

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

October, 1912.

The Month.

The Season
of Congresses.

THE month of October may be taken to mark the final termination of the holiday season, and the beginning of the winter's work. In these days there is an increasing tendency to dedicate some part of the vacation period to conferences, the number of which has been, of late, unusually large. Already the Congress of Universities has met in London, drawing its representatives from all parts of the British Empire. The International Eugenics Conference gathered its members from a still wider field, as did also the Congress of Mathematicians recently assembled at Cambridge. Before these pages are in print the Trades' Union Congress and the British Association will have gathered and dispersed. In some cases the topics discussed at these gatherings appeal mainly to experts, and have little interest for the outside world. In other cases the matter in debate has a very direct bearing on the practical realities of life, and it may not be untimely before the period of discussion finally recedes into the past to ask ourselves which topics, if any, of those which have been propounded should engage the serious practical attention of Christians in general and Churchmen in particular. Conferences are not intended to be mere displays of rhetoric. They miss their object unless they can so stimulate and inform public opinion as to lead to useful and appropriate action.

We have already tried to indicate in these pages **The Problem of the Unfit.** the points in the Congress of Universities which were of special interest to Christian workers and to Christian statesmen. We wish to point out here that many of the problems raised at the Eugenics Congress are connected with matters which cannot possibly be ignored. What are we to do with the feeble-minded, the constitutionally criminal, with those who are absolutely unfit to take any healthy and effective part in life at all? Are we simply to ignore and neglect them? Simply to punish and confine them when they break out in some way more distressing than usual? Or is it more kind to them and much more helpful to the body politic to give our serious attention to well-thought-out schemes for confinement and segregation? We are not speaking now—it need hardly be said—of those who could be improved in character and standing by Christian and brotherly care. There is a residuum which cannot be left absolutely free, and the problem is how to deal with this residuum in a wise and Christian spirit. We have to guard ourselves, on the other hand, against the idea that if the race is physically sound, all is absolutely well with it. The world of life and spirit would, indeed, be poorer if there were subtracted from it all the noble living and high achievement that has often been accomplished by men and women whose health was frail and whose bodies were diseased.

The British Association. Unless we are careful and keep our heads, the discussion of this year's British Association may mean a recrudescence of the old stupid controversy between religion and science. Professor Schäfer disclaims any scientific foundation for the view of supernatural intervention in the first production of life. Immediately thoughtlessness exclaims, science denies the supernatural origin of life. The real truth is—and both men of science and men of faith, so far as both are thoughtful, admit it—science, as science, has nothing to do with the supernatural. When science has finished its researches and completed its survey of phenomena, there is still

left a mystery which demands God. Forty years ago evolution startled the Christian Church, and the timid feared for the faith. But we have realized that evolution is but a description of method ; it is not a discovery of origin. We shall be foolish indeed if to-day we are startled by chemistry. Life may be reduced to a synthesis of certain elements, brought together by chemical process. We are not chemists, and we must leave the criticism of the theory to those who are. But granting the theory for a moment, we must postulate a Great Chemist behind all things, or we are driven back to the old discredited theory of a fortuitous concatenation of atoms. Years ago men held a mechanical view of the universe which made God a Great Carpenter. Professor Schäfer, if he can substantiate his theory, will make Him a Great Chemist. These are matters of God's method, and we must listen to science. For us God is the great Originator of all things. They may use different languages, but both science and religion demand this. It matters little to our faith in the God who is our Father, whether He brought all things into immediate existence by the expression of His Will, or whether He created by a large process of evolution or, indeed, by a series of chemical syntheses.

Professor Schäfer holds out the hope that some

*The Origin
of Life.* day some chemist in some laboratory may make "life." The hope is not new, and it has been disappointed again and again. The "life" thus made will be but a tiny morsel of "colloidal slime," a speck of jelly with some living function. What then? We shall have taken one step further back in the solution of the problem, and we shall meet mystery again, and as we look forward we shall find mystery even more mysterious. Manufacture your "colloidal slime," and you may have discovered a secret of method, you have not really advanced one single step to the discovery of origin. Bishop Welldon has put the position in the right perspective when he writes :

"After all, the more you can prove the possibility of producing or arranging the conditions of life without producing life itself the more mysterious

life becomes. While I welcome the speculations of the president, and shall still more welcome the amazing results which his speculations foreshadow—if ever they come to pass—I do not think he has at present shed much light upon the greatest of all mysteries.

“It seems to me that science in all its departments, great as its achievements have been, has stood, and still stands, baffled at the door of creation. No doubt the principle of evolution, which has bridged so many gulfs in nature, not unreasonably suggests the prospect of bridging the gulf between animate and inanimate nature, or between life and lifelessness—even, if I may not say, between life and death.

“I am afraid that the key of the great problem still remains, and is likely to remain, in the hands of Providence. There is nothing in Professor Schäfer’s address which ought to excite the slightest opposition or uneasiness in the mind of any Christian. Man is what he is, not what he was. His powers are such as they are, not such as they were; and Professor Schäfer is himself careful to distinguish between life, which he calls a problem of matter, and the soul, upon which all the spiritual aims and aspirations of humanity are centred.”

Just one point more. In his last paragraph *Life and Soul*. Bishop Welldon notices that Professor Schäfer distinguishes between life as a problem of matter and life as a problem of spirit. It is an all-important distinction, as our modern philosophers—men who have just as much right to be heard as scientists—Eucken, Bergson, and Croce, are in various ways trying to teach us. We doubt if chemists will ever be able to make life, we certainly cannot go to the laboratory of the physicist for “soul.” A modern novel has talked of the “Soul-shop.” The phrase has an irreverent note about it, but it is a break from materialism, and therein is its hope. The daily papers have in the main struck a true note upon this question, and we venture to quote a paragraph from a leading article in the *Daily Mirror* which puts our point :

“More life the scientist reveals to us: does he give us more life, the only life that matters to us, *our* life, the life of man, and of the soul in him?

“He patches us up, and we thank him; he wards pain from our bodies, and we are pleased; he fits up our life with many useful devices, for which occasionally we make him rich. And now, perhaps, he will make more life for us out of the elements. Only let us be clear about that ambiguous word. The ‘life’ he will make will not be of any importance to us, because it will not be a deepening of quality in the soul.

“And so—it’s a commonplace—all the manipulations and discoveries, the blendings and dissections, leave that presiding critical soul-life apart and

unattracted. Something beautiful, something good, is more to us than something new and curious. Thus, after the promise of more life from the chemist, one recalls with another kind of curiosity that similar claim which had reference to the sphere chemists never touch—that mysterious Word of ‘I am come that ye might have life and have it more abundantly.’”

Yes, He is the Life, and modern science, at its truest, has never yet threatened to deny or to supersede His claim.

Slavery in
Portuguese
West Africa.

Besides the debates of Congresses, a matter of grave urgency which has arisen during the last month is the question of Slavery in Portuguese West Africa. The Anti-Slavery and Aborigines Protection Society has done its best to present to the world the state of things in the Portuguese Islands of San Thomé and Principe, and the efforts of the Society have been seconded with ability and determination by our contemporary the *Spectator*. In a recent letter to that paper the Portuguese Minister in London has tried to show that the statements of the Anti-Slavery and Aborigines Protection Society have been “victoriously and triumphantly refuted.” The *Spectator*, however, by reference to, and quotation from, a Parliamentary White Paper published during August, has no difficulty in showing that this statement is quite misleading, and that under thinly-veiled forms the cruel reality of slavery is practised in these islands, for which, it must be remembered, Great Britain has made herself responsible by treaty. As the *Spectator* remarks, it would, indeed, make our ancestors turn in their graves if some other Power were to take in hand the suppression of slavery in these islands, and Great Britain were to find herself fighting in defence of it. And how would Evangelicals, who claim to trace their ancestry from the “Clapham” sect, appear in the matter?

Two Grave
Problems.

During the month of August there have appeared in the *Times* two articles of the profoundest interest to all those who have at heart the further extension of Christianity. One was from the special correspondent in Tokyo, who contemplates with grave concern

the condition of Japan in the coming days. The last fifty years of constructive statesmanship have been an era of *Meiji*, or Enlightenment, with a system of disciplined patriotism, having the Emperor for its pivot. Now that pivot has been removed, and if the welfare of Japan is to rest on a secure basis, many of its statesmen see that the coming era must be one of *Taisho*, or Righteousness. In the effort to secure this, some of them meditate forming a composite religion that shall incorporate the best elements in all existing creeds. Such a scheme is in itself a pathetic expression of the need for "the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ." The other article, which deals with Pan-Islamism, depicts in clear and somewhat lurid outline the determined efforts that are being made for world-wide revival of Islamism. The Italian War and British co-operation with Russia in Persia are being treated as exhibitions of Christian hostility to Islam. Christians may well pray earnestly that our diplomatists and statesmen may be divinely guided, so that the already great difficulties which hinder the winning of the Moslem world for Christ may not be increased by far-reaching international complications.

General Booth. "The General has laid down his sword." So was it announced to the world that one of the most striking figures in our religious and social life had passed to his rest. In many ways his methods and his beliefs were not ours; but he knew Christ, he understood human nature, and he lived to serve. It was only slowly that the world began to understand and appreciate him. Charlatan, impostor, fanatic—so men used to call him. He went on with his work unheeding, despite opposition, despite misunderstanding, despite, of late years, serious physical disability. To the credit of the world, he came into his inheritance in the esteem of men before he died. Oxford gave him her chiefest honour years ago, the King and Queen spoke for England as they sent messages of sympathy to the quiet chamber of his sleeping, and the citizens of London, headed by their First Magistrate, doffed their hats in respectful

silence as he passed to his burying. He ignored opposition or misrepresentation, though we know not what it cost him; but he rejoiced in the sunshine of appreciation that came to him in his latter days, and truly he deserved it.

It is not the time fully to estimate his character or discuss his work in detail. William Booth was a gift of God to his generation; he had his faults, but his hunger for the souls of men—ay, and for the welfare of their bodies—his splendid all-absorbing efforts, his versatile genius in the doing of his work, his determined perseverance that never brooked a hindrance, made him one of the world's strong men, one of the benefactors of his race. Thank God for him! A freelance, priest of no church, yet an autocrat within his own communion, he presents a problem to mere ecclesiasticism; yet even ecclesiasticism began to understand him, and his life amid all its many services will do this—it will tend to break down some of the old exclusiveness which has hindered the progress of the Catholic Church.

To the September number of the *Treasury* Evangelicals and Vestments. Canon Simpson contributes a thoughtful and deeply interesting article on "The Real Presence." Towards the end of it he says:

"The more Evangelical we are, the more real should the Sacrament become. The more strongly we believe in justification by faith, the more ready should we be to mark out the Holy Communion, which is the epitome of the Gospel, as the core of all our worshipful acts. Evangelicals ought to be the first to desire that its celebration should be accompanied with the use of vestments which, by contrast with those employed for the lesser and subordinate services, distinguish it as the characteristic rite of Christ's Gospel."

This counsel comes from one who is, we believe, a friend to the Evangelical school of thought, and who shares some, at any rate, of its distinctive tenets. It is, therefore, in all friendliness that we point out in reply how true Evangelicalism *does* "mark out" the Eucharist, but *not* at the expense of the preaching of the Word. It is no mark of a genuine Evangelical

to belittle the Sacrament of the Holy Communion. With regard to the use of a particular vestment, the obvious reply is not far to seek. We may preface it by a quotation from Canon Simpson's article on "The Lord's Supper" in the new "Prayer-Book Dictionary." He there says :

"The Supper of the Lord, and the Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass, was the title affixed to the reformed Liturgy in the First Prayer-Book of Edward VI. (1549). The last few words disappeared from the Second Prayer-Book (1552), and have never been revived, not because the term *Mass* is in itself objectionable, nor because the rite, as now celebrated, was regarded as essentially different from that for which provision was made in the mediæval Missal, *but because associations had gathered round its use which it was desirable to break.*"

We have italicized the last words because they exactly express our objections, not only to the *Mass*, but to the *Mass* vestments. They are associated with a doctrine of the Holy Communion which the Church of England has explicitly repudiated. Into the abstract question of *a* distinctive vestment there is no need to enter, because it is not a matter of practical politics. The only vestments it is suggested we should employ are the *Mass* vestments, and the associations which have gathered round them are such that we firmly believe their use to be an obstacle and a hindrance to any true conception of the Holy Communion.



Apostolic Succession: A Vision of Unity.

BY THE REV. H. COLIN WALKER, M.A.

IN the consideration of the subject of Apostolic Succession, there are two primary points which must be kept distinct. The first we may call the fact; the second, a deduction which has been drawn from the fact.

1. It is accepted as sufficiently proved that there has existed from the very first one form of ordination for presbyters in the Christian Church—viz., that the Apostles, in appointing them, laid their hands upon them, and that these presbyters, or certain ones of their number specially set apart for the purpose, in their turn ordained others; so that in the Church to-day there exists an order of ministers appointed in unbroken succession from the times of the Apostles. We find in Clement of Rome's Epistle to Corinthians these words: "The Apostles had provided carefully for a perpetual succession, that, when those died whom they themselves had ordained, others from them might take up their ministry."¹

It does not much matter for our present point whether at first this succession was maintained by the laying on of the hands of the whole College of Presbyters, as we find was the case in the Church of Alexandria in the third century, or whether the office was conferred by the head of the College of Presbyters only, but with the assistance of the other presbyters present on the occasion, as is done in the Church of England at the present day. Very possibly the two customs existed side by side for a long time. It was not till the fourth century, as Lightfoot says,² that the power of ordination was confined to the Bishop; it was the culmination of a long period of development of the Bishop's power. In the New Testament the terms "Bishop" and "presbyter" are interchangeable; but since it was inevitable that the head of the presbyters should very soon be regarded as a person of

¹ Ep. Cor., ch. xliv.

² "Philippians," p. 233.

special importance, we are not surprised to find that as early as the beginning of the second century, this head came to be regarded as a person apart, and that the three orders of Bishop, Presbyter, and Deacon, had come to be clearly defined.

The distinctive office of Bishop was first clearly recognized in Asia Minor, and, from the close connection of St. John with that part of the world, it is not unreasonable to suppose that the evolution of the system had at least Apostolic sanction, if not Apostolic authority. But even before St. John's connection with Ephesus we find Timothy appointed by St. Paul¹ to the virtual office of Bishop, if not the name, by the laying on of hands, and Titus similarly appointed, with the instruction to appoint presbyters² in the same way as St. Paul had appointed him. Such is the beginning of the system which has continued in the Church to the present day, and though, as the Bishop of Durham has said, our claim for authority for the system is "an inference drawn from inferences, and based at the last resort on a presupposition,"³ the evidence for the antiquity of the system, coupled with the benefits which history shows to have been derived from it, are sufficient to convince the unbiassed mind of the Apostolic origin of the fact, and the desirability of continuing the system.

2. But having acknowledged the fact, we come to the deduction that has been drawn from the fact. That deduction is, that only one who has been thus admitted to the presbyterate is qualified to exercise certain functions in the Church of Christ. The deduction is based on the assumption that one thus admitted by the laying on of hands is not only appointed as the Church's representative for performing those functions, but by the act of laying on of hands receives a supernatural power, technically called the "grace of orders," which one not so ordained does not possess. As members of the Church of England, we are entitled, according to our Article VI., to demand that proof for the deduction shall be furnished in Holy Scripture before

¹ 2 Tim. i. 6.

² Titus i. 5.

³ Speech at Edinburgh Missionary Conference.

we are asked to accept it as a matter of faith. However useful the system may be, however great the authority for it in the history of the early Church, we are not compelled to accept the deduction as *an essential of faith*; still less are we justified in demanding it as an essential from those who differ from us, unless we have reasonable grounds for proof of it in Holy Scripture. My feeling is that, on grounds of Article VI., we need more evidence before we can insist on the theory of the grace of orders being accepted as *an essential* by others who do not see eye to eye with us on all points.

Now, I think it will be accepted as a fact that those who insist most strongly on the acceptance of the deduction from the fact connect it with the sacrificial idea of the priesthood. It is because it is claimed that the priest has the power of offering sacrifice in the Eucharist that none but a priest episcopally ordained can be allowed to celebrate the Eucharist. Let it not be supposed that I wish so to misrepresent the school from which I differ as to suggest that they really claim to offer in Holy Communion the body and blood of Christ as an atoning sacrifice; though I must confess that it requires more education, time, and thought, than the average layman can give to distinguish between what their words mean in plain English and what they intend to say.

