the portico is seen a landscape with buildings, and in the middle distance are a few (now faded) figures representing "The Flight into Egypt." Even on this pictorially subordinate portion of the work Luini has bestowed the most scrupulous care, as may be noticed in his accurate appreciation of mountain form and the touch of nature suggested by a palm-tree bending before the wind.

The picture is, in short, full of detail, which, however interesting to examine personally, cannot here be described at length. It is signed (on a *cartellino*) by the painter, and dated 1526.

On the right-hand wall of the sacrarium there is another

large fresco representing "The Adoration of the Magi." This is in better preservation than the last-described picture, and is, perhaps, on the whole a finer work. The figure of the King, represented on the extreme left of the foreground, is a model of manly grace. He is attired in robes of great splendour, which the painter has depicted with consummate skill as to form and colour.

The Virgin's features belong to the same type as that adopted by Luini in the "Presentation" picture, but here they are more beautiful. The lilac-coloured robe is nearly concealed by a large blue mantle, which falls from her head to the ground. The infant Christ, whom she bears on her lap, turns to greet one of the Magi, who, draped in a magnificent mantle, kneels in adoration. Close behind him is a youthful page, bearing his master's cap of State. The face of this boy is curiously reminiscent of Leonardo da Vinci's "Mona Lisa," and suggests the influence of that master in this among many other of Luini's works.

This picture is, among other reasons, noteworthy for the number of animals introduced in the scene. The traditional ox and ass appear in the manger; several of the princely retinue are mounted on horseback, while in the middle distance camels, and even a giraffe, form part of the approaching procession. The forms of the last-named creatures would not quite satisfy an accurate zoologist, but more familiar beasts are portrayed with great dexterity.

It is, however, on the personification of human life, with infinite variety of age, character, and expression, that the painter has bestowed his chief skill in this interesting and truly marvellous work. There is scarcely a line or passage of colour which could be altered with advantage. When I last saw it a few vertical cracks had appeared on the surface of the plaster. It is to be hoped that it may be long preserved from more serious injury.

In a semi-octagonal *Córo*, behind the high altar, are four more frescoes by Luini. One of them, painted on a (feigned) niche, represents St. Catherine holding a closed volume with one hand and a palm-branch with the other. In a corresponding panel on the opposite wall may be seen "St. Apollonia" bearing iron pincers, the emblem of her martyrdom. She is clad in a very picturesque robe of pale blue, with an over-garment of (now faded) plum colour, while a green mantle is thrown lightly over her shoulders. In the features and expression of this singularly charming figure we are again reminded of Da Vinci.

Two other frescoes in the *Córo* were some years ago partly concealed by *sedilia*, which form part of the chapel furniture.

But I managed to look at them, and they are, perhaps, now open to general inspection. They represent two kneeling angels, bearing a *navicula* and other sacred utensils.

I spent nearly a whole day in the sanctuary, examining its pictorial treasures, and quite absorbed by their beauty. The sacristan, a most intelligent Italian, told me that the building was rarely visited by tourists, but that in previous years Mr. Ruskin had devoted considerable time to the study of its contents, which, as we know, he enthusiastically admired.

I have described them at some length because, amid countless examples of religious art to be found in the public picture-galleries and churches of Europe, I remember none—not even those executed by the most distinguished masters, from Fra Angelico to Raphael—which ever impressed me so much by their deep devotional feeling, combined (as in this case) with a highly refined sense of physical beauty in form and colour, and, above all, with a freedom from every taint of affectation.

There have been few painters of note who failed to receive—even in their lifetime—a generous acknowledgment of their ability. But the world has taken far too long to recognise and appreciate the unique character of Luini's genius.

CHARLES L. EASTLAKE.



ART. VII.—UPON PERSONAL EXPENDITURE.

“A well-ordered budget is as necessary for a citizen as a nation.”

“It is in personal expenditure we all find scope for the continuous daily application of Christian principles.”

“A purchase is a vital, and not only a commercial, transaction.”

BISHOP WESTCOTT.

