

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

AUGUST, 1888.

ART. I.—THE MARRIAGE LAW AMONG CONVERTS
TO CHRISTIANITY.

THE importance of this subject has been felt since the very earliest days of Christianity; so much so that it has found a place in the writings of St. Paul, and might therefore be supposed to have been fully settled. But it is not so. Cases have arisen, and must arise, which do not easily range themselves under the general principles laid down by the Apostle: and therefore there has always been considerable divergence of opinion among those who are called to act, or to give opinions in various cases.

The different cases that arise in the present day divide themselves into two distinct branches, which, while the same general principle must underlie them, require separate and distinct treatment.

I. First are the cases of Polygamy when the man becomes a Christian.

Under this same heading would come cases of Polyandry were they not so extremely rare, and were they not so distinctly condemned by Holy Writ and the consent of mankind generally.

II. Second come the cases of true marriage of one woman and one man, when one of them becomes a Christian.

On the first of these divisions two important articles have lately been written, by Dr. R. N. Cust, and by Professor Stokes, of Cambridge (see CHURCHMAN for September, 1886, and March, 1887).

The first article proceeds on the ground that Polygamy is acknowledged as legal in many countries, and that it is not

forbidden in the Old Testament. That though it is forbidden by Christ, and therefore may not be admitted into the Christian Church, yet men who become Christians who are already Polygamists ought not to be instructed to put away any wives, but ought to be taught that they should retain them because of the many troubles and hardships that would ensue on putting them away.

But Dr. Cust is against allowing such men to be baptized, unless "*in articulo mortis*;" he would admit them only as Catechumens.

Professor Stokes argues the question on the ground that it is especially "*putting away*" that is forbidden, and that Polygamy is not prohibited in the Old Testament. He would therefore have a convert instructed that he should retain his wives, as he has no right to put any away. He would admit a man in such a position to the rite of baptism, but he would not allow him to hold any office in the Church.

Taking all things into consideration, the latter would seem to me to be the more correct way. We have no right to refuse baptism to anyone confessing Christ unless he wishes to continue in actual sin. To say that Polygamy is actual sin is to beg the whole question, as well as to throw over the fact of the Old Testament not forbidding it.

For a Christian to become a Polygamist is undoubtedly a great sin. But for a Polygamist to put away some of his wives because he has become a Christian seems to be a greater sin. Yet if of their own accord they depart because he has become a Christian, then it is another matter. They come under the dictum pronounced by St. Paul.

Another question crops up here. The Mahometan says that the change of faith, from Mahometanism to any other religion, of itself dissolves the union. But this we cannot admit, because God made them male and female, and it is He who says "they twain shall be one flesh."

With these few words I may dismiss this branch of my subject and enter upon that which seems to present to us much greater difficulties.

On the second division of our subject, a very able paper appeared in the *CHURCHMAN* last April, written by Mr. Philip Vernon Smith, a Barrister. It is his aim, principally, to give the opinions of ancient authorities on the various points that are raised.

1. The first point raised under this head is a very simple one, and easily settled to the satisfaction of all. If one of a married pair becomes a believer, and the other, though still an unbeliever, is willing to remain with the believer, he or she is

at liberty to do so. The believer may not put the unbeliever away. This is plainly laid down by St. Paul, 1 Cor. vii., 12, 13, 14. But even here a question has been raised. If both become believers, or if one becomes a believer, is it necessary that they should be re-married, that is, according to the rites of the Christian Church? Clearly not, for the whole injunction proceeds upon the fact that the man and woman are really married, and therefore the marriage is not to be repeated. The Church's blessing may be given, but there ought not to be a re-marriage.

2. Next comes the case of those who have been married and divorced before either becomes a believer. Does the divorce stand good? or ought the one who becomes a believer to be instructed to seek re-union with the divorced partner? or is he, or is he not, eligible for re-marriage? There has been a considerable divergence of opinion here, expressed principally in connection with St. Paul's direction that a bishop (1 Tim. iii. 2) and an elder (Tit. i. 6) must be the husband of one wife.

I need not quote the passages,¹ but Jerome says plainly that "he is not a bigamist who had one wife before, and another after baptism," while Augustine, Innocent, and Eusebius say just the contrary.

But when we come to look at the matter in the general view, it would seem that these last opinions cannot be upheld.