The High Church position is very moderately summed up by Moberly: "What is duly done by Christian ministers, it is not so much that *they* do it in the stead or for the sake of the whole, but rather that the whole does it by or through them. The Christian priest does not offer an atoning sacrifice on behalf of the Church; it is rather the Church through his act, that not so much offers an atonement, as is identified upon earth with the one heavenly offering of the atonement of Christ."¹ But though the priest wields, as the body's representative, the powers which belong to the whole body, the body cannot wield these powers except through its own organs fitted to the purpose; these powers are represented as sacrificial; therefore the man who in

¹ "Ministerial Priesthood," p. 242.

the New Testament is a presbyter has become a priest who alone can offer sacrifice.

All are agreed that in the New Testament the body is credited with sacrificial powers; such phrases as "a kingdom of priests," "offering spiritual sacrifices," etc., abound. High and Low,¹ Lightfoot, Westcott, and Moberly, all agree in enforcing this point. The difference comes in the fact that, whereas the Low Church (to use a necessarily unfortunate title) takes the term "sacrifices" in the New Testament to refer to the self-sacrifice of the life which is following in the footsteps of Christ, the High Church, while admitting that the life of sacrifice forms part of what is meant, yet claims that these sacrifices find their consummation in the sacrifice of the Eucharist. They shift the centre of gravity from the life to a single act in that life. The most that the Low Churchman can admit is that, while the Eucharist is a continual reminder of that act of our Lord which is the *raison d'être* of Christian sacrifice, while no doubt, each time he partakes of the Holy Feast, he presents himself soul and body to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto God, yet that act is in its essence symbolic only of the life which, if it would come after Christ, must deny itself, take up its cross, and follow. We do not claim that the words "Do this in remembrance of Me" are the whole meaning of the Eucharist. We believe that when Christ said, "This is My body," and when St. Paul said, "This is a partaking of the body of Christ," it is intended that, to those who faithfully partake of the consecrated elements in obedience to the Divine command, there is a life imparted, a strength received, from receiving in a spiritual manner the body and blood of Christ. We hold that when Christ said, "He that loveth Me keepeth My words, and We will come to him, and *take up Our abode* with him," and when He said, "He that eateth and drinketh *abideth in Me*, and I in him," the two sayings are collateral. We hold that the essence of eating and drinking in the Holy Communion is obedience, and that this obedience;

¹ Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, p. 183; Westcott, "Gospel of the Resurrection," p. 169.

whether in that service or not, is the highest sacrifice, and therefore Christians are a kingdom of priests.

When it is claimed that the priest alone can offer the sacrifice, the Nonconformist—I will take up his position for the moment—has a right to ask what Bible authority we have for the statement. Moberly, in his "Christian Ministry," feels the force of this, and seeks to find justification in Scripture. He has to admit¹ that in the words of Scripture both the connection of Christian ministry with Eucharistic leadership and the application to Eucharistic worship of sacrificial and priestly language is less explicit than we might at first have expected. He then tries to explain the silence of Scripture (for silence it is) on the point. "Had Scripture," he says, "laid stress on outward means, this would have inevitably resulted in an exaggeration of the intrinsic value of the outward and mechanical." This may be so, but, on the other hand, were the sacrificial aspect of these outward means an essential of the faith, I cannot understand the silence of New Testament writers on the subject. And, again, a second reason for the silence of Scripture he finds in this: To have called the Christian ministers "priests," and Holy Communion a "sacrifice," would, he says, have confused the popular mind, filled as it was with ideas of the Mosaic priesthood, which was "symbolic, ceremonial, and unreal." People would have confused the Christian sacrificial system with the Old Testament system, as if it were one and the same thing. When, however, Jerusalem was destroyed, then it was natural that the sacrificial terminology should be used, when there was no longer any fear of its being misunderstood. I fear that, though Jerusalem has been long destroyed, the popular idea of sacrifice still remains, and that to call the Eucharist a sacrifice, and to insist that the Christian minister is a *sacerdos*, still means to most people that the minister offers sacrifice, and that sacrifice is the body and blood of Christ offered in the Eucharist. These are the only two arguments Moberly can find to account for the silence of Scripture; but, filled with the idea that the

¹ Moberly, *op. cit.*, p. 264.

Eucharist is the Church's identification of herself with the offering of Christ by means of the action of the priest, he cites a number of New Testament passages, and when any expression occurs such as "feeding the flock," "offering spiritual sacrifices," "the ministration of righteousness," "blood of sprinkling," or "we have an altar," he refers it directly to the Holy Communion. If these are the best arguments that can be brought forward in support of a theory that the Christian ministers have received an Apostolic commission to celebrate the sacrifice of the Eucharist, and that none but those episcopally ordained can do so, the Dissenter has a fair case in refusing to accept the theory. Granted that the Dissenter is lacking in historical perspective; granted that the *Didache* urges people¹ to elect Bishops and deacons *in order* to be able to offer the pure sacrifice in the breaking of bread; granted that it has been ever the custom of the Church to allow only those appointed in due succession to minister in holy things; granted that we find the historic episcopate an excellent institution in practice as well as in theory: at the same time, as Professor Gwatkin said at the Pan-Anglican Conference, "to claim for it a binding command of Christ or His Apostles is a defiance of history, and to make it a necessity for the Church without such command comes near to being a defiance of Christ Himself."

But to come to the point. We are seeking a vision of unity. We see ourselves surrounded by bodies of Christians claiming to be members of the Holy Catholic Church. We do not deny their claim; we admit that entrance to that Church is by baptism; and we do not deny even to the laity the right to baptize, we do not question the validity of lay baptism; and yet these are out of communion with us. As a matter of practice, we do not in individual cases deny Communion to full members of certain other Churches. Can we do anything? I only propose one step; there are many other difficulties in the way of other steps, but this is one step. Could we not go to ministers of accredited bodies? (It ought not to be impossible on the basis of

¹ Quoted by Moberly, *op. cit.*, p. 272.

Article VI. to find some definition of that term. (We say: "You claim to be as much a priest as I am"—*i.e.*, taking that word in the sense of "presbyter," in which sense alone it survives in the Prayer Book. "You have been elected by your Church very much in the same way as Paul and Barnabas¹ were elected by the presbyters of Antioch, as Timothy was elected by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery, or as the Didache calls on Christians to elect their ministers. You have been called by God; we cannot doubt it, since you have been permitted by Him to bring sinners to the foot of the Cross. Now try and look at the Church of England from an historical point of view. We have a certain order, inherited in germ at least from the Apostolic times, though developed according to the need of fuller organization brought about by time and place. We feel that this order is according to the mind of Christ, and that in following that order we receive a blessing and a power for carrying on the work of the Church of Christ.

"Your fathers once belonged to this Church of ours. They separated from us, wrongly—as we feel. We believe, as many of you do, that this breaking of the unity of the Body was a sin that has hindered the growth of the kingdom of Christ, and caused the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme, even though God has been pleased in many cases to work out His purposes in spite of our divisions. At the same time we admit that your fathers left the Church for conscience' sake, and we admit, also, that the Church had so often failed in her duty as to justify their desire to promote a purer form of worship. We, too, have sinned on our side. However, now the differences of opinion over which we split have largely, if not entirely, passed away. We have differences to-day, but they are largely different from the original causes of schism. We feel that by the exercise of mutual charity much might be done to heal our present divisions.

"Now, though we consider that our episcopal system is most important, that it is essential to *the continuity of our Church*, yet

¹ Acts xiii. 3.

we are willing to admit with you that it is not essential to *the existence of the Church of Christ*. Will you come back to us and acknowledge the spiritual authority of our order of Bishops for the sake of unity? We will admit you to our ministry without reserve on your acceptance of the great Creeds of the Church; this is what we give. And we ask of you that, as you admit the authority of our Bishops, your sons will enter the ministry by the episcopal door. It is a great deal that we are asking, but remember that we, too, are giving a great deal for the cause of unity."

There are, no doubt, many of the brethren who still will say, "Oh! but they have no right to minister because they have not received episcopal ordination." Be it so; but as long as this is insisted on, any talk of unity is futile, any discussion of it must end in a deadlock. Such objectors will not abate any of their claims; neither will the Nonconformists abate any of theirs.



Archæology and the Virgin Birth.

BY THE REV. M. LINTON SMITH, M.A.,

Vicar of Blundellsands.

IT is a remarkable fact that one of the most controverted points of the Christian creed, the Virgin Birth of our Lord, should be a subject on which archæology has thrown of recent years considerable light. It is not, of course, true that the spade has produced any evidence bearing directly on the article of faith; such a suggestion carries its own refutation with it; but a good deal of material, bearing directly on the veracity and accuracy of one of the narratives on which the article is based, has been published during the last fifteen years, and it may not be unprofitable to combine this with the earlier material of the same character, and to state the conclusion which may reasonably be drawn from the whole available evidence.

St. Luke in his story of the birth of our Lord supplies certain points of contact with contemporary history; and it has been maintained with much insistence that, where his narrative can be tested in these matters by the use of other sources of information, he comes badly out of the process; the further conclusion is then triumphantly drawn that, if he is inaccurate in those comparatively trivial matters in which he can be tested, he is not a trustworthy authority for those other matters, of far greater importance from the religious point of view, which rest upon his statement.

This is the position which it is proposed to examine, in the light of archæological discovery, in this present paper.

The objections to St. Luke's narrative may be summarized under four heads as stated by Dr. Schürer:

1. No Imperial census under Augustus is known.
2. Under a Roman census Joseph and Mary would not have been obliged to travel to Bethlehem.
3. If an Imperial census had been ordered, it would not

have been enforced by Herod, who was a subject-King with control over the internal affairs of his own kingdom.

4. Quirinius was never Governor of Syria during the lifetime of Herod.

With regard to the question of an Imperial census under Augustus, the position has been completely changed by the discovery of census returns among the papyri of Egypt, which render it plain that such returns were made in the first century A.D. at intervals of *fourteen* years; the earliest known dates from A.D. 20, and others from the subsequent period are fairly frequent; the reference of Josephus to the census under Quirinius in A.D. 6-7, when Judæa had become part of a Roman province fits into the series, and some tax receipts on potsherds make it likely that the arrangement was earlier still; this would give 8-7 B.C. as the next earlier period for the enrolment, which, if inaugurated by Augustus, might well date from his assumption of the Tribunician power in 23 B.C., the beginning of his Imperial rule "in its most formal and complete sense." While the census returns refer to Egypt alone, an inscription of one Æmilius Secundus mentions a census under Quirinius at Apamea in Northern Syria, confirming St. Luke's assertion that the enrolment concerned the whole Empire (*πᾶσα ἡ οἰκουμένη*). We may reasonably conclude, then, that, so far from there being no evidence for an Imperial census, both papyri and inscriptions combine to confirm St. Luke's statement on that point, and to make probable a general enrolment in the Roman Empire in 8-7 B.C., a conclusion further borne out by the statement of Tertullian that the enrolment connected with our Lord's birth took place under Sentius Saturninus, who was Governor of Syria 9-6 B.C.

So far as the second objection is concerned, it may now be asserted that so far from the journey of Joseph and Mary to Bethlehem being unlikely, it has been recently shown to be quite in keeping with the regulations known in connection with such enrolments. A copy of the decree of Gaius Vibius Maximus, Governor of Egypt in the year A.D. 104, has been

discovered, which runs : " The enrolment by households being at hand, it is necessary to notify all those who for any cause whatsoever are outside their nomes (*ἐκστᾶσι τῶν ἑαυτῶν νομῶν*) to return to their own hearths (*ἐπανελθεῖν εἰς τὰ ἑαυτῶν ἐφέστια*) that they may also accomplish the *customary* dispensation of enrolment. . . ." This find shows that the order to return was not a novelty in A.D. 104, but " customary " (*συνήθη*), and so removes all inherent improbability in the particular detail of St. Luke's narrative.

Turning now to the next difficulty, that Galilee and Judæa were under the independent jurisdiction of Herod, the fact is admitted at once ; but we know that it was not unusual for a subject-King to put into practice in his own dominions a regulation which could only be enforced by the Imperial power within the limits of the provinces directly under Roman rule. Tacitus gives us an example, recording that Archelaus, subject-King of Cappadocia, having subdued a tribe of the Taurus range, the Clitæ, ordered them to take a census, Roman fashion (" nostrum in modum," Ann. vi., 41), a measure which drove them into fresh revolt. It would be a very natural means of gaining favour with the Imperial authority, and might doubtless find many a parallel from the subject-Princes of the British Raj in India. That Herod carried out such a census cannot be demonstrated, but all antecedent improbability of St. Luke's statement is removed ; and the theory also does away with two smaller difficulties : (1) It would be likely that the imitation census of Herod might be a year or two later than its prototype, the Imperial one, which would bring the date closer to that probable for the birth of Christ ; (2) if this census were taken by a " native King," the language of Josephus, who implies that the census of Quirinius in A.D. 7 was a novelty, would be justified ; for it would be the first *enforced* by a Roman governor.

Let us turn now to the last objection—viz., that Quirinius was not governor during the life of Herod the Great, but held office A.D. 6, and for the next few years.

In the first place the word used for " governor " by St. Luke

(*ἡγεμονεύοντος*), while it is generally applied to the head of a province, does not necessarily involve that idea—*e.g.*, Josephus speaks of one Volumnius, whom he styles, along with Saturninus, as *ἡγεμὼν τῆς Συρίας*, though Saturninus alone was *legatus Augusti pro prætorè*; and it might be that Quirinius held office in some form under Saturninus; it has even been suggested that he was sent into Syria for the very purpose of taking the census, with the rank of Imperial Legate.

But here archæology has come to the rescue; in 1763 there was dug up at Tivoli, the ancient Tibur, the fragment of an honorary inscription containing the titles and honours of an official whose name was lost; a careful comparison of the statements of the stone has led to the conclusion that the *one* person to whom they can apply is Quirinius; the conclusion is accepted by leading Roman historians and epigraphists like Mommsen, and by scholars who deny that it elucidates St. Luke's narrative like Schürer; but the last statement upon the stone, itself only half preserved, is that the man who is commemorated held the office of governor of Syria *twice*. The second governorship of Quirinius was that beginning A.D. 6—when was the former?

The period in which this can have taken place lies between 12 B.C.—the year that he held the consulship—and A.D. 6—his later administration of Syria; the years A.D. 1-6 are excluded by the fact that Quirinius is known to have been in Armenia for part of the time, and by the possible dates for his governorship of the province Asia, which followed his first period in Syria; the latest likely date for the Asian governorship is 3-2 B.C. We are therefore brought to a period preceding 3 B.C. for the first tenure of office in Syria. Now in 6-5 B.C., South Galatia was being pacified, and as we know that Quirinius gained two *supplicationes* (solemn acts of thanksgiving in honour of a general whose successes did not warrant the highest compliment of a triumph) for the subjugation of the Homonadenses, a mountain tribe in the Galatian province it is not unnatural to connect the two statements, and to suppose that the successful campaigns were carried on in the years 6-4 B.C. But the province of

Galatia, not being a frontier province, had no troops, and for this work the forces of the nearest frontier province had to be employed. That province was Syria, and for the purpose of military command, Quirinius would hold the title of governor of Syria (*legatus Augusti pro prætore Syriæ*).

Such, briefly, are the steps by which Professor Sir W. Ramsay leads to the conclusion that Quirinius was legate of Augustus in Syria before 4 B.C., entrusted, not with the internal affairs of the province, but with its military command, for the purpose of war against the Homonadenses, which he brought to a brilliantly successful issue; there is no serious difficulty in the way of accepting the conclusion that Quirinius was legate of Augustus in Syria some time between the years 9-4 B.C., during which period an enrolment took place in Herod's dominions, an enrolment which is declared by Tertullian to have taken place in Syria generally under the governorship of Sentius Saturninus.

Such is the fresh light which discoveries have thrown on the statements of St. Luke with regard to the circumstances of our Lord's birth; such discoveries do not demonstrate the truth of that account as a whole; they do not necessarily prove that St. Luke was right in his belief as to the peculiar nature of that birth; but they at least clear him from charges of carelessness and inaccuracy on points where his narrative can be tested, and go far to establish his credibility in other matters, which must depend for their acceptance on the character of the man who relates them.



The Oxford Summer School of Theology.

By E. M. HIGHFIELD, S.Th.

THE idea of a Summer School of Theology on undenominational lines originated in Manchester College about four years ago, and, through the generous guarantee of the Hibbert Trustees, an experimental meeting was held in Balliol Hall in September, 1909. The experiment succeeded so well that it has been repeated this summer with equal success, the second meeting having taken place in the Hall of Trinity College from July 22 to August 2. The work of the school has been comprehensive, and the programme was arranged so that students could attend an average of five lectures every day. The syllabus fell into five sections: Philosophy of Religion, Old Testament, New Testament, the Early Church, and Comparative Religion.

As Church people, we do well to use all the opportunities which present themselves for widening our theological outlook, and for breaking through the prejudices which are so often attributed to us by others, even if we do not feel them ourselves. The more we come to realize that the basis of our corporate life within the Church is a common religion, but not necessarily a common theology, the more we shall widen our sympathies, not only with those outside our communion, but also with those within.