THERE is a well-known story about an eminent statesman being made furiously angry because in his sermon a preacher offered somewhat plain advice and exhortation upon certain details relative to the conduct of a man's private or personal life.

That the preacher could claim the authority of the Bible for trenching upon this field none will doubt. It may possibly have been the rarity of the choice of such a topic for consideration in the pulpit which upset the statesman's mental equilibrium. We cannot speak of the proportion of sermons upon such subjects at the date of this explosion. Is that proportion to-day as great as it might with advantage be? A well-known dignitary of the Church has quite lately given it as his opinion that “there are reasons in the circumstances

of the time which give cause to say that practical preaching, in the Christian sense, is 'a subject which requires attention.'" Certainly it may be questioned whether, as a body, the clergy in their public teaching deal sufficiently clearly and definitely with the practical details of life. It has been quite justly claimed for Christianity that it addresses itself not only to every man, but to the *whole* of man. The Sermon on the Mount and the concluding chapters of several of St. Paul's Epistles are a sufficient proof of this. From these we learn that Christianity was meant to penetrate into and to rule every sphere and department of life.

There is, perhaps, no one action which touches life at so many different points as our use of money, whether we possess little or much. Many tests of character have ere now been proposed. Tell me a man's or a woman's friends, or tell me of their tastes and pursuits, etc., and I shall be able to tell you at least something of their character. But I venture to think that this test, "Tell me how they habitually spend their money," would probably be about the most comprehensive, and not the least fallible test. It will show, at least, what is regarded as essential and non-essential in and for life. And the proportions of expenditure upon various objects would be an extremely useful indication of the "value-judgments" of any man or woman. It is proverbially difficult for any of us to enter into another's thoughts or feelings. One of the best illustrations of this difficulty would be obtained if we had the opportunity of examining a number of "other people's" private budgets; the relative proportions of their expenditure upon various objects would be extremely difficult to understand.

The earnest student, to whom the purchase of a new book upon his favourite subject is, after the bare necessities of life have been supplied, of paramount importance, cannot understand the budget, amounting, perhaps, to £1,000 a year, in which the only entry for "food for the mind" is an occasional sum for newspapers. On the other hand, to the pleasure-loving, the entire absence of any expenditure upon recreation, and, possibly, of £10 a year, out of an income of little more than £2 a week, upon "books" is practically unintelligible. The action of the philanthropist (in the highest sense of the word), who conscientiously gives a tenth of his income to charity, is incomprehensible to the selfish or the miser. On the other hand, it may be extremely difficult for those with an ample and assured income to understand the feelings of those with small and precarious means, who yet feel the necessity of providing against sickness or old age.

Now if, as surely seems to need no proof, personal ex-

penditure is not only a test of character, but is governed by character, may it not well find a place among those subjects upon which the Christian teacher—the *γραμματεὺς μαθητευθεῖς τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν*—not only ought to have, but ought to be able to express, an opinion? But if so, it is evident that that opinion should be based upon or ruled by some clear and stable principle or body of principles.

Does not the third of the three dicta of Bishop Westcott's quoted at the head of this article offer such a principle, and one which has the immense advantage of being practically capable of almost universal application?

Let me state what I conceive to be Dr. Westcott's meaning in somewhat different words: "I am about to give or expend a sum of money; I must try to estimate the value or the result of my gift or purchase in terms of life, that being the only adequate standard of which to measure and justify the expenditure."¹

In the case of a contribution to a charitable object we may ask, Does the object tend to the *increase* of life—to raise or deepen, to improve and enlarge life? Contributions to the maintenance of Christian workers of all kinds, to missions, churches, schools, and hospitals, may be said in various ways to fulfil this condition. Here a word of caution. We must be very careful ere we justify ourselves in withholding a contribution from some institution because in one or more details we do not agree with the management of that institution. We are often only too glad to find an excuse for not giving, and one who gives has far more right to strive for reform than one who stands altogether apart.

But it is in the sphere of expenditure upon more or less material things for ourselves or for those immediately dependent upon us that the question of return in terms of life needs most careful consideration.

