

*Millions*; an account of a Transvaal Women's Prayer Union, which is full of interest, in the Wesleyan *Foreign Field*; the first part of a record of Bible translation in the "Isles that Wait," published in *The Bible in the World*; an interesting sketch of itinerating work in the Wynaad—"After Many Days"—in *India's Women*; and a thoughtful survey of the present "Critical Time in Jewish Missions" in the *Missionary Intelligencer* of the L.J.S. The *Missionary Review of the World* has a long article—to be continued—on "Mormonism To-day and its Remedy," a valuable study of "Religion and Religious Growth in the United States," and a discussion of "The Macedonia Problem and Missions." G.



### Discussions.

[*The contributions contained under this heading are comments on articles in the previous number of the CHURCHMAN. The writer of the article criticized may reply in the next issue of the magazine; then the discussion in each case terminates. Contributions to the "Discussions" must reach the Editors before the 12th of the month.*]

#### "EVANGELICALS AND THE PROBLEM OF RITUAL."

(*The "Churchman," March, 1913, p. 178.*)

Two articles bearing upon this question have appeared in the CHURCHMAN from the pens of the Rev. J. R. Darbyshire and the Rev. E. C. Dewick respectively. Two points, which we all agree to be of pressing importance, appear to be uppermost in their minds: (1) The more successful diffusion of Evangelical principles and "atmosphere" among the younger generation; (2) the preservation of the individuality of the Evangelical party as regards the externals of its worship. In other words, two possibilities are before us—failure to retain our younger people, and failure to preserve our individuality as against that of other parties in the Church. Such failures we are all determined must never be. How, then, can they be averted? Mr. Darbyshire and Mr. Dewick think the remedy to be the adoption of what is popularly known as "ritual," yet ritual with an Evangelical individuality of its own. They take it for granted that such a step is an immediate necessity, would be quite harmless both at present and in future, and is in no way contrary to the best traditions of Evan-

gicalism. In expressing below a doubt as to whether this is so, the writer of the present article does this in, it is hoped, no carping and uncharitable spirit. He knows full well how easy it is to criticize the scheme of another, and how infinitely more complex is the task of the one who launches the proposals embodied therein. He would state his real appreciation of the cautious and thoughtful spirit in which the two former articles were written.

Mr. Darbyshire and Mr. Dewick have put forward a well-thought-out scheme which they believe contains a remedy for the present condition of the external aspect of Evangelical worship. But to the present writer it appears to be a palliative rather than a remedy. The disease needing to be healed is that of want of originality and attractiveness; it is deep-seated, and if it is to be remedied one must eradicate the root-cause. But the reformed ritual proposal, far from reaching successfully the root of the disease, seems to attack it at a point well on in its course. What is termed "Evangelicalism" is but the outward expression of personal beliefs and aspirations; surely, then, the grafting of a different ritual on to our public worship will not make us more original or more attractive Evangelicals!

As an instance of how we are losing younger men, Mr. Dewick cites a certain type of religious lad produced in our own day. He shows how such a lad continues for a while under Evangelical influence, and yet is ultimately lost to us, contending that the cause of such loss is the absence in our churches of an æsthetic ritual whereby he might be attracted. But is this so? Something more than lack of ritual is needed to account for that loss. Let us honestly face the real cause—lack of spiritual power and definiteness in the lives and ways of Evangelicals with whom the lad has been brought in contact, not lack of ceremonial in the services of the Church. The spiritual influence of his Evangelical friends has been too feeble, consequently the standard of their teaching has been too low to awaken and to satisfy his highest aspirations. And thus it is that what might be termed the lower cravings of his nature (amongst which must be placed a taste for the æsthetic or a longing for the outwardly beautiful), having been inadequately brought into contact with the Divine by means of the subjective influence of personal contact and example, cry out instinctively for a lower means of satisfaction—*i.e.*, the objective in religion, as realized in the outward symbols of worship. For this reason, then, a change in ourselves, and not a change in our ritual, appears to be the solution of the problems before us. And for another: Young lads of the type suggested by Mr. Dewick would, if feeling the need of ritual as an aid to worship, infinitely prefer to be surrounded by the associations of a ritual with a wealth of historical and romantic tradition behind it, such as that of the Roman Catholics or Tractarians; it is very improbable that they would be greatly attracted by any new-fangled devices which would approximate to those of the neo-Noncon-

formist type. If, as the writer believes, this is true, then the expedient of adopting a new ritual is not merely an unnecessary but a useless one.