WHAT IS A SOUL?—This is a question which baffled our childish imaginations, and to which, even in our maturer years, many of us are unable to formulate an expression which can give an adequate reply. Mr. R. R. Marett, approaching the subject from the anthropologist's standpoint, worked out some very interesting conclusions.

From the standpoint of the anthropologist, we have nothing to do with validity; our business is simply with the history of belief—we leave it to the theologian to assign values. For the present

purpose, however, we may put our modern theory of values in a nutshell: the doctrine that every man has a soul to save means that every man is ultimately responsible for himself before God. But we cannot leave it there; the theologian is driven to ask the question, "What does our neighbour think?" and here the anthropologist can help the theologian.

We shall begin by asking the theologian to try to regard the savage as his neighbour—not, may we say, in the too common modern missionary sense, but even for intellectual purposes. With regard to the fundamental facts of life—being born, growing up, falling in love, falling sick, dying—the experience of the savage is just as wide as our own, but the question is, Does it go as deep? Now, whether or not the experience of the savage is more shallow than our own, everyone agrees that it is a different one. Where does the difference lie? The answer is, In being felt and expressed more simply and more naïvely than our own. It is the main function of the anthropologist to enable a sophisticated generation to recover naïvete, and become as little children.

Then, to return to our question, What is a soul? Provisionally the soul may be termed as the inner man, or self—perceived and conceived as independent. Now let us first see what the savage thinks about the soul as experienced in presence. Every savage believes in an independent soul as a matter of course, but argument from consent is worth very little; we must ask why the savage believes this. What is the primary datum which causes the savage to feel something here and now which he comes to know as his soul? In answering this question, we must allow for the fact that the savage habitually looks outwards, not inwards; and yet his consciousness of objects is always bound up with a consciousness of self—he feels himself to be a plus quantity; he knows himself to be a free agent by direct experience. Now the savage ascribes supreme value to initiative as displayed by animals; he observes, for example, that a dog "knows" when he is after a rabbit; or when the dog wags his tail, he perceives that it is the dog who wags the tail, and not the tail which wags him. And so, eventually, the savage comes to erect upon such

primary data the conception of having a soul. His conclusions are simply the result of analysis—the word “reflection” tells its own story; we need a mirror to see ourselves, and the mirror is formed out of exterior objects. It is the old Aristotelian theory: the good man needs another to see his virtues in. The savage learnt the value of initiative; he saw that those who struck first won. The bravery of the lion, the cunning of the fox, became starting-points of a philosophy.

What the average man notes, admires, and imitates, is the power of initiative. So it is with the savage. His magico-religious interpretation of the world is largely based on a notion of a struggle between powers that are essentially powers displaying initiative each in its own degree. His whole philosophy of life centres in his experience of power; he sees all things engaged in a constant struggle for existence, and over all a higher power. And it is when he comes to recognize this higher power that he lays down his *orenda*, or, in other words, “he prays.”

Now every man and every living thing has a little *orenda* of his own, and when the worshipper prays, or lays down his *orenda*, he puts himself into the hands of a higher power, but he does not forego his free-will; on the contrary, it is of his own free-will that he comes to ask at all. Experience has taught the savage that this is the path to spiritual force; the man who has courage to wrestle with a spiritual adversary is the man who wins.

Then what shall we say of a soul in terms of the definition from which we started—the inner man, or self, perceived and conceived as independent? We think that the savage has taught us that this is a true definition of the soul as experienced in presence, and it is really what we call “personality.” Readers who want to know how the ascetic savage makes the most of his personality, or the soul which he feels within him, are recommended to consult Dr. Frazer’s latest edition of “The Golden Bough” (Taboo; or, The Perils of the Soul).

Then there is the other side—the soul as conceived in absence. What can we know about the souls of the dead? The “ghost-soul” is the peg on which we are going to hang

our knowledge of the subjective; it is a term which covers all the meanings of a dead man—he is dead, therefore absent. Memory is all we have now to depend on for determining what he is—a “memory image.” But when memory has to supply all the being of the absent one, unless replenished, those memory impressions will gradually vanish away. How comes it, then, that the living retain a memory of the dead? Again, let us try to recover our naïvete through the savage. Through analogy with the savage we can get at the impression produced on the naïve mind by a dead man. One element in it would be the uncanniness. Ghost-seeing is another source of fear attaching to the dead as viewed merely in their objective aspect. Then there is the aspect which is the result of “introjection”—that is to say, trying to enter into the inner feelings which an object may be supposed to have.

Now there are two theories with regard to the soul-life of the dead: (1) The *esoteric* theory—that the sphere of dead souls is here on earth; (2) the *exoteric* theory—that their sphere is away from the earth. Savages seem to be capable of acting on both systems. Now, if the esoteric theory be recognized, certain limitations are imposed on the living; the consideration which they show for the dead is apt to take a material form, and there is little disposition left to try to imagine what the experience of the dead is like on its own account. On the other hand, if the exoteric theory be accepted, since the dead are conceived as existing in some remote region, a more speculative attitude prevails. When death takes place, it is natural to feel that something has gone—there has been a “passing,” or, in the phraseology of Socrates, “a change of dwelling”; the disinterested, sympathetic view predominates, and tends to make one conceive of a soul as one’s own soul. Most of the stories that have been analyzed concerning soul-land belong to the exoteric tradition of savages, although it is, in the main, the esoteric mysteries which give us an insight into the real views of the savage. The keynote of their mysteries is the notion of regeneration—the dead have died to live again. The un-

progressive savage usually imagines a cycle of reincarnations ; he is predominated by a desire to bring back the dead to a second life. But it is also possible for the more progressive savage to conceive of a spiritual regeneration—an evolution of the soul proceeding continually onwards and upwards. It is with this more progressive belief of the savage that we can bring our own beliefs into line. Man's hope of a continued higher existence does not centre in the hope of another human life, but in his indwelling sense of the human will which dominates his whole being, and which forces him to believe that, if only he will try hard enough, there must be attainable for him a spiritual regeneration.

THE RELATIONS OF PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION IN THE MEDIEVAL CHURCH was the subject of the Rev. P. H. Wicksteed's course of lectures.

Variety is always pleasing, and even students bent on stern theological work can appreciate a touch of lightness here and there. Mr. Wicksteed began his first lecture, which was general and introductory, with a novel suggestion for the encouragement of what he called the "pernicious habit" of note-taking. Begin at the bottom of the page and write A.D. 1900, Self ; 1800, Napoleon ; 1700, Newton ; 1600, Shakespeare—and so on, until at the top of the page we were landed at 600 B.C.—Thales, Sappho, and the Prophet Jeremiah. In less than five minutes the paper presented a panoramic view of the most important person, so far as we were concerned, for each of twenty-five centuries, and the student was thus provided with an ingenious system of stepping-stones on which to follow the lecturer.

In the second lecture Mr. Wicksteed dealt with Thomas Aquinas, "Religion as Treated by a Philosopher," and in the third with Dante, "Religion as Treated by a Poet."

What is the specific note which differentiates the philosophy—or, shall we say, the religion—of Aquinas and Dante ? It is this : Dante believed in Hell, Purgatory, Heaven, as significant ; Aquinas also believed in them as significant, with the addition

of a ghastly representation of Hell as something which the sinner deserves, and which is essential to the bliss of Heaven. "Aquinas," says Mr. Wicksteed, "explains Hell, and therefore pollutes Heaven." But this ghastly conception of Hell is wholly absent in Dante. Hell is not essential—it is not what the sinner deserves ; it is what the sinner chooses.

"Dismal we were in the dim air,
Nursing in our hearts the sluggish fumes."

If anyone really knows what it is to sulk for a day, he knows that there is a possibility of deliberately choosing Hell, and the choice is the more awful because it is a free one. But, on the other hand, this very recognition of free choice tells him that Hell cannot be essential. If to-day we ever think of Hell at all, is it not the Hell of Dante of which we think, not the Hell of Aquinas ?

In the New Testament section, Professor Kirsopp Lake's lectures deserve special mention, although an attempt to report them would spoil the spontaneous freshness which was one of their chief charms.

We read our New Testaments now in a different way from the way in which we read them thirty or even twenty years ago, and the reason why we do so is perhaps not so much because criticism has thrown new light on the old passages, but because we ourselves are different from what we were twenty years ago. We read and study and hear lectures not in order to find new truths, but to find new light on the old truths ; the central truths of religion which are fundamental cannot really change, but the light in which we see them must change. To maintain that revealed truth in any aspect is final is to go clean contrary to the evolutionary principles which govern the laws of Nature ; we are bound to recognize that there are momentous problems which lie behind the words of the New Testament which as yet have no final solution. Dr. Carlyle found a very happy expression in summing up the work of the School. Referring directly to the lectures of Professor Lake, but also including all the lecturers, he said : " They have let us see the workings of their

own minds." This is the kind of lecturer that we want, and it adds a more than ever practical zest to the student when the lecturer urges him to employ the working of his own mind to help to solve the momentous problems which lie before us all, and which should not be regarded as the exclusive work of the specialist. We are grateful to Professor Lake for his work as a pioneer of reconstructive criticism of the New Testament, and we are more than ever grateful to him for having given us such an insight into his work in his lucid lectures on "St. Paul and his Converts." He has shown us the value of reconstructive criticism, which must not, let it be remembered, be confused with what is called "destructive criticism." We must go to the Epistles of St. Paul to try to find out what St. Paul really meant, and we shall never do this if we treat them as the earliest theological treatises; we must treat them as what they were—that is to say, the earliest practical letters to members of the Christian Church. Treating them in this way, we are bound, in the first place, to distinguish between what is central and fundamental, and what is local and temporal. With regard to the latter, in many instances, it is impossible for us now to know what St. Paul meant then, for the simple reason that his readers knew what he meant, and it was unnecessary for him to explain the circumstances. Professor Lake's valuable book, "The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul," has been in the hands of students since the end of last year, and readers may be interested to know that a second volume on "The Later Epistles" is already in preparation.

THE HISTORIC SETTING OF THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.—Although the work of modern scholars on the New Testament has tended within the last few years to assert the genuineness of most of the Pauline Epistles, students of the Summer School who were not already acquainted with Dr. Vernon Bartlet's views, were, perhaps, a little astonished to meet with such a warm supporter of the Pauline authorship of the Pastorals. How does Dr. Bartlet maintain his position? "The real abiding difficulty in acceding their genuineness," he

says, "is simply that attempts to place them in the period covered by the Acts have not yet been satisfied." This is not an insurmountable difficulty, if we allow that the Pastoral Epistles were written in the early years of St. Paul's Roman captivity. If we accede that the Epistles to Philemon and the Philippians were written when he was expecting his coming release, why not the Pastorals also? Why should not this expectation have been in his mind at the very beginning of his stay in Rome, when, but for having appealed to Cæsar, he might have been set free? This is more than probable, especially with Nero and Poppea already in Rome. 1 Timothy is the earliest of all, written just after St. Paul's arrival in Rome, say A.D. 60; Titus and 2 Timothy are a little later; Philemon and Colossians date still in the first year; Philemon rather later. There is no difficulty in placing them all with Ephesians in this period as genuine Pauline letters. In support of this theory, Dr. Bartlet maintains an open conviction that St. Paul never was released from his first imprisonment, but was beheaded as the result of his appeal to Cæsar. It was altogether to St. Luke's purpose to show, so he argues, that the release did take place if he knew of it, but no evidence of this can be brought forward. Moreover, St. Peter and St. Paul were dead before the Neronian horrors took place (so Dr. Peake).

Now the crux of the whole matter is 1 Timothy. In recognition of the difficulty, Dr. Bartlet referred students to Dr. Moffatt's "Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament" for a statement of the other side. "1 Timothy was the first to arouse the suspicion of critics, and it is assigned to a post-Pauline date even by some who incline to accept 2 Timothy. Were it not for 1 Timothy, it might be plausible to seek room for the other two within the lifetime of St. Paul; but all three hang together, and they hang outside the career of the Apostle" (Moffatt, Introduction, p. 398). It is very difficult, in the face of Dr. Moffatt's detailed study, and statement of the consensus of modern scholars in assigning a post-Pauline date to the Pastorals, to take an opposite view. Dr. Moffatt, basing his *terminus ad*

quem on the familiarity of Ignatius and Polycarp with the Pastorals, takes a date between A.D. 90 and 115 (120). His *terminus a quo* is the death of St. Paul. Yet Dr. Bartlet very ably defended his position, and gave evidence of the careful research and laborious work which he had spent on the problem. To his mind most of the stylistic difficulties disappear when we regard the Epistles, not as private letters, but as open letters which were intended to be read before the Church. "The best and only specific proof that they are genuine is that they are written naturally and for their own sake. The newer and truer light in which St. Paul is coming to be viewed is that which sees in him the missionary rather than the professor, the evangelist and pastor, with the larger outlook of the religious statesman."

In our opinion Dr. Bartlet seems to be biassed by the feeling of a religious advantage—which feeling we do not share, because we believe that the claim of religion is superior to any such test of values—in assigning the authorship of the Pastorals to the Apostle Paul. To Dr. Bartlet the value of the Pastorals is, above all, that they have in view the great end of the formation of a Christ-like character. They are letters dealing with the organization of Christian life on a social basis rather than letters of personal order. They show St. Paul, not the doctrinaire-theologian, but rather the ideal missionary—the disciple of Jesus Christ, in whom he saw God Incarnate, willing to condescend to those of low estate.

IS CHRISTIANITY SYNCRETISTIC?—Not very many years ago the question might have caused a disturbing element in some religious circles. It is now, however, widely recognized that the serious student of religion must be a student of religions, and we agree with Dr. J. Hope Moulton, who, viewing the matter from a sympathetic missionary standpoint, thinks that if Christianity can be shown to be a syncretistic religion through the fuller light which the papyri discoveries are able to bring, rather than causing a disturbing element, it will be a heightening of interest, if, when we approach the matter from a purely scientific outlook, we are able to claim our inheritance as

evolved out of the germ of a common religion far back in the revenue of the ages. The subject, however, waits further investigation; a connection is not yet proved because like answers to like.

ZOROASTER, and the ZOROASTRIAN DOCTRINE OF THE FUTURE LIFE, was the subject of Dr. Moulton's two lectures. Darmesteter and Meyer have both treated Zarathustra as a purely mythical personage—a figure-head of the official class of the religion, and the Gathas (the oldest portion of the Avesta) as belonging to a period later than Philo. Dr. Moulton (*cf.* also Söderblom) interprets the phenomenon in a different way—it is impossible to read the Gathas without feeling that the personal references are too trivial to be regarded as mythical, and therefore must be definite. But, above all, there is the argument of language—the language of the Gathas is exceedingly primitive; it stands nearer to the Sanskrit of the Rigveda than any other literature. It is impossible to believe that the Gathas could have been written in a dead language, unless there had been a plentiful literature to copy from, which at that time could not have been the case; further, the Gathas betray their antiquity by metrical tests—philological tests of modern science allow them to emerge with unshaken antiquity. As for the date of the call of Zarathustra, this can only be fixed very approximately; he stands at the very beginning of Avestan literature, and the developments in religion to which that literature testifies must have occupied a long period. About 1400 B.C. is usually assigned, but Dr. Moulton inclines to put it rather later.

The theme of the second lecture was a consideration of the main doctrines of Zoroastrianism parallel with the doctrines of Israel in full and complete development, including the teaching of Jesus and the Apostles, with syncretisms of later Christianity.

Let us follow some of Dr. Moulton's parallels: The idea of God as omniscient, personified as Wisdom (*cf.* Job xxviii.), has close parallels with the "Wise Lord" in Babylonian nations, and the doctrine is unquestionably maintained by Zarathustra. In Zarathustra's doctrine, as also in Deutero-Isaiah, there is no

room for the dual idea of good and evil; in Isa. xlv. 7 the Lord forms the light and creates evil; so also it is in the hymns of Ahura. The Biblical idea that God is light finds emphatic expression in Perseism—Ahura “clothes himself with the massive heavens.” Further, the Johannine doctrine that God is a Spirit also permeates the Gathic hymns; Ahura is wholly spirit. Again, there is a parallel in the idea of the six spirits which surround the throne of God; in the Gathas these spirits, which are “holy immortal ones,” not detached from God, receive names.

Judaism and Christianity have developed phases of central ideas which can be recognized in the Gathas. For our present purpose, it is not important to know when the doctrine of the Trinity emerged, but a comparison of the developed Christian and Gathic doctrines suggests that the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation must have sprung up on virgin soil. There are seven hues in Zarathustra’s rainbow—although it is possible to argue for a Trinity in marked detachment from the other four—only three in the Christian; and though there is a Holy Spirit in the Gathic doctrine, he is not a separate person. In the Avestan system, as in the Old Testament, there is a combination of distinctness and identity with regard to the word “spirit”; the root idea of the Greek and Hebrew word “spirit” is “breath,” and that of the Avestan is “think.” There is, on the whole, a general resemblance of the paths by which the two reached monotheism.