We wish to make a purchase. Will the object we wish to purchase *minister to life*? The question is of wide application. It may refer to rent or furniture, to art or literature, to food or clothing, to travel or various forms of recreation. I believe that this test suggested by Bishop Westcott might be most valuable if carefully applied to that vexed question of recreation. It would help to solve the following queries: What proportion of our time or money should be spent upon it? And into what kinds of recreation are we justified in entering?

But we must not forget to consider the other side of each

¹ "My own desire is to express all the details of life in terms of life" (from a letter by Bishop Westcott, "Life," vol. ii, p. 309).

transaction. What we purchase has "a value in terms of life" not only to ourselves, but to the one who sells it. We must ask at least ourselves, What has it *cost* in terms of life? For this is surely its *true* value. And this needs especially to be considered in an age when competition is so terribly severe, and the rage for cheapness is so widespread. A middleman, or retailer, offers us an article at a certain price. The pressure upon us—possibly arising from fashion, or from the rising standard of life—to obtain the article as cheaply as possible may be very great. But dare we consider the *conditions* under which the article has been produced in order that it may be sold at a profit by the middleman for the price he asks? To confine our attention to clothing and furniture: let us remember that the "sweater" has not yet been made to cease out of the land. The weakness of human nature which causes some to copy others, if only as far as *appearance* is concerned, and the rapid change of fashion, which causes many a thing to be disused long before it is worn out, have much to answer for. Again, of how many houses could it be said that all which they contain "ministers to life"? That which is useless and unbeautiful actually detracts from life. It cumbers the ground; it demands unproductive labour.

The argument which I am using is, I believe, the strongest of all arguments against every form of betting and gambling.

Try to estimate a transaction of this kind in "terms of life." Leaving on one side the professional bookmaker, can any of my readers point to a case from their own experience in which the habit of betting and gambling has tended to increase of life? Can anyone cite a case in which it has deepened the sense of responsibility, widened the sympathy, or raised the tone of character? On the other hand, I could quote many instances from my own personal experience in which mental energy was so concentrated upon the efforts and chance of winning (and the fear of losing) that it was entirely withdrawn from all useful objects. Work was neglected; the responsibilities of home and family were undischarged; most undesirable companionships were formed; and moral and financial ruin were the ultimate result. Measured in terms of life, the result is all on the wrong side of the balance-sheet. The man who loses on betting and gambling has lost more than his money; the man who wins has given nothing in return, and what he wins he has won at the cost of deterioration of his own moral fibre.

On the contrary, every wise act of charity—as an act of intelligent self-sacrifice—strengthens character. It has purchased an abiding possession which can at all times be turned to good use.

If, then, the use of money enters into conduct at so many points; if it is, as we know it must be, governed by, and in turn must affect, character, should not its wise use be among the most usual of subjects for Christian instruction? Yet in how many of our elementary or secondary schools; in how many Confirmation classes or Bible classes; in how many addresses to young people, or to men or to women, does such instruction find a place? How often, except in the form of an appeal for help towards some special collection, is its right use a subject of treatment in the pulpit?

And it is by no means an unintelligible or an uninteresting subject, and it is, as we have seen, a subject of the widest application. It satisfies, as few subjects can satisfy, the appeal for more practical preaching and teaching.

It is a subject upon which, if we will, we can constantly teach by example. I have been present at drawing-room meetings for charitable objects where the combined costliness, ugliness, and execrable taste in the furniture roused such a sense of incongruity with the appeals of the speakers that it was well-nigh impossible to listen to the subject seriously amid such surroundings.

The old furniture with which one meets in many a farmhouse kitchen is eloquent in relation to modern tastes and ideas. It is well made and good of its kind; it is eminently useful; it represents a genuine expenditure of life—time, skill, and thought—in its making, and it has ministered to the usefulness of life for generations. And because it is really good, artistic in the best sense, and useful, it is never out of fashion.

Compare it with much with which one meets to-day in the homes of the well-to-do, and especially in the homes of the vulgar rich, or in the homes of those who are not rich, but who apparently strive after show rather than usefulness.