Supposing the divorce to have taken place strictly according to the customs or laws of the people, some time before the conversion to Christianity, and another marriage to have taken place, would it be the duty of the Christian teacher to instruct his convert that he must forsake the woman with whom he is then living and seek out the one who has been some time divorced and be reconciled to her? Clearly not; for the divorced woman may also be re-married, and not only would there be endless confusion but untold misery connected with such teaching. If, then, the divorce must hold good in the case of one or both being re-married, surely it must hold good when no fresh marriage has taken place. And if according to the law of his country and people he is eligible for re-marriage when he becomes a Christian, it would seem to be right for the Christian teacher to receive him as he finds him. There may be cases where is a sense of injustice done to the divorced partner while in an unbelieving state, and when both remain unmarried, where it might be advisable to urge on the believer that he should seek reconciliation, his Christianity teaching him that he had done an unjust deed. But then a new marriage would be required, and if the one put away should

¹ THE CHURCHMAN, April, 1888.

refuse to be reconciled, then the new believer would be free and in a position to marry another. We cannot take into consideration all the past life of one who becomes a believer. In Christ he receives the forgiveness of his sin, but that does not undo the wrong deeds that he has committed.

3. Another branch of this part, and very nearly connected with it, is the question whether, when the divorce or separation takes place because one becomes a Christian and the other demands release, the new believer is altogether released; whether he may hold any office in the Church; and whether he may re-marry. The answers to these points will depend upon the interpretation of the passage 1 Cor. vii. 15, especially the words "a brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases."

Again there has been a divergence of opinions.

Gratian quotes a decree of a Gallican Council, which says that a convert may not be married while his former wife is living. But he also quotes from Gregory, who says that when a man has been forsaken by his wife on account of her hatred of the faith which he has embraced, he is at liberty to marry again. Pope Innocent III. also writes to the same effect, viz., that it is lawful to marry again. And this would seem to be the true decision of the case. Otherwise the clause "a brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases" would have no meaning.

The question as to whether the Catechumen may be baptized if left by his wife on account of his faith, is clearly answered in the affirmative by St. Paul, for he does not speak of a man as a believer who is not admitted to the initial rite. But if the believer who has been left by his wife for the sake of his faith is not allowed to hold any office in the Church, not allowed to preach the faith he has received, or not allowed to marry again, surely he is still "under bondage." He is bound to the wife that will not render him the duties of the wife. So that he is under the bondage without having privileges of the marriage tie. Surely this cannot be what St. Paul intends by "a brother or a sister not being under bondage in such cases."

The conclusions then to which we are led are these:

1. The Christian Church has clear and distinct laws for those actually within its pale. No Polygamy can be allowed.

Much as the divorce and re-marriage customs of the Jews are to be condemned, not only on Christian principles but also on the ground of the Old Testament revelation, yet we are compelled to acknowledge that they are the accepted customs of the people, and have with them the force of Law. Grounded as they are on a misinterpretation of the direction given by

Moses, yet the Jews following the School of Hillel have made them a part of their law. The stricter teaching of Shammai, acknowledging the clause of defilement, and interpreting it strictly, has been put on one side, and the lax teaching of Hillel has been followed. And divorce has been admitted on the slightest grounds.

Such being the case, though we utterly disapprove of the teaching and the practice, we are bound to accept it and act upon it in the spirit of St. Paul's injunction, and allow our converts the full benefit of his inspired direction.

No divorce can be permitted except for the one cause named by our Lord.

2. Yet Christianity compels us to honour the marriage customs of those among whom the Gospel is preached. To consider those married who have been married according to the customs of the place or people, and to see that the converts do not seek separation, though the marriage customs may be contrary to Christian Law.

3. As a consequence of the foregoing, Christianity demands that we should acknowledge the laws and customs of divorce that are prevalent among such people, though they also are contrary to Christian principles. All these concern those customs or acts only which have taken place before baptism, and have no concern for those within the Christian Church.

It is sometimes argued that we must allow something in a newly-formed Church for the surrounding atmosphere, and must not too sharply cut off the new community from the manners and customs of those around them.


This seems to be altogether a mistake. The Christian law is so clear and explicit that there can be no toning down allowed. In the Christian Church itself, though it be in its infancy, and though it be in the midst of those who still hold to old customs, a man may be the husband of only one wife, and there must be no putting away.