ESCHATOLOGICAL DOCTRINE.—The contents of the Gathas are essentially eschatological, and there are both similarities and differences between the Gathic and Christian systems. With regard to a future destiny, Zarathustra concentrates his thought on individuals; it is through their own self-will that they determine their future weal or woe. Throughout the whole Gathas runs the pious hope that the end of the world is not far off; Zarathustra himself hopes to see the dawn of a new and better æon, when the future Deliverer will come. Mazdeism (as developed in the later Gathic system), however, quite contrary to

the Christian conception, fixed a date (A.D. 2341) for the coming of the Deliverer.

As to whether or not Zoroastrianism enters into a period of syncretism with Christianity, we cannot say. Bousset says that it must be struck out of the system. The features, however, which bring its conception nearest to that of the Old Testament prophets are : Religious duties, including the slaying of animals ; sacred formulæ, as most powerful spells ; the idea of immortality ; the elaborate doctrines of angels and spirits. Our evidence for producing comparisons depends primarily on the classic writers and the Talmuds. The Jews brought their doctrines of angelology from Babylon ; an elaborate doctrine of angels and spirits was a later development of Jewish teaching. Contrast the attitude of the Sadducees in entirely rejecting it, and also St. Paul's attitude in his letter to the Colossians. To St. Paul, the one thing that mattered was to be in direct relation with the one Being higher than angels, and if it be maintained that St. Paul and other New Testament writers were stimulated by the knowledge that the Persees held the doctrine of immortality, the path by which they themselves arrived at the doctrine was certainly a different one.



Fraternity, or the Principles of Brotherhood.

BY THE REV. C. G. BROWN, B.A.

Canon Residentiary of St. David's Cathedral.

A CONSIDERATION of what is meant by fraternity, or brotherhood, and of all that brotherhood entails, cannot be out of place with members of a men's society.

That "all men are brethren" is a generally accepted truth; but too frequently it is a mere expression, conveying no idea of duty or of responsibility. And yet it expresses a relation in which human beings stand to each other which is permanent and real.

We know that a nation is divided into many classes, and that the interests of these classes are not always the same. We know, too, that these classes are not permanent, and that members of one not unfrequently pass up or down into the other. One thing that does remain permanent is the State or the Nation. No matter how individuals or classes may change, the nation remains one; but if one class suffers, others suffer with it; if one class is improvident, unfortunate, unsuccessful, or guilty of wrong, the prosperity of the nation as a whole declines. Therefore it does not matter what may be the political aspect of any Government—Conservative, Liberal, or Radical, its legislation is foredoomed to failure if its legislation is in the interest of one class only, or if, in its efforts for the benefit of one class, it does not provide for the welfare of the whole.

Up to within almost modern times, and even at the present time with many people, the idea prevailed that the prosperity of a country can be estimated by its wealth. Now it is seen that a country may be very wealthy, and yet the bulk of the nation may be anything but prosperous—that the wealth may be in the hands of the few, and poverty and, even destitution the lot of the many. And this is the condition in which we now find ourselves; and this is the cause of the unrest so prevalent—an unrest which will, in all probability, end in a social upheaval,

whose results it is impossible to foresee. The principles on which money can be *gathered together* are understood. Men are now seeking for principles on which money can be more justly and *more widely distributed*. We all know that wealth of all kinds represents labour. It is produced by the labour of somebody—labour of head as well as labour of hand. If one man secures too large a portion of it, another man has to be content with too small a share; and when this is appreciated, there arise discontent, clamour, and mutiny. This is one evil result.

Another evil result is this: the accumulation of wealth in private hands creates a class of men who have abundant means to spend on themselves. If they have no sense of duty, and are forgetful of their responsibility to the country in which they live, they are worse than useless. They are the idle rich—the heirs of those who by their industry created the wealth, who spend their lives in self-indulgence. Now, indulgence is the parent of vice, and the vices of some of these soon end their existence. Others, more prudent, live on; but, as satisfaction of mind is allotted by Providence only to industry, the lives of these men are aimless, useless, and unhappy. But the contrast between their wealth and idleness and the poverty and excessive labour of the many, arouses an indignation and dissatisfaction which may become dangerous.

Idleness, whether of rich or poor, whether it is voluntary idleness or compulsory, is not only a source of weakness to a nation, it is a positive danger; and being so, it should be the aim of our legislators to prevent it. How they are to prevent it is the problem that has to be solved.

Political economy, which has long been the gospel of the legislator, has urged *free competition* as the principle of business life, and free competition has certainly increased the wealth of the nation; but this wealth is in the possession of the few, and when it is pointed out that free competition produces cheapness and over-production, and that cheapness means sweated labour and low wages, while over-production means uncertainty of

work and times of great distress—political economy says *that* is inevitable—that the rule of life is the “survival of the fittest” and “the weakest must go to wall.” As a matter of fact, political economy knows nothing of self-sacrifice, and in political economy there is no room for Christian principles, or for the idea of brotherhood.

Again, *co-operation* is suggested as an antidote to free competition, as when men co-operate for the production or the distribution of goods, the profits are divided amongst the workmen themselves. But free competition, with a fair division of the profits among the workmen, is quite as advantageous as co-operation, and both do very well as long as profits are made; but when there are losses instead of profits, both do equally badly. The Socialist condemns both principles, and the Socialist claims that his desire is to make the brotherhood of man a reality. As Socialism is at present agitating the world, let us try and understand what are its principles, its aims, and its methods.

In the first place, remember that any interference of the State, which limits the freedom of the individual, with the intention of benefiting the whole community, is socialistic. You will see that the tendency of legislation for many years has been socialistic. Interference with the drink traffic; prohibition of the employment of women and children; limiting the hours of labour; compulsory education; old age pensions; compulsory insurance—all this is socialistic. Again, municipal trading in water, gas, tramways, is socialistic. Can we say that this is injurious to the nation, or are we prepared to say that its good results outweigh the evil—if there be any evil results?

Now, the Socialist claim is that the nation should recognize the brotherhood of man as a reality, and that all legislation should be based on the principle of brotherhood. If it were, he holds that the evils under which the bulk of the people live would cease—poverty, destitution, unemployment, sweated labour, a low standard of comfort, wretched dwellings, drunkenness, the too great wealth of the few, all would end, he says; and as he believes these are the results of *free competition*, he

would end free competition by making the State the sole producer and the sole distributor of goods. He asserts that the high prices of food are due to the land being uncultivated, and that it is uncultivated because it is improperly held as the property of individuals; therefore, he holds that the State should own the land, and should distribute it amongst practical men. The Socialist does not necessarily advocate that the nation should confiscate these properties, but that legislation should be of such a kind that the nation shall gradually acquire them by purchase, or by at first becoming itself a rival competitor.

I think we shall agree that the principle advocated by the Socialist seems sound and his aims just; but his methods want consideration.

First, as to the ownership of land. He says the State should own it, and allot portions to capable cultivators. "But is the State to take back the possession of these portions at its pleasure? If yes, then what becomes of personal liberty? If no, then the land is divided amongst a *multitude* of possessors instead of a few." That may be regarded as an improvement; but what would prevent these people from selling their interest in these possessions? What, then, could prevent these small properties being united into large ones? "If personal liberty is to be allowed, you may divide land as you please, but the land will not remain so divided very long."

Next, as to competition. The Socialist would end competition in order to end the evils which he believes are due to competition; and he would end competition by the State becoming the sole producer and sole employer of labour.

Now the *State* is a competitor in production already, as a manufacturer in its dockyards, powder factories, clothing manufactories, gunmaking shops, and so on, and it is a great employer of labour in the Army, Navy, Police, and Post Office. *Municipalities* are also large employers of labour. It is only right to ask the Socialist whether these businesses are as successful and economical as similar businesses conducted by private individuals; whether the work is better done, whether

those employed are better treated or more satisfied than men otherwise employed. The answer should be emphatically in the affirmative, before we extend the system. We cannot say the State, as an employer, has shown itself heedful of the welfare of its workmen, if we are to judge by its treatment of boy clerks, messenger boys, and discharged soldiers.

Competition is said to bring out the best qualities in man—his highest ability, his greatest effort, his best work—and ordinary men are said to be most energetic when they know they will reap the *results* of their work. It is said that Government and municipal workmen are not remarkable for their energy or industry. The Socialist reply would be that, when men take their proper position as citizens, their sense of duty will make all industrious, or, the sense of duty inspiring the majority will compel the others to energetic work. But should we wait until men have learned such a sense of duty, or should we make the change, in hope that the change would lead to this sense of duty?

Two other demands the Socialist makes—viz., the right to work and a minimum wage for the worker, and to the workman these demands seem reasonable. But what he does not see is this: that if these demands are conceded the concession will be accompanied by demands which are serious. If the right to work is conceded and a minimum wage is fixed, a man will no longer be free to work when he likes and how he likes, but will be compelled to work always, at work required of him, and to the satisfaction of those set over him. He will be no longer a *free man* but a serf, not a slave, for a slave has no right, and a serf has. "A serf and a freeman are like two horses, one in a stable and the other at large. The one gets oats and no freedom, the other gets freedom but no oats, although he may get fodder of some kind." Serfdom is not freedom, and history is not without its lessons how manhood deteriorates when freedom is lost. The question is, whether the men of this country are prepared to exchange their freedom and uncertainty of employ for serfdom and a minimum wage.

Now, I have referred to these matters, not to advocate any

particular political principles, not to further nor oppose socialistic ideas, but to suggest some subjects for thought.

We are a society—a brotherhood—pledged to prayer and to render service to our fellow-men. But we so pledge ourselves because we desire the advancement of Christianity, and through it the advancement of mankind. It seems to me that it is our duty to consider what means the leaders of the people are suggesting for the benefit of our nation, and to see whether the ends they have in view and the means they suggest are consistent with the teaching of our Divine Master Jesus Christ.

There is now in progress a movement, really a great social upheaval, whose results, whether for good or evil, no one can foretell. As men we should understand what it means, what are its causes, what its leaders are trying to do, and how they propose to do it; and we should think whether what they aim at is good, and whether the means they propose for attaining their desire are such as we can support.

How are we to come to a decision? I believe there is only one test which we can apply, and that is the teaching of Jesus.

Now, "it was Jesus who first taught the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. It was He who revealed to the world that God is a God of love, mercy, and benevolence, and urged that, as these are the qualities of God, they must be the qualities of His children. It was Jesus who gave men a code of morals to be their rule of life, and principles of conduct to be their guide. His teaching broke down the barrier between Jew and Gentile, between black and white. His teaching freed the slave, softened the cruelties of war, secured justice, benevolence, freedom, and good government. From Him men learned the sanctity of life and their right to liberty." Therefore, we may be sure that Christianity can give us that by which the principles, aims, and methods of Socialism can be tested.

What does Christianity say about *labour*? Where work is done by slaves, both labour and the labourer are held in contempt. Now Christianity abolished slavery, and by so doing it taught—

1. That labour is honourable and idleness is contemptible.
2. That it is by work alone that man can develop his

faculties and his sense of responsibility, and that, as it is his duty to God, to man, and himself, so to develop, every man should work.

3. That man must not be regarded as a means for enriching others.

This being Christian teaching, any legislation in favour of the labourer, which will aid him to come up to the Christian standard, must receive our support. Any legislation which insists upon all men having opportunities for sharing in the benefits of education, for living in decency and comfort, for adequate rest and recreation, any regulations which will *provide* work, which will *secure* men in their employment, which will *protect* them from unjust and unscrupulous employers or overseers; these, and such as these, being in accordance with the ideas of Christian brotherhood, we should encourage; but remembering that voluntary idleness is a sin, and seeing that human nature is what it is, we must so hedge about our regulations that the community shall be protected from the idle and worthless.

Next with regard to property. Christianity nowhere forbids one of its brotherhood to hold property. It regards the universal desire of men to enjoy the fruits of their own labour as a natural desire; but it bids men regard their property *as a trust*. It holds that men may not do what they please with their own; it bids them use it for the benefit of others, and it teaches that God will hold men responsible for the use they make of it. That "property has its duties as well as its rights" is a Christian saying: if these duties are ignored, it is due to selfishness, and Christianity condemns selfishness as incompatible with brotherhood.

We cannot, therefore, support the Socialist who says a man should not own property. If his aim in ending competition is to end private ownership, we cannot support him; if his aim is simply to end sweated labour, or excessive cheapness of goods (which is the chief cause of low wages and of unemployment), then we agree with him. If he contends for a living wage for all workmen, whether they are industrious or idle, able or

worthless, we must object; but if he can suggest means by which all workmen shall receive a fair share of the profits of their work we will support him. But we cannot forget that the character of a brotherhood depends on the character of the individuals who are members of the brotherhood, and that, if we regard the nation as a brotherhood, we must strive for improvement in the character of its citizens before we can hope for improvement in their lives and conduct. Improvement in character cannot be brought about by compulsion nor by legislation; but legislation can adopt means by which men can be led to self-improvement.

When a community, or the larger part of a community, will adopt the first principles of Christianity as their practical rule of life, social improvement will be certain; and that principle is this: that "the condition of right conduct is self-sacrifice. Every act of man which can be called a *good act* is an act of self-sacrifice—*i.e.*, it is something a man would *not* have done had he considered his own personal pleasure rather than the benefit of someone else. And, in the common things of life, self-sacrifice quickens the sense of positive duty, and the *good* man does his duty because he knows that, by so doing, others are benefited, and that, like his Divine Master, he is among others as one that serveth."

Christian teaching, then, points to the *cause* of all the evils that exist, and indicates their only remedy. The *cause* is sin and the selfishness which accompanies and results from sin. The *remedy* is self-sacrifice and self-discipline. As selfishness is the failing of the individual, so the individual must apply the remedy to himself. Throughout his life, his family, his neighbours, and his country have claims upon him, and he must acknowledge this and meet those claims; but to do so, he must throw off selfishness—in other words, Christianity tells us we cannot spread the idea of fraternity by force, neither can we establish a brotherhood by compulsion. We can make ourselves fit for it, and we can join with others in making such arrangements that the whole nation may learn how to make themselves fit for it.

Liberalism and the Church.

BY THE REV. ARTHUR J. S. DOWNER, B.A.,
St. Matthew, Bayswater.

PROBABLY no one would be rash enough to deny that the method of government by party, as carried on in this country, has great advantages. But it is no less true that it has great disadvantages; and it is probable that there are more people in Great Britain now who think that the drawbacks outweigh the advantages, than there ever were before since party government was established. It is not our purpose in the present article to discuss whether this is likely to lead to a change of system, or even whether such a change is to be desired; but only to refer to some aspects of the question which seem to affect directly the relations of one great political party with the English Church.

With the same general purposes in view, and in equal sincerity, minds of different sorts approach any problem from very different points of sight. In politics, more than in most spheres of activity, every question brings us up against several jarring interests, several different dangers attending every action, several different possibilities of doing harm as well as good, if not more harm than good. Every principle of action has a complementary principle, and if either be pushed to an extreme, that which is complementary becomes opposed. In this way each acts as a check on the other, and each adds what the other wants. Five such pairs may be taken as distinguishing Liberalism and Conservatism, and of these the first two pairs are fundamental to the others, and represent the essential difference between the outlook on the world and the general attitude towards its problems of the two parties. These are:

1. The importance of the individual and the importance of the relations between individuals. The Liberal mind thinks of the nation as an assemblage of individuals. The Conservative mind thinks of an individual as an integral part of the nation.

The Liberal thinks first of the duty of the State to the citizen ; the Conservative of the duty of the citizen to the State.

2. The need of action and the need of caution. "Do something. Think what you are about by all means, but do something now," is the Liberal advice. "Consider the consequences carefully. Do something, but do not act until you see clearly what the consequences will be," is the Conservative advice.

There is a danger inherent in each set of principles. That of Liberalism is class legislation, that of Conservatism ineffectiveness. The Liberal may do more harm than good by his hasty and drastic action. The Conservative's legislation may be ineffective because of his excessive caution. The Liberal may injure individuals, both those on whose behalf he is legislating and others also, by not sufficiently considering their relations with one another. The Conservative may allow an evil to grow to serious proportions, or delay much-needed and beneficent progress, by his fear of upsetting existing relations. In the long run these opposite errors are probably about equally injurious to the best general welfare. The Conservative works for the Future with his eyes on the Past, and is in danger of doing but little for the Present ; while the Liberal works for the Present with his eyes on the Present, and is in danger of imperilling the Future by forgetting the Past.