How doubly important is it for those to be careful in this matter whose profession demands that they should set an example! The clergyman's house which reminds us of the worst features of the successful, but uneducated, tradesman is simply an abomination. In the home of the clergyman, if anywhere, we may seek to find proof of the conviction that life does not consist in the abundance of things possessed. Here, if anywhere, one might hope to find "little and good," no superfluities, but only what ministers to usefulness first, and then, if means permit, to usefulness and beauty in combination.

The late Dr. Dale once published a sermon on "The Uses and Perils of Rich Men"—the perils were not to themselves, but to their neighbours. The uses and perils of clergymen with large means would not be an unfruitful subject for

meditation. Most of us could give examples of exceeding usefulness, where a noble sense of stewardship and a wise liberality has ruled the life to the great, and often lasting, benefit of a neighbourhood. Yet some of us know of cases which seem to assert that if it be hard for a rich man, it seems to be still harder for a rich clergyman to live a consistently Christian life. Personally, I could name parish after parish where any spiritual influence there might have been has been more than counteracted by a life which, in its material aspects and surroundings, was very much that of the world.

Above all men the clergy should see that the higher nature—and the mind as a part of that nature—is not starved. Yet if we talk to almost any bookseller to-day whose custom lies among the clergy, he will tell us that the clergy do not buy books as they did in the past. There may be good reasons for reduced expenditure, but are the reductions always made in the wisest direction? A well-filled table and empty bookshelves do not agree with the ideal about “the priests’ lips keeping knowledge.”

The *proportions* of expenditure seem to need more careful adjustment. The junior clergy—the young, the unmarried, and the unbeneficed—are probably better off to-day than ever before. But how is their money spent? One serious item in the expense of a curate is the constantly increasing number of parochial clubs and institutions to which he is expected to subscribe—the cricket, and football, and hockey, and tennis clubs, the young men’s associations, the many parochial tea-parties and excursions, account in the course of a year for a good many five shillings, and for more than an occasional half-guinea. But would not the following be a very valid reason for refusal to accede to at least some of these demands? “A workman cannot work without tools, and a man cannot study without books, and he cannot teach unless he studies.” An additional five pounds a year *well laid out* upon books which he does not put unread upon his shelves, but actually studies, would make an immense difference in the efficiency and knowledge, and so in the teaching power and influence, of many a young clergyman. Such an expenditure, even if it entailed self-sacrifice in other directions, would certainly conduce to the fulness of life. What is true of the clergy is not less true of Church-workers—indeed, of all who, in a materialistic age, wish to exercise influence in a wise direction.

There is no reason why our dress or our surroundings generally should be *ugly*. It is surely possible for our surroundings—and our dress is our nearest “surrounding”—to be at once simple and in good taste. The effect of example in

this matter upon Sunday scholars and upon the poor generally must be great. The rage at present for cheap imitations of fine clothes and fine furniture conduces not only to the setting up of a wrong "standard of value," but is distinctly a spending of money upon that which does not feed our life, and a spending of our labour upon that which brings no permanent satisfaction.

I have surely proved "the need of" what Bishop Westcott calls "the continuous application of Christian principles in regard to personal expenditure."

It does not require a very strong effort of the imagination to see that such an application would very materially conduce to both the greater usefulness and the greater happiness of life. Such a subject, or perhaps, rather, such an appeal, even when treated, as this must to some extent be treated, in detail and with many practical applications, is surely a fitting subject for treatment by the Christian teacher.

W. EDWARD CHADWICK.



ART. VIII.—THE PARABLE OF THE UNJUST STEWARD.

THIS parable has always been a subject of great difficulty to the Biblical critic, who is generally unable to recognise the accepted translation as consonant with the teaching of Christ.

The parable, which in general spirit seems to deprecate dishonest methods, although recognising the ability of their author, ends up with a sentiment which, if the usual translation be correct, absolutely contradicts this inference, suggesting dishonest negotiation as a pattern for the earnest Christian.