The fact is, no special attention need be paid to ritual as a means of attraction. The whole question is one of personality. A retention on our part of that austerity and dignity rightly indicated by Mr. Darbyshire as characteristic of old-fashioned Evangelicals, together with the addition of rather more loveliness of spirit than they sometimes manifested, will attract our younger people without involving the question of any loss of distinctiveness. And it is a fact of great significance that the records of the history of religion in past ages with one voice bear witness to the principle that the highest type of spiritual life and activity is found hand in hand with the minimum of ritual in worship. Take, for example, the condition of things in the early Christian Church. Worship was then carried on in the bare surroundings of the Catacombs. Emblems of our Lord there were, but these found no place in that worship; yet never since those days has the Church been endued with such power as then. Or, to advance many centuries along the stream of time, recollect worship and work as they existed in the time of the early Evangelicals. If it be true that the eyes of the early Christians rested daily upon the outwardly beautiful and splendid in their ancient cities, the same may be said here. A little over a hundred years ago Evangelicalism numbered among its adherents many of the gently nurtured. But, accustomed as they were to that standard of refinement and of the delicate and artistic which had been reached in their day, they appear to have been content with, and even desirous of, worship in the barest of churches. Such worship, carried on under such external conditions, undoubtedly brought out the highest and noblest that was in them—for this reason, that those who ministered to them had realized in so wonderful a way, and had led their people so to realize, the beauty of holiness, that neither minister nor people, caught up in this attitude to meet the Lord, ever troubled themselves greatly as to the beauty or otherwise of the building in which they worshipped.

If it be urged that the above argument is weak owing to the advance in culture and refinement which has taken place since the periods mentioned, the writer would answer that ritual has no greater power of attraction now than it had then, other things being given. Personality, humanly speaking, is to-day just as it has ever been—the rousing and uplifting factor among men. People of all tastes, temperaments, and shades of opinion will rally round an eloquent preacher, undeterred by the external aspect of his church-worship. It was personality very fully indwelt by God's Holy Spirit which made Evangelicalism in the past a far greater power to change sinful hearts and to fill churches than it is at present. And nothing less than such personality will accomplish the same blessed work to-day. In fact, it is the recovery

of this which is essential to the continued existence of Evangelicalism as a spiritual force in the Church of England. In other words, we must go through a season of refreshing and revival from the Lord, and be filled with greater earnestness, fire, and fervour; we must once more be enrolled as prophets of the Lord, distinguished by the two marks of a prophet—(i.) certainty as to our message, (ii.) contact with the Giver of it.

NORMAN BAPTIE.

“THE DECIDING VOICE OF THE MONUMENTS.”

(*The “Churchman,” March, 1913, p. 239.*)

Will you allow me space for a brief consideration of a recent review of “The Deciding Voice of the Monuments in Biblical Criticism,” a book of which I am the author? It will do much to avoid misunderstandings, which unfortunately already exist, to note at the outset that the book is a discussion of the thesis embodied in its title, “The Deciding Voice of the Monuments in Biblical Criticism.” The discussion is divided into three parts. Part I. is to show that the monuments have by right the deciding voice wherever they have anything definite to say upon Biblical subjects. Part II. gives a comprehensive résumé of the deciding of critical questions by archæological evidence. Part III. touches the salient points of the outline of Biblical history as it at present appears in the light of archæological evidence. The large amount of archæological material in the book is distributed throughout as illustrative facts—evidence, indeed—to establish the thesis announced in the title. This evidence is brought to bear upon a large number of the problems of the Old Testament which are just now of paramount importance in the Biblical world: the geographical and topographical trustworthiness of Scripture; the relation between the mysterious Hyksos Kings and the Patriarchs; the semi-barbarous condition of Palestine in Patriarchal times, and the impossibility of high religious ideas among the Patriarchs; the evolution of Israel’s religion from a Palestinian origin and environment; the gradual invasion of Palestine; the comparative unimportance of Moses as a law-giver; the naturalistic origin of Israel’s religion from astral myths; and the late authorship of the Pentateuch, etc.