These two pairs of principles are fundamental to the Liberal and Conservative positions. Three pairs more follow from the combination of these :

3. The equality of men and the existence of distinctions are the first of these secondary pairs. Liberalism emphasizes the primary equality of man, while not forgetting the distinctions of birth, possessions, character, abilities, position, attainments, which actually part mankind into classes. Conservatism urges the folly and injustice of overlooking these, yet does not wish to forget essential equality.

4. Liberalism urges and defends the right of liberty of thought, not forgetting the respect due to the authority of

knowledge and of the belief and experience of former generations ; while a sober Conservatism urges and defends this authority, not forgetting the right of liberty of thought.

5. Last, Liberalism urges strongly the responsibility of the rich toward the poor, while it does not forget the liberty of all to do as they will with their own ; and Conservatism presses the rights of property, while it does not forget the responsibility of the rich toward the poor.

These five pairs of principles seem to sum up the characteristic positions of the two great parties, or schools of thought, in politics. Details of policy on particular problems are active expressions, by no means always accurate, of these first-rank and second-rank principles. These five, and these five only, may be said to be essential to Liberalism. Third and fourth rank principles become closely associated with it, and are adopted enthusiastically by it, such as Free Trade, which is traditional, but certainly not essential to Liberalism.

The five pairs are consistent with one another, the three which we have placed in the second rank growing naturally and inevitably out of the first two. When we say that the Liberal puts the responsibility of the rich toward the poor before the rights of property, it may seem as if in this instance he has changed places with the Conservative, and is preferring the importance of the relations between individuals to that of the individual. A very little thought will show that this is not so. He thinks of the individual poor man and his needs, and insists on helping him out of the pockets of the rich ; and is in danger of so doing this as to set class against class, dislocate the relations of mutual dependence, and, still more important, mutual confidence and good feeling ; so, in the end, injuring both the rich, whom he is ready to sacrifice, and the poor, whom he wishes to help. The Conservative, on the other hand, is so anxious to avoid this serious mistake, that his legislation is in danger of being ineffective to help the poor. The enemies of the Conservative accuse him of toadying to wealth, while those of the Liberal accuse him of toadying to the shallow popularity

of the moment and the interested plaudits of the most selfish and ignorant of the mob. If we deal with conscious and deliberate motives, both accusations are—at least as regards reputable statesmen—no doubt equally false. If we deal with tendencies and actual results, both may equally have an element of truth.

Complementary charges of electricity or magnetism attract one another. But when one party lays stress on one principle, and another party lays stress on another principle which is complementary to the first, the result is repulsion; and each is driven to a more extreme position than it would have taken up if left to itself. Although each is compelled by reason and public opinion to acknowledge the principles complementary to its own, yet each thinks that those are unduly pressed by the other side, and that its own must be pressed in order to restore the balance. Therefore the Liberals are more uncompromising in their opinions than they would be if it were not for the Conservatives, and the Conservatives than they would be if it were not for them. This is only human nature, and is inevitable. It is a disadvantage inherent in the method of government by party, and in a less degree in all associated action by men of different opinions. The advantages of government by party are, in the main, threefold: that both sets of principles are continually put forward and skilfully explained and defended in the country; that the alternation of government gives each an opportunity of prevailing in turn; and that even the side which is in opposition has power to enforce some regard to its principles, and check the madness of extremists on the other side. Yet under the stress of party conflict, legislation can seldom be quite impartial, giving due weight to both sides of the problem, at any rate when it is controversial legislation, but is strained to one side or the other. The result is often an alternation of rather one-sided enactments, which cannot be so good for the national welfare as more even legislation.

The Church of England takes the Liberal position on all

five of the pairs of principles enumerated, and is doing so in a rapidly increasing degree.

1. It is quite essential to the Church's teaching to put the importance of the individual before that of the relations between individuals. It regards the individual as eternal, his present relations with others as temporary. In its teaching the character of the individual is regarded as the determining factor, and the element of chief importance, and the foundation of the relations between individuals, in a degree in which no other kind of teaching can so regard it. Its messages are addressed to individuals, and only to groups when each has first separately accepted them.

2. This being so, the purpose of its existence is to *do something* to promote the formation of character and the best general good. It puts this need, of doing something to raise mankind and combat sin and suffering, far before the need of cautious calculating of results, believing that it is its duty to do its best in the *present*, leaving the consequences in the Master's hands. It has a message to deliver and a work to perform, which come in its estimation before all other things, and, indeed, are the only things that really matter. This attitude of mind does not mean recklessness, either in the Church or necessarily in the sphere of politics. It does mean a greater readiness to try experiments, a greater adaptability to changing circumstances, a greater elasticity of method, a greater courage for decisive and vigorous action.

Similarly, and consequently, the Church is distinctly Liberal rather than Conservative with regard to the second-rank principles.

3. It puts the essential equality and brotherhood of men far before all social and temporary distinctions. Indeed, in its services and sacraments, in its work in the world, and in all official acts of its ministers, all these distinctions as such are totally and purposely ignored. And this spirit of human equality is becoming increasingly dominant in all its relations with mankind. But it has always been one of the characteristic distinctions

between the Church and the world; and if the Church in any way and generation has failed to show it, it is then most plain that this is its true spirit; for then both friend and foe alike confess that therein it has been unlike its Master, who is no respecter of persons.

4. The English Church teaches liberty of thought more as a duty than as a privilege. "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind," is the foundation of its work. It uses the authority of knowledge and of the belief and experience of many former generations to persuade, not to compel, men. In putting this liberty of thought before respect to authority is seen the most distinctive point of difference between the Churches of England and Rome. Rome takes the strongly Conservative position, putting authority far before liberty of thought; the English Church takes a moderately Liberal position, putting liberty of thought first, but not extravagantly so. With regard to the world in general, it guards with jealousy this principle of complete freedom of thought, holding its doctrines too precious to be forced on such as cannot value them, and knowing that only free acceptance of them can be of any use. With regard to even the inmost circle of its own members, who, *ex hypothesi*, have freely accepted them, and are privileged to join in the highest act of worship, no declaration of belief is required as a condition, except the Apostles' Creed, which is the simplest, most primitive, most elementary, and therefore the broadest, basis of membership possible. Short of this the title to the honoured name of Christian becomes at least doubtful; and to fall seriously short of it is, quite without doubt, to forfeit that title altogether.

5. It puts the responsibility of the rich toward the poor as an imperative moral duty, the neglect of which will certainly bring judgment; and utterly rejects the plea of the rights of property as an excuse to avoid that self-denial, which is one of the essentials of its doctrine. The rich, it says, are stewards of their property, not absolute owners, and are answerable to God—though to God alone—for a right use of it. If in any

place or time the Church has taught otherwise, it has been admittedly so far unfaithful to its Master, who taught a rich man that he was not perfect in religion by setting him the too hard task of giving all that he had to the poor, and told the story of the Rich Man and the Beggar, and said, "It is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the Kingdom of God."

We cannot think that anyone will deny these to be the principles of the English Church. Such a denial could not be maintained if it were made. If mistakes have been made at any period in the Church's story by individuals, groups, or generations, these mistakes are beside the mark. The Doctrine of the Church has had slowly to pervade a hostile world. Its members are living in the world, and their shortcomings are the shortcomings of the world and worldliness. The Gospel Kingdom has to pervade the world as the leaven pervades the dough. The world is still hostile, and where and when the members of the Church can be shown to fall short of the highest doctrine of the Church (and that is everywhere) it is because the leavening, as yet, is incomplete.

Of course, we do not say that Conservatism is un-Christian. All the ten principles given above are good and necessary. To neglect one is to be an extremist in regard to the complementary one. Sober Liberalism and sober Conservatism are closely allied, and can, both in theory and practice, work well and efficiently together. They are thrown into opposition, not by any inherent incompatibility, but by the Party system. One type of mind puts one set of principles first, another the other set. Both may be good Christians. Both may be loyal Churchmen. But the Liberal is in closest agreement with the English Church's outlook on the world. A new type of Churchman is springing up, more distinctly Liberal than in recent ages. To him the importance of the individual, and the need of prompt and vigorous action, are the first considerations more than ever before, and he therefore holds most strongly the equality of men, liberty of thought, and the responsibility of

those who have to come to the aid of those who have not. In this attitude of mind the fundamental principles of the Gospel encourage him. Thousands of convinced, and loyal, and earnest Churchmen are oppressed, as by a nightmare, by the sufferings of the very poor, whom they see sick with cold, weak with hunger, worn by hopeless struggles with privation and want. In these helpless ones they see souls for whom Christ died, as valuable to Him as any of the powerful and rich—nay, often and often far more valuable. This is the type of Churchman who is essentially Liberal at heart: In his Church he finds a mighty force, able to raise and strengthen, able to bless both rich and poor. By its persistent antagonism to this force, which he knows for the most effective to regenerate the world of all forces which can be turned to that purpose, the Liberal party drives him into opposition. Such men are, of all others, the truest Liberals, the very ones whom the party most needs and ought to draw into its ranks. It is time for the Liberal party to join hands with the Church. It is time for them boldly to cast aside the counsels of fanatics, demagogues, and bigots; all who try to set class against class, all who try to revive religious persecution, all who—in the name of religious liberty, a name perverted and misused—seek to weaken the forces of religion, and to tie the hands of those who are working with the most potent means to regenerate the world. If these Churchmen are included in its ranks, Liberalism will raise its head with a strength it has not known for many years, will carry out reforms which it is at present impotent to effect; and perhaps its crowning triumph may be to accomplish that religious co-operation and unity to which this country has been long a stranger, which will do more for the regeneration of the British Empire than any Parliamentary or political force can do. The present opposition is an unnatural and fratricidal war. The Church will meet Liberalism more than half-way. Already it has, in more than one important line of policy, upheld the hands of a bitterly hostile Government, forgetting that hostility, by active co-operation, or by withdrawing its forces from those political

camp in which it is received as a friend and ally ; so proving that the Church is disinterested, that its chief—nay, its only great—aim is the salvation of man. Why cannot Liberals believe a truth which lies so clearly before them? The Church will spring to meet them half-way on those points on which there is now conflict of opinion. Societies of Churchmen are continually trying to adjudicate these points on a reasonable, practical, and just basis, but Liberalism has as yet failed, through the influence of irreconcilable bigots, to meet them. This is unworthy of a great party, unworthy of the aims which that party sets before it, unworthy of the deeds that it has done, and the deeds it desires with a whole-souled and disinterested patriotism still to carry out.



Gilbert Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury.

BY THE REV. H. A. WILSON, M.A.,
Vicar of St. Peter's, Norbiton.

GILBERT BURNET, the courageous, broad-minded, but highly conscientious Bishop of Salisbury, was probably the greatest of the "latitude men" of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. In politics he was a Whig or Low Churchman—the two were almost interchangeable terms. We cannot too carefully remember that the expression Low Churchman was at least as much a definition of political views in those days as of religious views. It is now really an obsolete term, and most misleading in its loose application to the Evangelical School of to-day.

He was of Scottish birth on both sides; his father was an Episcopalian of liberal views, and belonged to a family of importance in Aberdeenshire; his mother was a highly connected lady and a Presbyterian. Their son was a true child of his parents, and his religious views showed a wide and Christian sympathy with the religious systems favoured by both his father and mother. The result was not entirely happy, for he was never really trusted by either party. He was quick to see the wrong in each, and his courageous Scottish nature never hesitated to express with blunt truth his opinion. "He supported their" (the Episcopalian) "measures when he approved of them, and was duly thanked; he reproved them, not even sparing the monarch for his sins, and in return was hated." In days when all men were party men and clung to the party whether it were right or wrong, he was out of place and was never really appreciated by his generation as he deserved.

Gilbert Burnet was born in 1643, and died in 1715, thus living through a period when the pendulums of religious and political thought were violently oscillating. He was most conscientious, especially in matters of religion. At the age of

eighteen he was offered a valuable family living, and was urged by all his relatives, except his parents, who remained silent, to accept. But he knew he was not yet equipped for such a high calling and firmly refused the offer. He set out upon travels instead, and, like his greatest friend Leighton, for whom he had the most intense love and respect, he owed to this period of his life much of that toleration and broad sympathy for the views of others, which was the most prominent characteristic in his temperament and coloured all his policy.

In London he made friendships which were lifelong with the most eminent prelates and statesmen of the day. On the Continent he enlarged his mind by his insight into the views of Arminians, Lutherans, Brownists, Anabaptists, and Roman Catholics. He came home imbued with an almost universal charity and a disposition to always think the best of those who differed from him, with one exception. He had a dislike for High Church principles, which almost amounted to hatred. But this can be explained from the fact that his association with High Churchmen was mainly with the bigoted politicians at the Court, and not so much with men of the type of Ken and Kettlewell. Every High Churchman in his eyes was a "Sacheverell," who stood in the way of those principles he cherished. Ralph Thoresby could pass from the company of his High Church friends and yet appraise the qualities of Burnet. "Notwithstanding the censures of a malignant world, he is doubtless an admirable, holy, and good man, and has one of the best regulated houses in the world."¹

In 1665 he was offered the benefice of Saltoun, but withheld his consent till he knew whether he would be acceptable to the parishioners. They unanimously elected him, and he was ordained by the Bishop of Edinburgh in the same year.

We must briefly note the way in which he fulfilled his duty in this office. Twice a Sunday he preached and once in the week. He visited his flock from house to house, and the sick folks twice a day. The Holy Communion was administered four

¹ "Diary," ii. 67.

times a year. To rightly appreciate this fidelity we must remember the degenerate state into which his brother clergy had sunk. They were many of them of evil life, absentees from their parishes, and performing the few duties they were compelled to discharge in a cold and perfunctory way. In the biography written by his son, the writer says his father was the only man in Scotland who used the prayers in the English Church Liturgy at this time, and yet so good and liberal and faithful was he that even the Presbyterians respected him.

In 1669 he became Professor of Divinity at Glasgow University, greatly to the delight of Archbishop Leighton, who found in him a friend and champion in his futile attempts to reconcile the Covenanters to Episcopacy. He attended the conferences arranged by the Archbishop between the two opposing forces, and, so clear was his knowledge of all the questions at issue, that when an objector rose to protest that in no way did the Bishops of that time resemble those of the primitive Church, Burnet in his reply absolutely silenced him, and none could answer him a word.

He was married three times, and though outwardly he appeared cold, as a husband, father, and friend, he was loving and tender.

Burnet feared no man. During his life in London he did not hesitate to write a long private letter to Charles II. rebuking him for his scandalous life and warning him of God's sure judgments. This might well have cost him his head, but when duty pointed the way Gilbert Burnet never drew back. This letter is still preserved, and is a most striking document, combining, in a beautifully balanced way, the respect of a subject for his sovereign and the independence of the preacher of righteousness.

About the same time he argued, supported by his friend Stillingfleet, with the Duke of York (afterwards James II.) on the errors of Rome.

Charles II. never really forgave him for writing the letter referred to. He was waiting his chance. Burnet was Thurs-

day lecturer at St. Clement's Church. The King ordered his dismissal. But a more dangerous trap was set, and one that, though he perceived it, he was too courageous to avoid. He was required to preach on November 5, 1684, at the Rolls Chapel, by the Master of the Rolls. Burnet begged to be excused, but, when the Master insisted, he determined not to avoid the topic naturally in all minds on such a day. The King had strong leanings to Romanism; indeed, it was generally believed he was secretly a Romanist, and Burnet knew trouble was bound to follow if he rebuked Popish errors. He chose as his text, "Save me from the lion's mouth, Thou hast heard me from the horns of the unicorn." Although, as he quaintly says, he avoided all reference to these as "the two supporters of the King's 'Scutcheon,'" for which his hearers were eagerly listening, yet he did not shrink from denouncing the Roman Church. For this he was ejected from his position, and suspecting that more trouble was in store when James came to the throne, he quietly withdrew to the Continent.

He journeyed to Paris, Rome, and then to the Hague, where he stayed some time and was well received by the Prince of Orange. Scarcely was he out of the King's hands than the latter regretted he had allowed him to go abroad and sought to get him back into his power. For this, as well as for private reasons, Burnet became naturalized. James was furious with wrath, and unable to seize the man he hated, he even offered £5,000 to any rascal who would murder him. But his life was not to end thus or yet.

We must here note a very interesting point to which Burnet made reference later on in the debate in Parliament on the Occasional Conformity Bill. During his enforced stay abroad he was not cut off from all spiritual privileges. "I ventured to say" (in the debate in the House) "that a man might lawfully communicate with a Church that he thought had a worship and a doctrine uncorrupted, and yet communicate more frequently with a Church that he thought more perfect; I myself had communicated with the Churches of Geneva and Holland, and

yet at the same time communicated with the Church of England." This is most instructive. Obviously in his mind there was no idea of repudiating the ministry of non-Episcopal Churches. His conduct in this respect is paralleled by many of the best divines about that time who, under similar circumstances, had no hesitation in attending communion with the Continental Protestants.