The gist of the parable is so well known that it is scarcely necessary to state it in full. Suffice it to say that, after having commended the versatility and resource of the emphatically Unjust Steward, Christ proceeds to recommend the same spirit to His followers, though seeming to contradict His own vital doctrines in morality: "Make to yourselves friends by means of" [Revised Version, or "out of," Authorized Version], "the mammon of unrighteousness."

The whole matter hangs upon the precise meaning of the Greek preposition *ἐκ*. It has always been translated as

referring either to an agent or instrument, or else to an act of separation. Examples of these uses are, of course, common throughout the classics—*ἐκ πολέων τέσσηρες*, “four out of the cities”; or, again, *ἐκ κοινωνίας*, “by means of friendship.” But—and here is the crux of the matter—the preposition *ἐκ* also equals *ἔξω*, “outside of,” “away from,” of which use there are several examples. Not only have we *ἐκ βελέων*, “out of range,” but in a passage of great importance in the “Odyssey” we have *ἔξ ἁλός*. This, if interpreted according to mythology, should mean “away from” the sea; and such a view is by no means contradictory to the prophecy of Tiresias, who bade Odysseus go far inland, there to dwell, and there, incidentally, to die. The other translation given to the preposition *ἐκ* by many commentators, “out of”—*i.e.*, origin—is just as inconsistent with the context as is the interpretation “out of” in the present parable.

If, then, we translate “make to yourselves friends” *away from* “the mammon of unrighteousness,” the point of the parable is rendered many times more striking, and is at the same time a masterful exposition of Christ’s doctrine. Wisdom, as He shows, is an admirable quality, and cannot be neglected by those who live in a practical world. But dishonesty in the slightest degree whatever is reprehensible, and to be avoided. Moreover, the mammon of unrighteousness, being of the earth, is mortal, and will pass away. Therefore, friendship *beyond* the mammon of unrighteousness is that which shall save a man at the last.

The reading *ἐκλίπη* is preferable to *ἐκλιπῆτε*, thus emphasizing the contrast between the transitory nature of terrestrial and the unending value of celestial friendship.

R. L. LESLIE.



Notices of Books.

Modern Biblical Criticism in Reference to the Old Testament. A Paper read at a Ruridecanal Conference. By the Rev. ALEX. NAIRNE, M.A., Rector of Tewin, and Professor of Hebrew in King's College, London. London: S.P.C.K. Pp. 16.

Early in this year the question of the Higher Criticism was placed among the selected subjects submitted to ruridecanal conferences in the St. Albans Diocese, and resolutions upon it were invited. Professor Nairne's paper, read at one of these gatherings, claims some notice because of its publication in tract form by the Christian Knowledge Society. Ruridecanal conferences are ill-suited for the consideration of such a topic. The shortness of the time and inclusion of other business in the proceedings render serious discussion impossible, while a large proportion of the members consists of young curates and lay representatives from the various parishes, few of whom have sufficient acquaintance with the present state of the controversy or with the issues involved. But if such bodies are asked to deliberate and vote upon a matter so vital, it will be admitted that the case should be put properly. The tract before us shows how it should not be put. In the first place, the radical differences between the traditional view of Holy Scripture and the standpoint of the new criticism are altogether unnoticed, the writer taking refuge in the fallacy that "the aim of all criticism is to discover the truth." The word "all" happens to be singularly misleading, since the avowed aim of many leading critics is the elimination of the supernatural. Mr. Nairne tries to meet the objection that our Lord's language about the Old Testament conflicts with "the new views," and prefaces this part of his paper with the following remarks: "Never man spake as He did; never man spake so *scholarly*. In the one event of His boyhood which is recorded He comes before us as a studious boy; and whenever He refers to the Old Testament, He does so with the carefulness of a scholar, as well as with the practical insight of a Saviour of men." It is the first time that we have seen the epithet italicized thus applied, and this condescending commendation of the Son of God as a student and scholar cannot be too strongly reprobated. Notwithstanding the proofs to the contrary in such passages as St. John v. 46 and St. Matt. xxii. 43, we are told that "He names Moses and David, but does not stake the validity of his argument on their authorship." Citing St. Luke xxiv. 45-47, the writer urges that the Risen Saviour "was not quoting definite detailed predictions, but drawing out the ultimate significance of prophetic words." Not only is that a pure assumption, it is irreconcilable with the precise statement about the resurrection on "the third day," and the fact that our