The arguments used above and the conclusions arrived at refer only to those who have been entangled in wrong customs before they had the knowledge of Christianity, and before they accepted it, but they can have no application to those within the Christian Church.

A. HASTINGS KELK.

JERUSALEM, *June*, 1888.¹

¹ This paper was read at a Conference of Clergy and Laity, held in Jerusalem, under the presidency of the Right Rev. Bishop Blyth.



ART. II.—BISHOP ELLICOTT'S COMMENTARY ON THE
FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians: with a Critical and Grammatical Commentary, by CHARLES J. ELLICOTT, D.D., Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1887.

IT is with the most sincere pleasure that we welcome the Bishop of Gloucester's return to the field of his former labours. Not that his critical and exegetical studies had ceased during the many years which have intervened since the appearance of the last volume in his series of Commentaries on the Epistles of St. Paul. His continuous interest and work in that department are not only evidenced by the part which he took in the "Revised Version," but appear, if we may be allowed to say so, in the ripened critical judgment manifest in the present volume. It has therefore not been wholly time lost, so far as the interests of exegetical science are concerned, although we honestly grudge the delay which the manifold—we fear, often unprofitable—engagements of the episcopal office have necessitated. It seems one of the unsolved problems of our ecclesiastical polity how to conciliate the fact that eminence in theological study ought to lead to posts of the highest distinction in the Church with this other, that occupancy of such posts renders theological study, at least of the fruitful kind, well-nigh impossible. All the more honour and thanks are therefore due to those who, like Bishops Lightfoot and Ellicott, combine the two: doubtless, at no small labour and self-sacrifice.

But there is an innate love of study which, irrespective of even higher motives, does not allow the genuine student to rest. He loves research and work for their own sake, and this love shows itself in every page of the work which he produces. The hours and days of patient labour which he has devoted to the investigation of what to the superficial reader may seem but secondary points, if not trivial details, have been to him times of real enjoyment. And they will prove of incalculable benefit to those who come after him. We feel that these are perhaps somewhat lower grounds on which to set forth the value of such work. Nevertheless, when, as in Bishop Ellicott's Commentary, we find on every page a mass of accurate details which, as we know, represent an immense amount of scholarly, patient labour, we are glad to remember that it has also its compensation in this, that work is its own best reward. All the same, we gladly recognise that there is a yet much higher aspect of it. To those who receive and reverence Holy Scripture, the highest aim and object must ever be to employ their best powers and their unwearying labour to the fullest

ascertainment of its meaning, and thus to serve, so far as is granted to them, alike the Church and its Head. From this point of view nothing can be small or secondary, and work is no longer merely an inward impulse or a pleasure: it is a privilege and a service.

As already indicated, we recognise all the qualities referred to in Bishop Ellicott's latest contribution to the exegesis of the New Testament. The first Epistle to the Corinthians has received much and very careful commentation, not only in this country, but in Germany and in Switzerland. Still, even by the side of the masterly notes by Canon Evans of Durham (in the "Speaker's Commentary"), and the more recent works of Heinrici and Godet, Bishop Ellicott's Commentary occupies a distinct and distinctive place of its own. Like the previous volumes by the same writer, its chief value lies in the textual and grammatical study of the Epistle, although full attention has also been given to other departments. But in what we may describe as Bishop Ellicott's exegetical *spécialité*, this volume not only maintains but exceeds the standard of its predecessors. Indeed, the careful student of this Epistle will feel it indispensable for his work: he will be equally grateful for what it suggests and for what it gives. Even where he may feel constrained ultimately to dissent from the conclusions of the Bishop, he will recognise the value of the labours of a most accomplished, painstaking, and conscientious scholar, whose contribution will always occupy a foremost rank among those of English exegetes.