The reviewer does not agree with the conclusions of the book; I am at least sure of this, however wrong he thinks me to be in some other of my opinions. Now, I am not averse to criticism. I think I rather enjoy it. We learn far more from those who criticize us than from those who praise our work. Then I stand for the truth at all hazards. If it is not with me, I shall be glad to find who has it. I will express no opinion concerning the reviewer’s work, but some brief consideration of the points which he mentions in criticism of my

book will enable the reader of the *CHURCHMAN* to decide for himself whether or not the reviewer's strictures affect the argument and conclusions of the book, even supposing that the exceptions are all well taken.

The general charges made by the reviewer are very clear and specific: inadequate equipment of the author, improper use of archæological materials, and weakness of logic—enough to make an end of any book, if sustained. The tone of the review is in the main exceedingly courteous, and the recognition of the sincerity of the author frank. The first two of the charges seem to be considered together, as follows:

1. He says that "at the outset the author complains that Biblical archæology has not had an adequate place assigned to it in recent Bible dictionaries, and, among other instances, he puts forward the 'Encyclopædia Biblica' as an offender." That would have been worthy of the sharpest criticism, if I had really said or implied that this great dictionary made little reference to archæological materials. The reviewer seems altogether to have missed the subject of the passage to which he refers. It is not "Biblical archæology," as he says, but "the function of archæology in criticism." On pp. 11, 12 I say: "Biblical archæologists generally, until the most recent, have not given this subject a place at all." Under this I cite, among many others, the "Encyclopædia Biblica," and note the fact that it is so far from discussing this subject that the very word "archæology" does not occur in the index. Sentences might be taken from the passage which, aside from the context, would give the sense presented by the reviewer, but this is not the sense of the passage.

2. The reviewer is disturbed because I rarely give "any hint of the fact that the methods of Biblical criticism are the ordinary methods of literary and historical criticism applied to the Bible, only *after* their value had been proved in other fields." In what "other fields" than the field of old literatures has the method of parcelling out a literature between different authors been applied? In what field of living literature has it ever been even tried where it would be possible immediately and finally to prove its value—or disprove it? I know that in one great modern University this method in the department of Biblical literature has been the butt of ridicule of the departments of living literatures.

3. The reviewer quotes from my book (p. 38): "Yet the spade of Petrie at Abydos, of Evans at Knossos, and of Schliemann at Troy has revealed the 'cloudland' as solid earth, and shown the ghostly heroes to have been substantial men of flesh and blood," and adds: "If by the last phrase he means 'historical characters,' two out of three of his examples are wrong. Flinders Petrie has demonstrated the historical character of Menes; but Dr. Evans, while revealing the

background of early Greek legend and demonstrating the historicity of its broad outline, has never ventured to suggest that the characters of that legend have been proved historical; and Schliemann's wild identifications of his discoveries with Homeric characters have never been taken seriously by responsible scholars." Well, if the "broad outline" of the legend of Knossos is historic, is it historic with characters other than "flesh and blood"? It has not been the custom to consider the doings of such ghostly folk as historic. Then I do not in my book endorse Schliemann's identification of particular Greek heroes, but only the fact that his discoveries had turned the story of Troy from legend to substantial history. Was a real city of houses and walls built and its history enacted by creatures of "cloudland," or by "substantial men of flesh and blood"?

My statement that "the Philistines are still to-day as great a mystery as were the Hittites a few years ago," which seems to amaze the reviewer so much, may well be left to the intelligent reader for consideration. Statements in Egyptian records, combined with those from Crete, have been thought by some to shed light upon the Philistines. Perhaps it is so. I am quite in accord with the reviewer in the hope that it may be so, but I am quite as much amazed at his confident assertion that it is so, as he is at the cautiousness of my statement quoted above. Moreover, if he proves to be right, I will be as glad as he, and the argument of my book will not be affected in the least. I will be glad to substitute his statement for my own. If my argument be disturbed by new truth, so much the worse for the argument.