Lord explained to the disciples where His rising on the third day was "written" in the Old Testament Scriptures. To base the rejection of His testimony on the ground of a *kenosis* might have shocked some members of the conference, so its rejection is put on another ground—the plea that the Lord Jesus Christ "did not discuss critical questions." His teaching, therefore, was not at variance with that of the critics, and "criticism has placed the great ideas of the Old Testament" in a "clearer historical setting." *Spargere voces in vulgum ambiguas* just describes this kind of language.

Mr. Nairne suggested to his hearers a plan of study, advising them to study one book of the Old Testament thoroughly. "Of course," he added, "a guide is needed; and lately a most excellent guide has appeared in Dr. Driver's commentary on Genesis." Some of the discussions in that work might be "startling to those who have never given much thought to these matters"; but the commentator's reverence, honesty, and modesty "should save anyone from being pained by them." We can claim to have given a good deal of thought to these matters, and can speak of Dr. Driver's commentary from a close acquaintance with its contents. A more one-sided book has, in our opinion, seldom appeared. Every possible objection against the authenticity of the history is made the most of, every difficulty is magnified, the witnesses on the other side are discredited, and elementary rules of evidence thrown to the winds. A very grave responsibility has been assumed by the Tract Committee of the Society under whose auspices this paper is published. It is surprising that they should thus endorse Mr. Nairne's panegyric on a work entirely destructive of belief in the Bible narrative, and lend their sanction to the statements in his address which we have noticed above. We trust that some explanation will be forthcoming, for their action in the present instance is far from conducive to the interests of Christian knowledge.

The Church of St. Mary the Virgin, Oxford, in its Relations to some Famous Events of English History. By the Rev. HENRY L. THOMPSON, M.A., Vicar of the parish, sometime Student and Censor of Christ Church. Westminster: A. Constable and Co. Pp. 196. Price 3s. 6d.

Many of our English parish churches have memorable histories of their own, but there are only two or three that can compare with St. Mary's in the continuity of its traditions and its connection with great intellectual and religious movements. Mr. Thompson, who acts the part of chronicler with genuine enthusiasm, has produced a fascinating book. We have animated narratives of the settlement of the Friars at Oxford and their dispute with the University, the Lollard troubles, and the trial and condemnation of Cranmer and his fellow-martyrs. The burial at St. Mary's of the ill-fated Amy Robsart gives Mr. Thompson an opportunity of endeavouring to vindicate Leicester. Some other episodes mentioned will be new to the majority of readers. A list of the vicars from Adam de Brome's time might well be appended in a future edition.

Quintin Hogg: A Biography. By ETHEL M. HOGG. With a Preface by the Duke of ARGYLL. Illustrated. London: Archibald Constable and Co. Pp. 419. Price 12s. 6d.