The offer of the Crown to William of Orange and his acceptance of it meant the change of the fortunes of Burnet. He became one of the new King's advisers in Church matters, and admirably he used his influence. Some of the names he mentioned for preferment were men of the greatest eminence, and through him the Episcopal bench was graced by great divines—*e.g.*, Patrick, Stillingfleet, Sharp, Cumberland, Tillotson. He never sought any advancement for himself. In a place-hunting age this was most singular, but all his influence was on behalf of others. He had been offered the choice of four Scotch Bishoprics, but had refused them all. In 1689 the See of Salisbury became vacant. Burnet earnestly besought the King to give it to his old friend, Dr. Lloyd, Bishop of St. Asaph. William coldly replied: "I have another person in view." The next day it was offered to Burnet himself. So great was his unpopularity, that Archbishop Sancroft refused to consecrate him, although he did authorize his suffragan to do so in his name.¹

It is almost impossible to exaggerate the admirable way in which the new Bishop did his work. He struck at the many abuses at the time. Non-residence and pluralities were not only sternly reprovèd and held up to contempt, but by his own example he showed the right way. He was even bold enough to introduce a bill into the House of Lords to correct the latter evil. In order to remove the excuse of many incumbents, who held more benefices than one, that poverty compelled them to do so, he supplemented many poor livings in his Diocese out of his own purse. Nothing but urgent duty ever called him

¹ Grew, "Court of William III.," p. 123.

from his Diocese, and then he hastened to return. "There was hardly a corner of the Diocese which was not well acquainted with the burly form and loud voice of its bustling bishop."¹

Two of his practices deserve more than passing notice.

Confirmation was administered by the Bishops generally, only very occasionally, and then rushed through in a cold and formal way. Burnet felt the solemnity of the rite intensely; he regarded it as the great crisis in the lives of young people, and he was determined that the tone of the service should be raised. He drew up a short directory on Confirmation which he issued to all his clergy, in which he set out the lines upon which instruction should proceed. Every summer he toured through part of his Diocese for six weeks or two months, preaching and confirming in the parish churches. Latterly he went to five or six market towns annually, and making each in turn his headquarters for a week, went out every morning to the surrounding country churches preaching and confirming. In the evening he returned, and assembling the children in church, catechized them in person. On Sunday he confirmed those he had thus prepared, and gave to each a present of some suitable books. So punctilious was he in this work that once he was nearly drowned in a flood when trying to keep an appointment for a Confirmation Service.

Candidates for Holy Orders received searching scrutiny in every way from the Bishop. He never turned them over for examination to chaplains, but conducted this personally. First he tested their knowledge of, and soundness in, divinity. If they failed, they were at once rejected. If they passed, he engaged them in long and searching conversation as to their high calling, pointing out the lofty requirements of the sacred office and beseeching them to withdraw if not fully persuaded they were divinely called.

Burnet's idea was to correct abuses by slowly raising the tone of the clergy, but though his care in ordaining was a great

¹ Overton, "Life in the English Church," 1660-1714, p. 69.

safeguard, it could not protect him from unsuitable presentees to benefices in his Diocese. Here he was almost powerless, but a splendid instance of his courage in even this direction is told us by his son. The young son of a noble family was preferred to a living in Oxfordshire by the Lord Chancellor. Burnet sent for the incumbent elect, and found him so ignorant that he refused absolutely to admit him to the benefice. The Lord Chancellor instituted legal proceedings, but the Bishop stood fast. For some reason these fell through, and then Burnet did a most Christianlike thing. He sent for the young man and told him he did not wish to injure him, and if the benefice were kept vacant for a while he would himself instruct him and prepare him for his duties. This the Bishop did, and eventually the young man passed the examination creditably.

Nothing was so dear to the heart of Burnet as the cause of toleration and comprehension. It was with the greatest joy he saw the passing of the Toleration Act in 1689. He supported it enthusiastically in Parliament. "I showed so much zeal for this Act, as very much sunk my credit," so he writes in his history of this incident. But comprehension he was not to see. The scheme to bring this about in 1689 was a complete failure, but Burnet appears not to have altogether regretted it, for the times were not ripe for any scheme to include Dissenters and authoritatively recognize their ministry.

There is one permanent blessing which the Church enjoys with which our Bishop's name is closely identified. He had long sought the abolition of the dues payable by the clergy to the sovereign. Queen Anne fell in with the proposal, and if Burnet was not the sole person responsible for "Queen Anne's Bounty," no one had a larger share in bringing it about than he had.

Of all Burnet's writings none is so well known as his "History of his own Time"; and not the least value of this book is the insight it gives into its author's character. Fond of gossip, and somewhat egotistical, he was yet a shrewd observer of character and far-sighted in his outlook. The "conclusion "

of the history is a grand piece of reading, and some of his statements have the most remarkable bearing upon present-day problems. We cannot refrain from noting a few :

“The capital error in men’s preparing themselves for that function (Holy Orders) is that they study books more than themselves, and that they read divinity more in other books than in the Scriptures.”

“I see a spirit rising among us too like that of the Church of Rome, of advancing the clergy beyond their due authority to an unjust pitch.”

“And let me say this freely to you, now that I am out of the reach of envy and censure, unless a better spirit possesses the clergy, arguments (and which is more), laws, and authority will not prove strong enough to preserve the Church, especially if the nation observes a progress in that bias which makes many so favourable to Popery and so severe towards the Dissenters.”

Burnet is rather hard on Archdeacons, unless the following is inspired by his dry Scottish humour :

“Archdeacons’ Visitations were an invention of the latter ages in which the Bishops, neglecting their duty, cast a great part of their care upon them ; now their Visitations are only for form and for fees, and they are a charge on the clergy ; so when this matter is well looked into I hope Archdeacons with many other burdens that lay heavy on the clergy shall be taken away.” (!)

But Burnet’s favourite work was his “Pastoral Care,” and here we get an inner view of that holiness of life which was so often overlooked by his many enemies, and obscured by his overbearing manner. He was the chief instrument in the conversion of the Earl of Rochester, and thought nothing of the long journey from London to Woodstock to visit the penitent nobleman. He was a close friend of King William and Queen Mary, and it was to him alone that the bereaved King unburdened himself on the Queen’s death. “He called me into his closet,” wrote Burnet, “and gave vent to a most tender passion ; he burst into tears and cried out that there was no hope of the Queen, and that from being the most happy, he was now going to be the most miserable creature upon the earth. He said that during the whole course of their marriage he had never known a single fault in her ; there was a worth in her that nobody knew besides himself, though he added that I might know as much of her as any other person did.”

Burnet was a popular preacher, although the few surviving

specimens of his sermons would not lead one to this conclusion. Macaulay tells us, "he was often interrupted by the deep hum of his audience ; and when, after preaching out the hour-glass, he held it up in his hand, the congregation clamorously encouraged him to go on till the sand had run out once more."¹

We cannot better conclude this sketch of this great man's life than with a quotation from his will which discloses much of his character, and still more of his hopes and fears :

"I die, as I all along lived and professed myself to be, full of charity and tenderness for those among us who yet dissent from us, and heartily pray that God would heal our breaches, and make us like-minded in all things, that so we might unite our zeal and join our endeavours against atheism and infidelity, that have prevailed much ; and against Popery, the greatest enemy to our Church, more to be dreaded than all other parties !"

¹ "History of England," ed. Dent, vol. i., p. 641.



Sin in the Making.

BY THE REV. J. E. GIBBERD.

MANY a paper of verses—outpourings of amorous hearts—has been treasured in loving bosoms as poetry, having merits imputed to it whose tune came from the partiality of bountiful affection. In after-years, it has sometimes happened, the man who sent poetic effusions in his youth came across his own compositions. Since indulging in rhythmical flow he has read the sonnets of master minds. His hours of care have been smoothed by the melody of tuneful words and the richer melody of inspired thoughts. His ear for poetry has been trained—corrected, taught, tuned. His sense of truth and worth in poetry has been refined. The consequence is fatal to his own composition. He holds the old form of lyric in his hands with blushes on his cheeks. “The miserable doggerel!” he cries; “burn that rubbish!” If the true poets had not spoken to him, his own verses had not had blame; if the master poets had not done for him works none other man did, his own work had not had blame. When true music finds a soul and wakes its response, tinkle is condemned.

And if the mind of God had not spoken through the mouth of man, man's barbaric notions had remained in possession; his crude, vindictive code of honour had continued to this day; his bleak pantheon of competing gods had still starved his reverence behind pillared porticoes; he would still have dared his sons to walk through fire to prove their yea was yea and their nay was nay, and have thought better of them, if they passed unscathed through the ordeal than if they had exhibited in their words and actions the gleams of an illumined conscience and the glistenings of a heaven-born faith. For to Christ's presence in the world, once, in the midst of the ages, all milder manners; all more generous thought; all prerogatives of good character over material possessions; all enfranchisement of

womanhood in equality of rank with manhood ; all preference for the arbitrament of justice over the appeal to force ; all generous and honourable sense of what is due to children and the poor ; all motive to arrest the course of the transgressor, the violent, the intemperate, the profligate ; all hope of redemption from tyrannies of error, temper, and baneful habit ; all Gospel of God's forgiveness ; all radiancy of the hope of heaven round death, are due. If He had not come and spoken unto men, they had not had sin. They would have had frailty and inconvenience, but not sin.

If He had not raised the tone of thought, they had not had sin. If He had not enlightened conscience and opinion, they had not had sin. If He had not dignified love and the mind of love and enwreathed it with the praise of God, they had not had sin. If He had not filtered the judgment of heaven into the will of men, they had not had sin. One has heard old people who were cradled in ignorance exclaim with delight when their boys brought copy-books home from school with legible mottoes on the lines. But the boys' masters set the *copy* beside the copies, and called the copies "scrawl." Thus the true word dethrones the false, the pure doctrine degrades the impure, the glowing pleasure in goodness and graciousness unfrocks and deposes the apathy of ungodly souls, the word that reveals God blights and shames all unregenerate hearts. Christ's word is man's criterion. Christ sets the copy. He chiseis the statue, in form and features all Divine, in material human ; henceforth, the human, untenanted and unlit by the Divine, is sin. For light is come into the world, the true light shineth, and the darkness of mind and the fears of darkened hearts are silhouetted in black relief against a bright horizon.

If Christ had not done among us the works which none other man did, we had not sin. If He had not lived an unsullied life, stained and freckled lives had remained passable. If He had not forgiven His enemies, the implacable temper had continued to be manly. If He had not healed the sick, cleansed the leprous, given sight to the blind, it had still been right to

treat the disabled, the incapacitated, the destitute, as of no account. If He had not loved the harlot and the prodigal, it had still been just to consign them to the remorseful misery they made for themselves. If He had not given His life for the sins of the world, the world's redemption had still been a negligible weed. If He had not opened the Kingdom of Heaven to all believers, the world had still been a faithless, flowerless, songless desolation; a barren plain littered with fallen chips of rock; and its souls had been born to face an uncheered death, and to feel in view of death the pitiless satire of existence. With no anticipation of the open vision of God in a Redeemer who should come and no prophetic foresight of heaven being opened, the best spirits of men before Christ had been barren. With no well-grounded and lively faith in the Christ who has spoken and worked, the spirits of men to-day are feeble, and poor, and unclad. And their paltriness and commonness, their insolvency of soul, is this—they know not the righteousness of faith, they know not their Father in Heaven, for they know not even so much as sin. The Spirit is come which convicted us of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment, and sanctuary is denied Him. If He had not come and spoken, if He had not done the works none other man did, we should not have the obligations to Him. Without obligation there can be no sin; with it what was sinless becomes sinful.

“If ye say ye have no sin, your sin remaineth.” Credit with men is yours, respectability is yours, with a grub at their core. A man may be at his worst when he thinks himself at his best. Prosperity may delude him; industrious poverty may blind him. Engrossed in all that allures his senses and appetites, gratified by the successful pushfulness of his propensities, he may leave his spiritual nature unfed and unclothed. His side towards the world answers. The world elects him, and he is one sort of an elect man. But his side towards God is withered.

“For merit lives from man to man,
And not from man, O Lord, to Thee.”

“If ye say ye have no sin, your sin remaineth.”

Now sin, as Christ makes it by the new obligations He brings, has two modes of existence.

The obvious forms of sin appear in *action* as transgression. Conduct expresses sin. The preference for second-rate acquisitions, the feeble self-control, the faltering unreadiness for sacrifice, the cold immurement in selfish circles, the unchivalrous want of regard of opportunities for influence, the sordid eye that is unfair without intention, the love of mammon that is unaware of itself, the censorious judgment, the self-indulgence along the lines of passion, the easy condoning of one's own faults, and the faithless excusing of one's own secret sins—these are the less obvious forms of obvious sins—the tinselled transgressions—these and the like. Of vulgar, obtrusive, defiant transgression, it is less needful to speak. The patriot, the law, and the policeman, deal with these. Where they fail to restrain open wickedness, the many withdraw their skirts from the contagious touch. "Sin is the transgression of the law."

But deeper, more penetrating and pervading, is indwelling sin. This is sin in the grain. This is the general demerit that covers the whole surface and saturates the whole substance of the interior life. It is the thistle where the herb should be. It is the foul smoke vitiating the atmosphere; the unconsumed products of combustion in a life that cannot cleanse its own output and discharges its waste on the world. "When I would do good, evil is present with me." "My sin is ever before me. Thou desirest truth in the inward parts." Sin is bad quality as well as bad works. It is mildewed grain traded off as wholesome grain. It is shoddy, mercerized. It is base metal silver-plated. Sin is in the quality. A man's quality matters most. "Out of the heart proceedeth" all the obvious transgressions. The man is guilty for what he is much more than for what he does. Counterfeit coin is bad and unlawful whether it be passed or not. Its existence is without justification. There is the sin of being as we are.

And as sin appears in exterior and interior modes so also does guilt, the moral offensiveness of sin, the odour of it that renders it fit only for the scavenger.

First there is the guilt that adheres to the sinner. His blame sticks on him. Whatever names the disobedient spirit has are his names. He wears the broad arrow of the convict. As the blight clings to the tree the offence clings to the wrongdoer. Men blame him—men who are as blameworthy as himself. They resent his awkwardness, his caprice, his crookedness. They draw round him the speckled cloak of unpleasant opinions. In their view he might be a much more agreeable man than he is. His sharp angles and rough edges maim their feelings. The blame they inflict on him is inflicted by him on them. So the common consent to guilt moves round in an endless circle. "If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." And man's blame is a faint reflection of God's judgment. Christ's Spirit would come to convict the world of sin because they believed not on Him. The surest mark of culpability was the want of response to, and confidence in, the Christ of God. For unbelief shows incapacity—a gap where a growth ought to be. When a great climber was on a lofty spot upon an Alp, his guide in front raised his axe, and by a blow that was intended to hew out a step to plant their feet in for the ascent, drove his axe through the snow. Instantly he took alarm. Beneath the snow there ought to have been the solid mountain, but instead of mountain there was a hollow cavern. The peril of the situation was realized, and the party of men hurried off a thin crust that had no foundation. Not less perilous is a heart that has no foothold outside its own guilt. For a blameworthy state of spirit and life has no more security than the thin crust of snow over a yawning cavern. Guilt is imputed to the sinful because it is theirs. By man and by God the responsibility of sin is laid on them.

But, beside this guilt that adheres, is the guilt that inheres; that evinces itself in the dissatisfied heart, the unacknowledged self-reproaches, the waves of doubt, the eddies of conscience; in the sense of a void, of incapacity to be as good, as true, as high-souled, as intimate with the Father of spirits as one feels he should be.

For in observing the Lord Christ's holy union with His Father, His placid confidence in the Providence and Righteousness of His Father, His self-denying consent to His Father's will at the cost of His own abasement in suffering, His splendid faith that God would use His sufferings to draw men to Himself, the limping heart of the crippled man knows its own lameness, the empty heart of the hollow man knows its own ill-desert. And the man who has begun to know himself in the light of God cries the cry he felt but could not utter in the days of his ignorance : "In me dwelleth no good thing." This is the voice of inherent guilt.

So the Holy and True One came, gifted by His heavenly descent and His unerring perception of God, convinced that one of the greatest services He could do us, and one of the most beneficial ministries He could render us, was to expose the deep-seated ill out of which our discontent and our unsettled feelings, our disability and our misery, arise. If He had not come and spoken unto us, if He had not done among us the works none other man did, we had not had sin. Now if we say we have no sin, our sin remaineth. To fix the complaint is the first act towards the cure. To convince the man with diseased organs that he must lend himself to the remedies is the first step towards his healing.