4. Concerning the Hittite remains at Boghatz-Keui, I quite agree in the main with the reviewer in his statement. In fact, I could substitute his statement for my own in my book, without changing the argument or conclusion in the least. The only difference between us is in the statement of the facts. The great treasure of tablets found "in" Boghatz-Keui by Winckler were, as the reviewer insists, and as I intended to say, written in cuneiform script. My statement of what was brought to light "at" Boghatz-Keui was intended to cover a larger area than the village itself. In the exceeding brevity of the statement I do not seem to have made my meaning entirely clear. Whatever obscurity exists there I will endeavour to remove in the next edition.

5. The reviewer thinks I have placed the Hyksos in Egypt too early. The positiveness with which he claims "the entrance of these foreigners into Egypt after 1800 B.C." will astonish a good many. Even supposing that the dates derived from Cretan discoveries are absolutely correct, who can certify that the notice of the Hyksos so dated was really the first "entrance of these foreigners into Egypt"? I am quite willing to say that I am very cautious about determining facts so positively from ancient chronology in its present condition.

I have tried in my book to get the facts in proper order and synchronism, feeling confident that when this is done the chronology will be found to be correct—in short, to test ancient chronology by the order and synchronism of events, rather than the events by the uncertainties of chronology beyond the middle of the second millennium B.C.

Then it seems to me that there will be as many Assyriologists to dispute the reviewer's date for Hammurabi as there are Egyptologists to dispute my date for the Hyksos. Apparently he accepts, as I do, the new date for Hammurabi, which brings down the former "fixed" date for that King about three hundred years. Yet there are those who utterly repudiate that change, and still put Hammurabi 2100-2200 B.C.

The reviewer's criticisms of my discussion of the earliest Babylonian civilization is utterly unjust; but as what he says is almost entirely insinuation, it is very difficult to reply to it. I only ask the reader to consider what he says in conclusion: "Here is confirmation indeed! But he forgets to point out that Cush, if it means anything in the Old Testament, means Ethiopian; while archæology is equally clear that, if we know anything about Sumerian origins, that race was Mongolian in its affinities. The link needed by Dr. Kyle which would make the Ethiopians Mongolians has yet to be forged." And then read this, from p. 196 of my book, which is everything *I say on the subject*: "The first Babylonian civilization, according to the Bible, was Hamitic, by a son of Cush. According to archæological research it was Sumerian, or Accadian, but who the Sumerians or Accadians were archæology answers not, except that they *were not Semitic people*. They had not a Semitic language, and their faces are not at all those of Semites." I simply state the facts—and they are the facts—without comment. I do not hesitate to face the facts, whether they look like confirmation or like contradiction. I am a firm believer in the security of the truth.

I have now noticed every one of the strictures of the reviewer, and, with the single exception of some possible obscurity in my statement concerning the Hittites (I thank him for pointing it out), not one of them is founded upon undoubted fact where he speaks of matters of fact, or a correct representation of the book where he discusses it. Presumably he has chosen what he considered the worst errors, so that the others may be regarded as negligible. The reader of the review, who had not seen the book, might well be wondering if it consisted entirely of isolated, incidental references to archæological discoveries, so little does the reviewer touch upon the real purpose of the book or the problems with which it deals. There are great problems before the Biblical world to-day; there are different views concerning the correct solution of those problems. I have the utmost respect for the many honest scholars who reach very different conclusions from myself. Eventually we will all find the truth and move on to other problems;

but may I be allowed to express the opinion that we will not arrive at agreement concerning the truth by plucking the mote out of our brother's eye, but by a calm consideration of each other's arguments on the questions at issue?

Of the reviewer's charge against the logic of my argument I need say very little. If one's logic does not defend itself, it is incapable of defence; and especially if it cannot be defended by more logic of the same kind. I will only ask the readers of the *CHURCHMAN* to examine my argument and judge it for themselves; and at the same time I would remind the reviewer that he who challenges another man's logic does by that challenge put his own logic on trial, and that the multitude in the great amphitheatre of public opinion will decide the issue by thumbs up or thumbs down.