In his "Life and Labour in London," Mr. Charles Booth names the subject of this memoir as one of six men who have in the present generation profoundly influenced the social condition of the Metropolis. The development of a small ragged school, started under most unpromising circumstances, into the Polytechnic Institute, with its 17,000 members, was in itself a noble work for one man to achieve. But even this seems small compared with the extent of the personal influence brought to bear by the founder on the boys and young men to whose welfare he devoted himself. Miss Hogg's biography of her father is all that a biography should be. It is not too long, is not crowded with superfluous details, and tells the story of a remarkable life in an unaffected way. Her father left Eton in 1863, at the age of eighteen, going straight to a house of business in the City, and a deep impression was made upon his mind by the sight of the destitute youths who crossed his path in his walks about the streets. The story of his buying a suit of shoeblack's clothes and outfit, and spending his nights with boys he meant to rescue, may be known to our readers, for it has been often told. After some months he and the present Lord Kinnaird hired a room near Charing Cross, where a ragged school was opened; and much other work was done in the way of visiting and open-air speaking, until Mr. Hogg found it necessary to confine himself to the care of his "boys." What strikes us most in this record of his career is the uniform consistency which characterized his purpose and methods. For almost forty years—up to the moment of his sudden removal in 1903—he spent his days in business, and nearly every one of his evenings in carrying out his philanthropic enterprise. He made a point of knowing all his young people, even when they numbered some thousands instead of a few dozens; and amid his schemes for their intellectual improvement and recreation, their religious teaching was constantly kept in view. When a grant to the Polytechnic was mooted during the sittings of the Royal Commission on Parochial Charities, objections were raised on the score of the religious classes held there; but Mr. Hogg refused to discuss the subject, saying that he would rather forego the grant than abandon an important branch of his work. Many of his letters published in this volume were addressed to members of the Institute, revealing him in the light of guide, philosopher, and friend to all who asked his advice. It was a fitting end to such a life that the call to rest came to him in the building which had long been the scene of his labours, and his last acts of charity were in pathetic harmony with his whole history. "As the Institute was closing," his daughter writes, "on the night of January 16, he stood at the top of the stairs, shaking hands with the members as they passed out, when one passed him very thinly clad. 'Where is your overcoat this cold night, sonny?' The boy answered that he didn't possess one; so, laying a hand on his shoulder,

'Q. H.' detained him, whilst one of the porters went out and obtained a warm coat, into which he buttoned the boy before sending him home." The next morning he was found in his room lying dead, an unfinished letter to a former member on his table. There is little in the biography about politics or contemporary events, but few books could prove more interesting to those who feel the need of social reforms, and we could scarcely have a more graphic picture of the combination of Christianity and citizenship.

The Journal of Theological Studies, No. 21, October, 1904. London: Macmillan and Co. Pp. 160. Price 3s. 6d.

The most interesting article in this number is one by Mr. A. A. Bevan on "The Beliefs of Early Mohammedans respecting a Future Existence." The writer thinks that the subject is little understood by Europeans, maintaining that Mohammed's teaching about the hereafter, far from supplying an easy explanation of his success, proved to have been a great stumbling-block to his contemporaries, and was not entirely accepted by his followers in subsequent times. Arabian poets of an earlier date were never weary of repeating that after death man has nothing further to hope or fear. Reasons are given for concluding that Mohammed's doctrine of a resurrection, apart from his elaboration of it, was mainly derived from Christian beliefs. On the intermediate state of the departed the Koran says little, and ideals wholly foreign to the Koran have found their way into Mohammedan society, coming to be reckoned essential elements of orthodoxy. Some of the evidence collected from Arabic literature is remarkable. A reply to some criticisms in the April *Church Quarterly* on the late Professor R. C. Moberly's books is contributed by his son, who aims at correcting what he considers to be wrong impressions of Dr. Moberly's opinions. Those who have read "Atonement and Personality," or "Ministerial Priesthood," may like to know of the paper. The short studies are a trifle dry this time, with the exception of Mr. J. R. Madan's examination of the meaning of *ἀσμία* in Acts xxvii. 21. He comes to the conclusion that it was a medical term used by St. Luke, signifying "loss of appetite from illness." For such a use of the word an example may be found in the Egyptian papyri (Kenyon's edition, No. 144), where it occurs in a first-century letter. The cause of the illness is ascribed by Mr. Madan not only to distress and anxiety, but to the excessively trying motion of the ship. A contribution on "The Inspiration of the Liturgy," though written from the Roman Catholic point of view, contains some wholesome remarks about the influence of environment upon the Christian life.

Peterborough Sermons. By the late BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT, D.D., D.C.L., Bishop of Durham, sometime Canon of Peterborough. London: Macmillan and Co. Pp. viii+391. Price 6s.