At the beginning when God created the heaven and the earth He divided the light from the darkness. In the fulness of time He divided enlightenment from benightedness. For Christ boldly affirms that His coming imparts sin to kinds of thought and lines of conduct. Sin is *had* through Him. It is as though sin were a property, a calculable asset. And is it not? Can you think of a beaver, a swallow, a salmon, a horse, having sin? Can you think of a human being without sin? It is the moral capacity of mankind which divides man from other animals. Because we can be made right we are under blame for being wrong. We deserve ill of God who made us. Our ill-desert is palpable to us. The light of God in Christ has divided it from the darkness of creaturely ignorance. One had better know

remorse than remain blind. For the fabric of a life that can be condemned can also be approved. Quality in character carries value.

It is no cynical Master who spoke and worked that we might come to our own sin and our own censure. In a factory the man who examines the products, dividing the good from the defective, has the reputation and prosperity of the mill in his charge. Among men he who has grace from God to show forth the radiance of a right mind and righteous life cannot help but show up the drab inferiority of a mind and life that is less than right. Christ appreciates the eternal possibilities enfolded in the culprit's knowledge of his mean quality of life, of his worthless character. The man who can be redeemed and made Christ's own by the purchase of His blood must needs be made aware of moral values. He who comes that we may have sin comes that we may have quality. He comes to reveal to itself the neutral, indifferent, insensible soul, and stir it to its depths, clearing out the silt that chokes the channel in which healthy and holy vitality may flow.

“It's wiser being good than bad ;
It's safer being meek than fierce ;
It's fitter being sane than mad.
My own hope is, a sun will pierce
The thickest cloud earth ever stretched.
That after last returns the first,
That what began best can't end worst,
Nor what God blessed once, prove accurst.”



The Missionary World.

OCTOBER is the month when missionary departures are uppermost in our minds. The work and prayer of the year then manifests its fruitage, for though no external measure is entirely satisfactory, the test of the number of out-going missionaries is the best that can be applied, whether on the financial or on the spiritual side. Each Society's magazine contains a notice of farewell meetings; some give a list of the men and women going forth. The C.M.S. list is a long one, more than 150 names in all, forty-eight of the missionaries being accompanied by their wives. But of this total only thirty-one are new recruits. The number shrinks still further when the new missionaries are divided amongst the Society's many fields. Africa, according to the list in the *C.M.S. Gazette*, with its great needs and opportunities, receives six new missionaries, three being men and three women. Palestine and Persia receive one added woman worker each, and the latter has a layman besides. India receives an accession of twelve (one of whom goes out married), seven of these being men, of whom five are clergy. Ceylon has not a single recruit. China, in this time of unexampled urgency, receives nine new missionaries—two clergy (one of whom is accompanied by his wife), one doctor, one layman, the rest single women. Japan is reinforced by one ordained man and one woman missionary. That is all. Thousands will gather and send this handful forth. Small as the going and the sending is in face of the claims of Africa and the East, it represents a sacrifice well-pleasing to God, for faith and prayer and devotion have moved the little group. And amongst the recruits there are those who give promise of signal service in days to come. The list, though short, is a noteworthy one. But when will the absolute inadequacy of our sacrifice be realized? When will the Church revise its scale of giving to the world?

* * * * *

Those of us who are stationed at the home base need to take this matter soberly to heart. We need a deep, perhaps a

painful, awakening to the real issues with which we play. We need a quickened relationship with the Lord of the Harvest, which shall impel us to pray, that He may thrust forth. And we need to give ourselves to sustained and faithful intercession that the little band, lacking addition at our hands, may receive a spiritual multiplication from the Lord Himself. Each man or woman, going forth in weakness and inexperience, may prove a little one who shall become a thousand. The first year is the most critical one of a missionary's life, and often makes or mars a whole term of service. We must not let go the ropes on which those who have gone out for us depend for support.

* * * * *

A considerable proportion of the out-going recruits have had the privilege of attending the Vacation Course arranged at Oxford during August by the Board of Study for Missionaries. We congratulate the Board, and its Secretary, Canon Weitbrecht, on the success of this effort. The testimony as to the value of the Course is very high, both lecturers and students being full of enthusiasm concerning it. The work of the Edinburgh Conference Commission on the Training and Preparation of Missionaries is bearing good fruit.

* * * * *

Another notable Conference was held at Oxford in September, when some 150 women educationists met to consider the Christian education of women in the East. The Conference met in the Hall of Magdalen College, and members were grouped residentially at Wycliffe Hall and other centres. The Chairman was Miss Richardson of Westfield College; the Secretary was Miss de Sélincourt. Amongst others taking part was Miss Douglas, President of the Headmistresses' Association; Miss Gray, St. Paul's Girls' School; Miss Roberts, Girls' Grammar School, Bradford; Miss Wood, Cambridge Training College; Miss Powell, St. Mary's College, London; Miss McDougall, Westfield College; and Miss Helen Gladstone. The Bishop of Oxford, Professor Cairns, the Rev. W. Temple, the Rev. F. Lenwood, and Mr. T. R. W. Lunt, were amongst

the speakers. Two most valuable addresses were given by Government educationists from India—a man and a woman. The Conference brings a new missionary factor into the forefront. Never before have a body of educationists generated within their own ranks such a Conference, or ranged themselves corporately on the side of missions. The significance both for the world and for the missionary societies is great.

* * * * *

At the close of the Conference it was distinctly put from the chair that, however necessary it was for Christian women to fill posts in the East—such as those in Government employment, where their influence would tell for the extension of the Kingdom—it was a higher and greater thing to be a Christian missionary, employed in direct work for Christ. The Conference, though widely inclusive in its tone, made this its dominant note. Those best able to judge are confident that the mission-field will ere long share in the results of the Oxford Conference. The gain to the missionary societies (who were well represented both by home and foreign workers) should also be great. Nothing but good can result from coalition between those who are expert respectively in education and foreign missions. Each has need of what the other can give. The educationists have made a noteworthy approach. It now remains for the central administration of the various societies to follow up without delay. The outlook of trained women educationists upon the world is too valuable to be lost. These women are educating future missionaries in school and in college. There is a distinct need that they and the missionary societies should learn to understand each other. Hitherto educationists have been too often approached merely as those who could give or withhold permission for a visit from a missionary speaker. The Oxford Conference has finally shown that there is a body of sympathetic and able women who ought to be drawn into missionary councils, consulted on problems of missionary education, and acquainted with the conditions—physical, mental, spiritual—of missionary life. It

will immeasurably cheer the workers and thinkers in each sphere to find how they can respectively help each other.

* * * * *

The leaders of Mission Study Circles are to be congratulated on the text-books issued this year by the United Council for Missionary Study. Both books deal with India; both are splendidly edited and equipped with every aid to efficient use; both are charged with spiritual messages; both are certain to interest and inspire. Beginners will find Mr. Phillips's book, "The Outcasts' Hope," easier to master. Those who have previously worked in a good Study Circle will thoroughly appreciate "The Renaissance in India," by the Rev. C. F. Andrews of Delhi. The latter book should prove of special value in Study Circles of men. In parts it will stir question and possibly dissent; but Mr. Andrews' knowledge of Young India is so close and his sympathy is so comprehensive that every position he takes is worthy of consideration and of discussion. At a juncture when so much depends upon the vitalizing of the home base, it is a true encouragement to know that such books as these will be studied during the winter by thousands of those who are the hope of the missionary cause.

* * * * *

From time to time the veil is rent before our eyes, and we are compelled to look upon cruelty, oppression, and wrong. Our hearts have bled for Armenia and for the peoples of the Congo; now from the centre of a third continent there has come a vision which fills us with horror and holy wrath. Whilst measures for the relief of the Putumayo Indians are being discussed and slowly adjusted, England has flamed with shame and indignation at the crimes that have been perpetrated by some of her sons. The Indians who are part of our "trust," who dwell within that world which is our "parish," have been maltreated for the sake of gain. The call to repentance and to reformation is followed hard by a call to fresh effort to send them through every open channel, such as the British and Foreign Bible Society and the South American Missionary Society, the healing message of Him whose name is Love.

* * * * *

The death of "General" Booth has elicited a wonderful testimony to the impress made upon the world by one devoted life. Few kings or emperors have been more widely known or more deeply honoured. However one may hesitate to endorse certain aspects of the Salvation Army's work, there is no doubt that it has been a powerful agent in the saving of thousands, both in body and in soul, and that in many lands. The *Foreign Field* of the Wesleyan Methodist Church for September contains an account of the foreign work of the Salvation Army, which will be a surprise to many. The whole of this, with its social and evangelistic aspects, has been built up under the direction of the brave old man just laid to rest.

* * * * *

Another useful life, of a widely different type of Christian service, is that of Mr. Henry Morris of Blackheath, concerning whom details are given, with appreciative memories, both in *The Bible in the World* and in the *C.M.S. Gazette*. Mr. Morris was a valued worker and leader in both the B. and F.B.S. and the C.M.S., and in their committee-rooms gave regular attendance and careful work. He delighted specially in two things—one was to act as a link binding the two kindred agencies together; another was to address words of sympathetic counsel from the chair in the C.M.S. Committee of Correspondence to missionaries proceeding to South India, where he had himself done distinguished Government service, and had proved himself a devoted friend of missions.

* * * * *

The missionary aspect of the Church Congress is emphasized by the fact that its date closely coincides with that of the centenary of Henry Martyn's death at Tokat. It may be that the inspiration of that heroic life and saintly personality may stir many a man to venture forth on like high endeavour. It is these glorious failures—for outwardly Henry Martyn failed—which make success for God.

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.]

"SOME THOUGHTS ON THE CHURCH OF INDIA."

(The "Churchman," August, 1912, p. 605.)

WITH much of the article by the Rev. S. H. Clark appearing in the current issue of the CHURCHMAN I am in complete accord, but it also appears to me that the author (himself a retired Indian missionary) has drawn some of those cheques on the bank of futurity which are so light-heartedly signed by good-natured people in England, because they can leave the meeting of them to the Englishmen resident in India.

Mr. Clark talks of the time to come when the work of the English will be done, and an Indian Christian King shall have been proclaimed in Delhi. Were an Arya Samajist to look forward to the purification of Hinduism, and to speak of the work of his Samaj being consummated by the proclamation of an Hindu Sovereign at Indraprastha (Delhi's ancient Hindu name), the issue of his paper would be marked by the Criminal Investigation Department for report as dangerously near sedition. And if this is so, it behoves an ex-missionary to write with sober carefulness as to his day-dreams, for the excuse "I was day-dreaming" is not lightly accepted in a court of law. Mr. Clark ignores the fact that a Christian King has already held his Coronation Durbar at Delhi—a King who is infinitely nearer in race to the Aryan people of Northern India than a King from the Dravidian people of Southern India could ever be. North and South may well rally more easily to an Englishman than a Panjabi to a Telegu, or a Tamil to a Pathan.

Again, Mr. Clark writes of the enthronement of an Indian Archbishop, but the discussion of the metropolitanate which the Durbar announcement of the change of capital has called forth has shown that the conditions of North and South are so diverse that two, if not three, archbishoprics are needed; and the appointment of the first Indian Assistant Bishop has raised a quarrel between Tamil and Telegu which is child's-play to the storm that would result if a man of North India were put over a South India See, or *vice versa*.

Mark Twain once said, "Never prophecy till you know," and I cannot but feel that they who sow to the wind in their kindly-meant but unsubstantial day-dreams deserve to reap the whirlwind of disappointed ambition, which they tend to foster in immature and unbalanced minds.

Mr. Clark's own experience of Bengal ought to have taught him that the Englishman should be very chary of making promises which involve conditions expressed or implied, for the promise is remembered, while the conditions are ignored, and the opening paragraphs of his article will touch the imagination when its more balanced close will be forgotten. When he builds airy castles of political and ecclesiastical fancies in the study of his English vicarage, he should remember that, if these visions meet the eyes of Indian Christians in Bengal, it is of his successors in Calcutta that it will be demanded, "How long are we to wait before we receive from you English in India what Englishmen in England are so ready to give us?"

I cannot believe, as I read the history of the rise of the British power in India, that God has brought us to Bengal, or to the Punjab, or to Bombay in vain, and that being so, I should count myself rash indeed if I should lay it down that He who has brought us here will also take us away when such and such conditions have been fulfilled. It might have robbed Mr. Clark's article of much of its interest to have omitted these gorgeous visions, but I believe the doing of the thing that's nearest, though it's dull awhile, is worth many reams of airy literature which is remote from everyday realities. If England left India to-day, or for many a long year to come, India would not be left alone, for Russia would come, or Germany, or Japan. But the task to which God in His providence has called the Englishman in India of setting forward the cause of Unity and Righteousness, is made infinitely harder if the rising generation of Indian youth are to be taught by so-called friends of India that *the* thing to look forward to is the day when the last Englishman shall sail from Calcutta. It was a grim story told in the "East and West" of a few years since of a North India Prince who, on being asked what he would do if the British left India, replied: "The day the British leave India, I and my army will be on the march for Calcutta, and in a month there will be neither a virgin nor a rupee left in Bengal." And while things are so, it is not the wisdom of the seer, but the folly of the unwise, to talk of what will happen in the way of crowning a Christian King when the British Raj has done its work. He is no friend of the growing lad who is always impressing upon him the grand days he will have when he is of age and freed from parental control. He only sows the seeds of discontent and of rebellion. He is the true friend who encourages the lad to fit himself to enter into his parent's noblest aims. God in His providence has put India to school in the British Empire, and her salvation and hope lie in the diligence with which she learns the lessons God has for her to learn, without at the present moment concerning herself as to what shall be her position when school-days are over, or when they will be over, for her teachers are progressing as well as herself. Co-operation and sympathy may have a drab hue about them compared with the gay colours of *Swaraj*

(Home Rule) ; but the path of duty is the way to glory, and the path of impatient defiance of present tutelage and of inordinate yearnings after premature independence leads only to disillusionment and bitterness. It is because Mr. Clark's opening paragraphs tend to the rasher instead of the more sober of these counsels that I have addressed to you these words of protest.

AN ENGLISHMAN IN INDIA.



Notices of Books.

THE PERSON OF CHRIST IN MODERN THOUGHT: DONNELLAN LECTURES, 1912. By Rev. E. Digges La Touche, Litt.D. London: *James Clarke*. Price 6s. net.

"The supreme question for Christians is not whether Christianity is true or false—they know from their personal experience that the Son of God has come—but whether it can be so stated in terms of the thought of the age as to win men intellectually as well as morally." So writes the author, and his book is an attempt to answer the question. The subject is of such vast importance that even a small contribution to a successful answer deserves to reach the hand of every Christian student, and we are grateful to Dr. La Touche for his accounts of modern teaching. But in these days of many books and of strenuous life it is impossible enthusiastically to commend a book if, for all the good it gives us, it makes too large a demand upon our time and temper. We have no time in the twentieth century to search for a needle in a bundle of hay. There are many needles here, and some of them well pointed, but we should have preferred to find them more easily. The book is verbose and heavy, so that it becomes dull and difficult to read. We can easily illustrate. In his introductory pages the writer discusses his method. He calls it "methodology," and right through the book it is always his method metaphorically to extend to five syllables that which could be as well expressed in two. He speaks of "my learned and able friend," and when he desires to refer to Farrar, Geikie, Edersheim, and Bernard Weiss, we have "the eloquent Farrar," "the learned and sober Geikie," "the profound Edersheim," and "the venerable Bernard Weiss." Little wonder that his second Lecture, that on the negative criticism of the age, extends to 175 pages, and we hope, for his hearers' sake, was not all delivered. The book is overloaded with quotations and references to authorities of very unequal value. Dr. La Touche has evidently read widely, but we cannot feel that his reading has always been discriminating. For instance, in dealing with the criticism of the Old Testament, he speaks of the unbelieving scholars "from whose pens almost every creative contribution has come." Can he really mean that? Either "unbelieving" or "creative" has lost half its meaning if this is so. The whole question of our Lord's relationship to the Old Testament is dealt with in very scrappy fashion. It is not fair to speak of the "kenotic vagaries of Bishop Gore," and then to evade the issue oneself. It is not fair to spend but a couple of pages over a difficult question,

and then to speak of the folly which "rejects the testimony of Him to whom we have committed our all in favour of the testimony of the dominant school of Old Testament critics of an age decadent in criticism, in religious fervour, and in moral earnestness."

Dr. La Touche evidently writes from a standpoint towards which we are sympathetic—a fact which makes us loath to criticize—but much of the value of the book is lost in the verbosity of its style and the hastiness with which its conclusions appear to have been arrived at. As an indication of haste, we notice that the Greek quotations are sometimes provided with breathings, but never with accents—a phenomenon in a book which makes pretensions to scholarship hardly reflecting credit on author or publisher.