M. G. KYLE,  
*Kenia Theological Seminary.*

### THE TEACHING OF JESUS ON DIVORCE.

(*The "Churchman," April, 1913, p. 280.*)

In discussing, in the last two numbers of the *CHURCHMAN*, the problem of the discrepancy between the qualified prohibition of divorce by our Lord, as recorded in Matt. v. 32, xix. 9, and the absolute prohibition recorded in Mark x. 11, Luke xvi. 13, Canon Ford assumes (p. 259) that the death penalty for adultery was obsolete in His time. Was this, however, the case? The narrative in John viii. 1-11, which is generally considered authentic, certainly implies the contrary; and in the "Jewish Encyclopædia," vol. i., p. 217, it is stated that the death penalty was abolished among the Jews in the year 40, before the destruction of the Second Temple. But if this is so, it would have been as inept for our Lord to have mentioned in His teaching adultery as a ground of divorce as it would be among ourselves to lay down that marriage could be dissolved for murder. In either case the infliction of the legal punishment would sever the marriage bond without recourse to divorce. When, however, the death penalty was abolished, the writer of the First Gospel may not unnaturally have considered that he would more accurately represent our Lord's meaning if he expressed the exception which the state of the law implied when our Lord's words were actually uttered. If this is the correct solution of the problem, it supports Canon Ford's contention that the Church is not precluded by her Master's teaching from holding that marriage may be dissolved for adultery. In the exercise of her power of binding and loosing, she thinks fit to adopt that position. Whether, however, in the interests of morality, it is wise for either Church or State to accord unrestricted liberty of remarriage to an adulterous *divorcée*, and especially of remarriage with the partner of his or her sin, is an entirely

different question, upon which we may well come to an opposite conclusion from that at which Canon Ford has arrived (p. 260).

P. V. SMITH.

### THE OPIUM QUESTION.

(*The "Churchman," March, 1913, p. 167.*)

There are some questions of supreme importance to humanity which for many years fail to gain the public ear, perhaps because of remoteness or unfamiliarity to the many. These questions are left to a small minority of the public who make a special study of them, and with difficulty, and in the face of much discouragement, strive to prevent such important matters from being entirely ignored.

A question of this kind, until a few years ago, was the opium question ; now, however, it has come to the front, and, it may be added, it has come to stay. To-day there are few more living questions. Interest in the opium problem, however, has hitherto been mainly concentrated on China, but the International Conference on Opium at the Hague in 1911 has lifted the question to the rank of that international and world-wide importance to which it is entitled. This wider aspect is to be discussed on April 24 at a conference called by the Society for the Suppression of the Opium Trade, in Caxton Hall, Westminster, to which representation of a large number of Church and Nonconformist societies and philanthropic bodies are invited. In the meantime I would like to open a discussion on the more limited—*i.e.*, the Chinese—part of the question. Space will not allow me to deal adequately with the amazing development of the opium problem in China and its strange and disconcerting results to British policy, but I feel I may take for granted that readers of the CHURCHMAN are more or less familiar with the recent history of the subject. These developments should be closely followed by those who have the cause of Christianity in China at heart, and who are concerned for the honour of our country.

A good deal of attention has been paid to certain articles in the *Times*, to which reference was made in the CHURCHMAN last month, suggesting that China is less desirous of protecting her people from the ravages of opium than of getting the profits of the trade away from foreigners and into her own hands. Instances are given of poppy being planted in several districts again, the Government being unable or unwilling to put it down. No one denies that during the revolution many persons took advantage of the prevailing inevitable chaos to begin growing the poppy again ; the high prices which opium was sold for constituted a temptation which it is not likely no one would give way to. But the thing that is wonderful is not that there was *some* return to opium growing, but that there was so little. Evidence has been pouring in upon us as to the strenuous efforts to suppress the growth

and consumption of opium, and the drastic legislation (whatever we may think of it from an ethical point of view) dealing with those who transgress certainly points to sincerity.

Perhaps the best answer to the one-sided statements of the Peking correspondent (not Dr. Morrison's, whose knowledge and experience of China made his contributions to the *Times* so invaluable, but his successor's), may be found in the same paper in another column, when it was stated that two more Chinese provinces had just been added to the list of those which have shown to the satisfaction of British officials that they are clear of opium; while three more were awaiting inspection so that all might claim the privilege (?) of being allowed to exclude Indian opium.