It is in nowise inconsistent with the appreciation which we have expressed of this Commentary, that in the final interpretation of passages we feel constrained, occasionally, to differ from the conclusions of Bishop Ellicott, although certainly not without having first given careful consideration to his reasoning. It would be out of place here to give instances, since a full discussion would be impossible, and the mere statement of differences might leave an impression the very reverse of that which it is our wish to convey. But as we are in duty bound not only to speak the truth and nothing but the truth, but also the whole truth, it seems necessary to advert to two other points. We could have wished to have had a more full "Introduction" to the Epistle, and we have missed the illustrations which, in not a few passages, are afforded by ancient Jewish writings. These not only throw light on certain expressions used by the Apostle, but show how completely the forms of thinking of the writer were, even in his statement of highest truth, cast in the mould of his time and people. But on the other hand, it must be admitted that references to Rabbinic expressions and Jewish usages may, unless thoroughly under-

stood, be misleading. An instance of this occurs in a passage which has of late occasioned some discussion. In commenting on the well-known words *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε* ("do this") in 1 Cor. xi. 24 (compare St. Luke xxii. 19), Bishop Ellicott rightly remarks: "To render the words 'sacrifice this' in accordance with a Hebraistic use of *ποιεῖν* in this sense in the LXX. (Exod. xxix. 39; Lev. ix. 7, al.; see Schleusner, *Lex. Vet. Test.* s.v.) is to violate the regular use of *ποιεῖν* in the New Testament, and to import polemical considerations into words which do not in any degree involve or suggest them." Impartial readers will probably have no hesitation in agreeing with this remark of the Bishop.¹ But there is more to be said on the subject, and, in view of the importance attaching to it, a few sentences at least may here be in place. It is quite true that not only in the passages quoted by the Bishop, but in many others, alike the Hebrew verb *asah* and its Greek equivalent *ποιεῖν*, are used in regard to the offering of sacrifices—whether to the true or to false Gods (compare for the latter 2 Kings xvii. 32), whether of bloody or of unbloody offerings (compare for the latter Numb. vi. 17, perhaps also Hos. ii. 8). From Biblical it has passed into Rabbinic usage, where both the verb and its derivative substantive (*asiyah*) are used in connection with sacrifices, and notably also with that of the Paschal Lamb (*Mishnah Pes.* ix. 1, 3). But it ought to be observed that, although the term is frequently applied to the sacrificial service of the priest, it is equally so to that of the layman who brings the sacrifice. Unlike some other words (such as notably *zaraq* and *zeriqah*, *nazah* and *hazzayah*, and *nathan* and *mattanah*), *asah* is not a rubrical nor even a strictly ritual term, but refers, as its common Rabbinic usage shows, generally to a legal observance or that of a command. More particularly it is used in such a connection for the observance of any feast, as, for example, that of Esther (or Purim) in *Meg.* 17a (line six from bottom). Secondly, it requires to be remembered that the sacrificing of the Paschal Lamb (to which alone there could be a reference) was not a priestly act, but done by the offerer himself—the *sprinkling* of the blood being the distinctively priestly function. Lastly, since the Holy Eucharist connects itself not with the sacrifice of the Paschal Lamb, but with the Paschal Supper that followed, it is not easy to see how the *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε* could have reference to anything else. And this seems fully borne out by the repetition of the same expression in the verse following that discussed (see 1 Cor. xi. 25). Thus the rendering "sacrifice this," which is

¹ Bishop Wordsworth (on St. Luke xxvi. 19) remarks: "The Apostles could not now suppose themselves to be *Priests*, not being of the line of Aaron."

advocated as "in accordance with Hebraistic use," absolutely fails on Jewish grounds of interpretation. This much may suffice on a point which has, curiously, been put forward by Roman Catholic writers, and which, if unchallenged, might seem open to discussion. On the other hand, it is perfectly certain that no Jewish writer would in this connection have so expressed himself if he had intended to indicate a sacrificial act.

We conclude this brief notice by coupling our acknowledgment of the obligation under which English students are laid by this volume, with the sincere wish that its continuation may not be long delayed.

A. E.



ART. III.—ST. PAUL AND SENECA: THE APOSTLE AND THE PHILOSOPHER.

A CHRISTIAN EVIDENCE.

I WISH to take one, the highest in this world's wisdom, and compare him with a contemporary guided by the Holy Ghost. In Seneca, the philosopher, we have a man very favourably circumstanced for influencing the world by his teaching. They lived about the same time, being born about four years B.C., and both died under the Emperor Nero—the Apostle a Christian martyr, and the philosopher an enforced suicide.