Admirers of Bishop Westcott will welcome the publication of another series of his sermons, thirty-three in number, delivered at Peterborough

between the years 1869 and 1883, when he held a canonry there. Over twenty of these discourses are expository lectures on St. John's Gospel, containing much matter subsequently embodied in the author's commentary. It is most instructive to mark his way of expressing the same thought or treating the same subject in the exposition and commentary respectively. We may mention as an example the sections in the introduction to the latter on St. John's style and his relation to the Synoptic Gospels, which are also considered at length in two of the Peterborough lectures, and in these (though paragraphs here and there are identical) the subjects are presented in a simpler and more rhetorical form. The same may be said of the addresses on our Lord's sayings to the disciples at the Last Supper, which should be compared with the Bishop's notes on St. John xiii.-xvi. The outbreak of the Franco-German War in 1870 gave Dr. Westcott more than one opportunity of expressing his sentiments on the "calamity" which had befallen "the brotherhood of nations." He protested earnestly against the view taken in some quarters that it was a judgment upon France, for "there may be martyred nations as well as martyred men," and deplored the continual craving on the part of the public for news. "In the straining after some new excitement," he observed, "we convert the most overwhelming tragedies of life into food for our passing curiosity. We are impatient for tidings which will enrol one more among the blood-stained names of history. We watch the movements of armies as if they were representing a drama for our amusement. We almost feel ourselves aggrieved if a day fails to add a startling incident to the progress of the action." A sermon at the beginning of 1873, occasioned by the death of Napoleon III., is probably the nearest approach to eloquence ever made by Dr. Westcott, who seems to have been intensely moved by that tragic end of fallen greatness. Several addresses on miscellaneous subjects make up the rest of the volume.

Bible Work and Warfare: A Practical Manual of Bible-Class Work.

By the Rev. FRANK SWAINSON, Vicar of St. Barnabas, Holloway, formerly Curate of All Saints, Sheffield. London: Longmans, Green and Co. Pp. xx+194. Price 2s.

We heartily recommend these stirring chapters, in which Mr. Swainson relates his experiences amongst the artisans of Sheffield, where he was instrumental in forming two large Bible-classes, one for working men and the other for women. He went to Sheffield after having worked for five or six years under the Church Missionary Society as a missionary to the Indians in North-West Canada, and was not long in discovering that a large percentage of his new parishioners were nearly as much strangers to Christianity as his former charges. There was "a strong prejudice against the Church, any amount of indifference, while portions of the neighbourhood were honeycombed with spiritism, commonly known as spiritualism." Mr. Swainson's book is eminently practical, recording conversations with men who attended his meetings, and their freely-expressed ideas on religious questions, along with notes for addresses

and hints on dealing with special cases. He declares his conviction that it is vain to try to reach the masses by entertainments and amusements, there being only one way of getting at them, by bringing home the conviction of sin, and then holding up our Lord as their Saviour. The cause of failure is pronounced to be "lack of faith in the Bible, and a non-realization of its saving power." The author was well qualified to judge of the facts, and we hope that his pages will be widely read.

Some of Life's Gleanings: A Commonplace Book for Churchmen on Protestant Questions of the Day. From the manuscript books of the late Rev. RUSSELL WING, M.A., St. John's College, Oxford. Selected and arranged by the Rev. WARDEN F. STUBBS, M.A. London: Charles T. Thynne. Pp. xx+240. Price 2s.

Mr. Russell Wing, who died in the November of 1901, was long debarred from active work by ill-health, but took a keen interest in current controversies. This volume contains a selection of extracts from his notebooks, and will be found useful both by speakers and writers. Few of the passages are original, many coming from the writings of the older Protestant divines and a variety of modern authors. A still larger number are quotations from articles in the press and reports of speeches, and include numerous memorable utterances of public men to which it is often convenient to refer. Amongst these is the peroration of Lord Eldon's speech in the debate on the third reading of the Emancipation Bill, a wonderfully vigorous deliverance. His warnings on that occasion are as much to the point now as they were then. A paragraph on p. 142, attributed to Cramer, was written by Thomas Becon, and is not given quite accurately. The contents of the book show to what an extent the cause of Protestantism is identified with the maintenance of civil and religious liberty.