To those who are constantly studying the subject nothing seems so clearly demonstrable as the sincere desire of the Chinese—their passionate desire—to be freed from the curse of opium, whether native or foreign. When the Chinese authorities—to the consternation of the opium merchants—seized seven chests of opium at Anking, the property of Chinese subjects, they did not store it up for future illicit use or sale, but publicly destroyed it. Surely this shows that whether or no they are breaking the spirit of the treaty by such actions, they are at all events sincere. No charge of discrimination in favour of native as against foreign opium has been maintained against the authorities.

Those who oppose the opium traffic deplore that a treaty should still exist which forces China to admit Indian opium even in reduced quantities. It is true that the trade will die out in five years' time; but the iniquity of such a treaty, acquiesced in gladly enough perhaps by China as the best terms she could get, stands out every year more glaringly as we watch the magnificent struggle of this pagan people to rid themselves and their nation of a vice, the destructiveness of which they know far better than any others.

No doubt the problem is a difficult one with which the British Government is faced. Is China to be kept to her bargain?—a bargain which the opium merchants relied upon when they bought up all the opium they could lay hands on in the hope of selling it again at fabulous prices to the opium victims. The Indian Government has profited by this so-called "windfall," and has devoted it to purposes of education—worthy enough, no doubt, like all the uses to which the opium revenue has been put during all these years in which China has been urged to allow the trade, but none the less "the price of blood."

The Government has to decide between the claims of India and of the opium merchants. It must also reckon with China—the new China—and last, but not least, with our own national honour. But difficulties of this kind are precisely such as statesmen are bound to face and solve. It is for the British public to give all the encouragement and stimulus they can to all efforts for a worthy solution, and,

above all, it is for those of us who believe in Christian ideals to demand that the problem shall be solved in a way that does not run counter to those ideals. China has had reason enough to think ill of Great Britain as a "Power"; but if there is one hopeful feature in all this sordid and sorry history it is surely that the best and most patriotic amongst the Chinese do recognize that, whatever reform has come about, and whatever sympathy shown to China—and there has been much, as we know—it has been inspired by our Christian ideals; and thus, as we hope, "the appeal of China to Christ" has not gone altogether unanswered.

A. CONSTANCE DAVIES,  
*Hon. Sec. Church Anti-Opium Committee.*



### Notices of Books.

THE MEANING OF CHRISTIANITY. By the Rev. F. A. M. Spencer, M.A.  
London: *T. Fisher Unwin.* Price 7s. 6d. net.

Mr. Spencer, like the authors of "Foundations" and others, believes in the necessity for restatement. He knows that criticism has dealt hardly with the Bible, and has shown that much of it is the product of beliefs and ways of thought current in a bygone age, but long since out of date. Therefore "we must not take the theology of the Bible without alteration as the foundation of our theology." Similarly, the dogmas and theology of the early centuries of Christianity represent the endeavour of early Christians to construct a theology by means of current thought, and these also need criticism and modification. With these premises probably every thoughtful man is to some extent in agreement, and he is therefore prepared to consider sympathetically any attempt to translate traditional beliefs into language which will make them more acceptable and intelligible to men of the present day. The danger of all restatement is that only such part of traditional belief will be restated as happens to fall in with dominant modes of thought at the moment. Hereby it often happens that the new expression is as much or far more open than the old to the charge of being a creature of its age. And, what is worse, the many-sided character of all truth about Divine things falls out of sight. Now, with however much sympathy we read Mr. Spencer's attempt to restate, we cannot feel that he has escaped these dangers; and with however great a consciousness of possible defects in the old, we still feel that "the old is better." Mr. Spencer expounds in lucid language his views on God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, sin, the Atonement, the doctrine of grace, the institutions of Christianity, the end of the world, the Resurrection, the Judgment, the Kingdom of God. It is impossible within the present limits to follow him in all these topics. The chapters on Christ and the Atonement may serve as illustrations of the rest, and Mr. Spencer shall speak for himself.

On p. 150 he says: "We found that the traditional conception of Christ was involved in certain difficulties arising from the progress of science.