The book is a general review of the Christological controversy of the past 200 years. It brings out the essentially supernatural character of our Lord's Personality, and deals lightly with the various theories as to His Personality which modern criticism has presented. As a *rechauffé* of the literature of the subject it doubtless made an interesting series of lectures, and will find readers amongst the class which likes to have a cursory acquaintance with current controversy; but as a contribution to the study of the subject it will not bear comparison with the Rev. C. F. Nolloth's excellent book, "The Person of Our Lord in Recent Thought."

We are sorry to give so scant a welcome to these Donnellan Lectures, for there is much that is good and valuable in them, and there is plenty of room for another book on the subject. There are always pitfalls in the publication of prize essays and University lectures. Dr. La Touche has not escaped them; in a later edition of these lectures, and in the second series, we hope that he will.

JOHNSONIAN GLEANINGS. Part II.: FRANCIS BARBER. By Aleyn Lyell Reade. London: *Arden Press*, Norfolk Street, Strand.

The student and lover of Johnson will be delighted with this charming book. With infinite pains and excellent taste Mr. Reade has pieced together and made a continuous story of all that he can discover concerning Johnson's negro servant, Francis Barber. It is a fit continuation of Mr. Reade's previous work, and a real addition to our Johnson literature. We are grateful to the author for all the care that he has given to his labour of love, for that, it is clear, it must have been to him.

THE INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY: MICAH, ZEPHANIAH, NAHUM, HABAKKUK, OBADIAH, AND JOEL. By Dr. J. M. Powis Smith, Dr. Hayes Ward, and Dr. Bewer. London: *T. and T. Clark*. Price 12s. 6d.

It would be ungrateful not to recognize that this book is a solid mass of painstaking scholarship. It is impossible not to admire the *finesse* with which words and phrases, texts and versions, have been treated, and the patience with which the conclusions of other scholars have been sifted, weighed, and commented on. But we cannot express the same admiration for the critical methods pursued, or for the results which those methods yield. We must confess that we put the book aside with a feeling of brainwhirl, with the disappointing experience that our perception of the message of these prophets was not enriched to the extent that we had hoped.

The work of the authors is for the most part influenced by the fantasies of the extremer school of German critics, and proceeds on their lines. We are faced with the same provoking army of redactors and interpolators and revisers. Their contribution is represented as so considerable that it is at times difficult to dig out the original nucleus from the mass of disjointed fragments in which it lies buried. Again, the process of shaping every prophecy to make it fit a precise metrical system is overdone. True, the authors are loud in their insistence that "metrical considerations unsupported by other evidences do not warrant extreme measures in textual criticism"; but, unfortunately, times and again they violate their own dictum, though the "other evidences" are so slight as to be negligible. A phrase has only to be labelled a "prosaic gloss," or regarded as "lying outside the poetic form"; that is sufficient ground of offence to demand its excision! But is it really fair to expect to find in the impassioned speeches of an aggrieved yeoman farmer like Micah absolute conformity to a hard-and-fast metrical scheme? And yet, again, the text is sadly mutilated by the frequency with which a verse is cut out as gloss or interpolation, if it happens to break the connection of thought or to repeat the thought of a verse in its immediate neighbourhood. One is tempted to ask what would be the ultimate form of the Pauline Epistles if these same canons of criticism were applied to them? But seeing that only fragments of prophetic utterances have come down to us, it is surely reasonable to expect these abrupt transitions, which are so disturbing to critics with rigid ideas of oratorical sequence and style. And while it is easy to understand a redactor, supplying a connecting link to bridge an awkward break, it is not flattering to his skill to charge him with introducing foreign and irrelevant matter which disturbs the original flow of thought.

Directing our attention more closely to the specific books treated of, we were prepared to find the unity of Micah disputed. But Dr. Powis Smith (who is responsible also for the editing of Zephaniah and Nahum) metes out drastic treatment to chapters iv. and v. and chapters vi. and vii. He regards both these sections as miscellaneous collections of fragments, the former having as a common bond the hopeful outlook upon the future; the latter possessing no logical unity at all, and being the work of at least four different authors of widely scattered periods. The eschatological ideas of chapters iv. and v. are responsible for their relegation to the post-exilic age. We are told that "early prophecy did not contemplate the conversion of the world to Jahweh, hence did not denounce the nations for disobedience to Jahweh." Such a sweeping statement could only be made good by a skilful manipulation of pre-exilic prophecies. No doubt the interpolator could perform the trick. But it would be interesting to see how the writer of the above would deal with the universalism of the earliest of prophetic writers, Amos. We fully agree with him when he says that it is "psychologically and religiously impossible that Micah should have had no hopes for Israel's future"; but we cannot accept the conclusion which follows—viz., that "no word of Micah's is preserved for us concerning those hopes." Was Dr. Smith thinking of these unrecorded hopes when, in his preface to Zephaniah, he speaks of "the *ideals* exalted by prophets like Isaiah and Micah"? He must have been, because he has plucked every ideal clean out of the Book of

Micah. There is not one left in the meagre original fragment of it which survives his dissection.

We find the same eschatological prepossessions influencing the rejection of the closing section of Zephaniah, chapter iii. 6-20, with its ideal pictures of Jerusalem's deliverance and coming world-wide glory. On the same grounds, presumably, those great passages treating of Israel's future spiritual destiny must be torn from the pages of Jeremiah, Zephaniah's contemporary! But, apart from that, here is a strange contradiction: On the one hand Dr. Smith insists on our recognizing that these pre-exilic prophets had the *pen* of the poet, and were punctilious in regard to the external form of their message; on the other hand he fetters their poetic *power* and *passion*, and makes no allowance for inspired imagination—to say nothing of revelation—as a factor in the internal moulding of their message, assisting in the creation of an ideal picture of the future. The introduction to Zephaniah is an interesting piece of reading. It is not a little disturbing, however, to find a tinge of uncertainty in the author's mind as to Zephaniah's monotheism. That the prophet viewed Jahweh as the Lord of Lords and the only God he sets down as “a probability,” though he does go on to say that “the probability is reinforced by the fact that the religious writings of his contemporaries—*e.g.*, Jeremiah and Deuteronomy—reflect a monotheistic theology.” Surely the contents of the book itself are sufficient to lift the question above probability on to the plane of certainty! Amongst many illuminating notes on the text, Dr. Smith has an interesting comment to make on that obscure phrase, “I will punish everyone who leaps over the threshold” (i. 9). He suggests that the object of the prophet's attack was some superstitious custom in vogue amongst the rich, which arose from a belief, prevalent amongst many races, that the threshold was the favourite abode of demons and spirits.

Passing on to Nahum, we are met with an attack on the unity of the prophecy, on the ground that i. 2-10 is an acrostic poem whose artificiality and abstract style do not harmonize with the fresh and vivid portraiture of the rest of the book. A most astounding theory is put forward to account for its presence. We are told that this poem “was found ready to hand and forced into service by some editor who failed to appreciate its acrostic form.” Fancy a Jew being unable to appreciate one of the favourite literary devices of his people! Fancy him patching—and patching badly, too—an artificial fragment on to a poem of singularly striking movement and colour! It is beyond fancy. It is impossible to conceive of a Jewish editor being guilty of such glaringly bad literary taste. But an examination of the Hebrew reveals that this acrostic of fifteen lines can only be made out by clumsy—one had almost used a stronger word—juggling with the text. For instance, these are the methods of getting the required initial letter: In line 4 initial **N** is unwarrantably changed to **T**; in line 7 the first two words are interchanged; in line 10 initial **V** is cut off; the sequence of initials in lines 12 and 13 is obtained by transposing their Massoretic position; line 14 is formed of a fragment of Massoretic text wrenched from its original position after line 1; in line 15 the first two words are omitted to give the desired letter. In addition, two of the lines of this spurious acrostic are left unfinished, and a further piece of Massoretic text after line 1 has to be cut

out. We look for some explanation of these violent expedients, and here it is: "The writer of the acrostic is quoting from memory." We always thought that one of the purposes of the acrostic was to aid the memory. It is akin to jesting to ask us to believe that this fabulous editor had forgotten the order of the letters of his own alphabet.

We presume that on p. 276, line 15, 525 B.C. is a mistake for 625 B.C. We could wish that these strange statements a few pages later were a mistake too: "Nahum and Jeremiah belonged to different religions and political parties. If Nahum was not in actual opposition to Jeremiah, he was at least indifferent to his efforts. . . . His point of view is essentially one with that of such men as Hananiah (Jer. xxviii.), the four hundred prophets in opposition to Micaiah-ben-Imlah (1 Kings xxii.), and the so-called 'false prophets' in general. For such prophets the relation between Jahweh and His nation was indissoluble. Jahweh might become angered at His people and give them over temporarily into the power of the foe. But He could no more wholly abandon them than a mother could desert her child." It seems to us monstrous that Nahum should be thrust into such company and on such shallow evidence. There is no logic in the whole position. Are we honestly to believe that Nahum's message was prompted by the "evil spirit" which dictated the counsel of Micaiah's opponents? And ought he then to come under the ban of the strong indictments against false prophecy of Micah and Jeremiah and Ezekiel? Where is the proof that he was guilty of the selfish aim and the moral taint which called out those indictments? And is it fair to say that, because Nahum, in his prophetic and patriotic exuberance, shuts his eyes for a moment to national sin, he was therefore indifferent to it, and even hostile to measures of internal reform? Moreover, it is hardly necessary to point out how misleading it is to represent the idea of the indissoluble relationship between Jahweh and His people as a peculiar doctrine of the false prophets. It is woven into the fabric of all prophetic doctrine, and the assurance of Jahweh's everlasting love runs like a thread of light even through Jeremiah's darkest prophecies. However, these inconsistencies pale before this flat contradiction. In his introduction Dr. Smith writes: "Nahum was an enthusiastic, optimistic patriot. . . . For Israel the dawn of a new day was discernible upon the horizon." Now, the only verses in the prophecy which could warrant this statement are i. 12, 13, 15; ii. 2. But we turn to the commentary, and, lo, they are not allowed to Nahum! The incipient dawn is postponed, and the inspiration of Nahum's optimism rudely crushed by the following note: "The fall of Nineveh, to which Nahum confidently looked forward, can hardly have occasioned such vivid and certain confidence of immediate relief to Israel; for at that time Assyrian power had long come to an end, and Judah was under the heel of Egypt." Where, then, is the hope of dawn in his prophecy? and where the cause of his optimism?

The prophecy of Habakkuk is treated by Dr. Hayes Ward—treated scantily and inadequately in barely twenty-six pages, of which less than five pages form the introduction. It strikes one as being a hurried stopgap. The commentary lacks the freshness and suggestiveness of exegesis which are a consoling feature of the work on the other prophets. Even in ii. 4, used by St. Paul as one of the two Old Testament pillars on which to base

the doctrine of justification by faith, there is no attempt at all at exegesis. We are simply told that "the first member of the verse gives no sense, but must have a sense like that of the second member," and that "the Hebrew should probably be corrected after the LXX." In the introduction Dr. Ward would have us believe that Habakkuk was an editor of Maccabean times. To him chapters i. and ii. owe their final compilation. He may have actually written ii. 9-20 himself! Of the rest, i. 1-11 belongs to Jehoiakim's days, i. 12 to ii. 8 is a post-Captivity relic, and chapter iii. is an appendix culled from a liturgical collection.

Dr. Bewer says many things in his treatment of Obadiah and Joel from which we dissent, but he deserves a word of praise for the commentary portions of both books, which are rich in pithy exposition, and for the picturesque and fascinating introduction to Obadiah. His view of the authorship of the latter does justice to the three different methods of interpretation of it. It is a poetic narrative of *past* events, because it is an echo and adaptation of an older oracle against Edom, delivered shortly after the sack of Jerusalem. It is a prophetic estimate of *present* events, for it was Edom's disaster in the Nabatean invasion which recalled to the fifth-century prophet Obadiah the oracle of his predecessor. It is a prediction of *future* events, for a fourth-century patriot-prophet sees approaching a crisis which will be uplift to the house of Jacob and downfall to the house of Esau. And his convictions take shape in the appendix to this little book (verses 15-21). That the prophecy of Joel is a unity Dr. Bewer will not admit. He splits the book roughly into two sections, chapters i. and ii. and chapter iii. True, in this he disagrees with even advanced critics like Nowack and Marti, who uphold its unity on the ground that the idea of "the day of Jahweh" runs through both these sections. But Dr. Bewer has an ingenious theory to support his contention. It is this—that the references to "the day of Jahweh" in the early part of the book are the work of an interpolator! We are told, further, that this interpolator—who was an individual with a second-hand style, borrowing thoughts and phrases from other prophets—was responsible for much of the second part of the book. The author claims by this discovery to have solved the vexed problem of the interpretation of the locust plague. Was the plague literal or allegorical? The question would never have been raised but for this interpolator. He was a man steeped in eschatological ideas. He regarded the locust-swarm as allegorical—as the great Northern foe, Jahweh's instrument of judgment, predicted by former prophets. That was why he interpolated the eschatological phraseology which links up the two portions of the book. And yet, in the face of these ideas, the writer calmly tells us that the great passage of ii. 28-32, "I will pour out of My Spirit upon all flesh," etc. (which he allows to Joel), is a direct reference to the great day of Jahweh. Why, then, is it necessary to invent theories to prove that the eschatological phrases of this earlier part of the book are not original, but imported? In dealing with that same passage (ii. 28-32) in the commentary, we do not think that Dr. Bewer is particularly happy. He will not allow it to refer to "moral transformation, or to inner renewal, or to deeper and more intimate knowledge of God." He regards it as descriptive of "the ecstasy caused by the tremendous excitement which takes hold of people under the stress of terrible fear of the

approach of a great catastrophe." That is watering down its meaning to a very thin consistency. We also fail to see why the lines that follow "Before the great and terrible day of Jehovah comes" are ruled out as an editorial note. Is it another of those offending eschatological interpolations? But, then, Dr. Bewer has already admitted that Joel meant the passage to have an eschatological significance. Why should he not, then, be credited with a phrase which brings out its significance more clearly?

We glance at an exegetical note as our final comment. It is interesting to notice the author's interpretation of the phrase "Jehoshaphat's Valley." He regards it as not strictly a geographical, but a symbolical term, used to symbolize the place of which Jehovah says, "I will contend in judgment with them," and called in verse 14 "the Valley of Decision."

In conclusion, we may say that the exegetical notes, with the exception of those on Habakkuk, are the part of the book which appeals to us most. The critical theories are damaged by serious contradictions to be found in the writers' own handling of them, and by statements which will not stand before sober investigation. And there is only one simile which is applicable to their methods of textual criticism—that of a surgeon trying to perform a delicate surgical operation with very blunt instruments. W. E. BECK.

Received: DANGEROUS DECREITS: AN EXAMINATION OF THE TEACHING OF OUR ARTICLE XXXI. By the Rev. N. Dimock, M.A. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 1s. net. A new and valuable volume in the new edition of Mr. Dimock's books. SOME NOTES ON THE BISHOPS OF FOUR WELSH DIOCESES. By W. Arthur Westley, B.A. Manchester: *Christian Knowledge and National Society.* Price 4d. net. History has been manipulated of late in the interests of politics; here is some that is not manipulated, and it is valuable. BROWNLOW NORTH: THE STORY OF HIS LIFE AND WORK. By the Rev. Kenneth Moody-Stuart. London: *Chas. J. Thynne.* Price 2s. net. THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS. By Two Clerks. *Cambridge University Press.* Price 2s. 6d. net. An experiment in conservative revision. THE PASSOVER, THE COMMUNION, AND THE MASS. By R. B. Girdlestone, M.A. London: *National Church League Book Room, Westminster, S.W.* Price 1d. MASS VESTMENTS. By R. B. Girdlestone, M.A. London: *National Church League Book Room, Westminster, S.W.* Price 1d. Speeches of the Bishops of Carlisle, Liverpool, Manchester, Newcastle, and Sodor and Man, in the York Convocation. THE COPPING CALENDAR. By Harold Copping. London: *R.T.S.* Small size, 1s.; large size, 2s. 6d.

In the autumn announcements made by Mr. Robert Scott—an exceptionally good list—there are three books to which we should like to call especial attention. Canon Girdlestone issues an important work on the Old Testament, of which the title is "The Building Up of the Old Testament," a book which will be warmly welcomed by conservative students, and which will be worthy of serious attention by those of a different critical standpoint. Principal Tait writes on the Session of our Lord, a matter of serious importance in view of some of the controversy concerning Holy Communion. The third book is a new and greatly-improved edition of Litton's "Dogmatic Theology," a book of exceptional value, which we are glad indeed to see reprinted. Canon Girdlestone's and Principal Tait's books will be reviewed in due course.