Seneca, the favourite of fortune, was the tutor of the Emperor and the manager of the State, so to say, to the approval of everyone during the first five years of Nero's reign. The teaching of his "Treatise on Pity,"¹ dedicated to Nero, was fairly well put in practice. The social state of such a teacher and writer at the Court of Rome was certainly very different from that of the Apostle working as a tent-maker at Corinth. The travelling missionary, shipwrecked, gathering a bundle of sticks to make a fire for himself and other shipwrecked passengers, "because of the present rain, and because of the cold,"² on the island of Malta, is far removed in the things of this world from Seneca with his "500 tables of cedar with ivory feet to them, all alike and of equal size." Even allowing a margin for over-statement as to the number, the contrast is still sufficiently marked.

The Apostle, after his shipwreck, was taken on to Rome, and—permitted to labour as a missionary there, as we are told in the end of the Acts of the Apostles—he may have met the

¹ "Ad Neronem Cæsarem de Clementia, liber primus et secundus."

² Acts xxviii, 2.

great philosopher, for his "bonds became manifest in Christ throughout the prætorian guard,"¹ and they of Cæsar's household salute the Christians at Philippi to whom the Apostle writes. Be this as it may, the Apostle met Gallio, the brother of the philosopher, at Corinth, a clever, amiable man; and the lordly indifference with which he treated the whole dispute between St. Paul and the Jews, his persecutors, has passed into a proverb, for Gallio cared "for none of these things."

The teaching of Seneca on moral subjects in his letters to his friend Lucilius is often very admirable. From the first letter, "On the Value and Use of Time," to the hundred and twenty-fourth, "Against the Epicureans; that Good consists in Reason and not in Sense," one finds a seeming likeness to several of the Apostle's words and thoughts. "Where will you find," says he in his opening letter, "a man who sets any value on time,² or seems to understand that he dies daily?"³ In his eighth letter, "On Temperance and the Benefit of Philosophy," he says: "Maintain therefore this sound and salutary way of living: so far only to indulge the body as to preserve it in good health. It must be treated more roughly, if you would have it obedient or serviceable to the soul. Think there is nothing admirable in thee but the soul."⁴

Indeed, some of his teaching is such as to have led to the belief that he was a Christian. In Epistle X., "On Solitude and Prayer," he advises Lucilius: "Cease not to pray and ask particularly for wisdom, a sound mind, and health of body. Why should you not often pray for these blessings? Fear not to importune a gracious God." In this one finds almost a Christian ring. The philosopher cannot, however, have grasped this valuable thought very firmly, for in another place⁵ he denies the good of prayer.

It is certainly strange in the surroundings of Nero's Court to hear the philosopher teaching that nothing better can be desired than "a soul that is truly just and good and great,"⁶ and also stating "Bonus vir sine Deo nemo est." This last thought seems to be an echo of St. Paul's: "If any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of His." The agreement is merely on the surface; underneath, the two thoughts are very far apart. Seneca teaches that God is the soul of the world, "Anima mundi," and therefore every soul must be a part of this, and God must be in each.

¹ Phil. i. 13. Commentary by the Bishop of Durham.

² See Eph. v. 16.

³ 1 Cor. xv. 31.

⁴ See 1 Cor. ix. 27.

⁵ Epistle xli., quoted in "The Stoics, Epicureans, and Sceptics," by Dr. Zeller, translated by Oswald Reichel.

⁶ Epistle xxxi.

All are but parts of one stupendous whole,
Whose body Nature is, and God the soul ;
Breathes in our soul, informs our mortal part,
As full, as perfect in a hair as heart.¹

Paul, in his address to the Athenians on Mars Hill, adopts the words on the Fatherhood of God as Aratus of Tarsus, or rather of Soli, in Cilicia, had taught it—"for we are also His offspring"—and shows them that God is very near each of them, and that "in Him we live and move and have our being."

Paul, as a citizen of Tarsus, was no doubt familiar with the commonplaces of moral teaching in the schools of that place, "no mean city." As in his great speech at Athens, so in his epistles: the Apostle often refers to the forms of expression usual among the philosophers, giving them a Christian turn and making them a living power.² The Apostle, as everybody knows, was well acquainted with the current teaching of the poets and philosophers of his time.

I wish now to show the shortcomings of Seneca's teaching, as a reforming and a transforming power, with all its merits, which it undoubtedly had.

(a) It is a great shock to our moral nature to pass from his writings to the social life of his day. Never has there been a more corrupt state of society. It is but fair to him to conclude that his feelings and judgment were always on the side of what was right and good; but he was a weak, timid man in practical life.

Banished for eight years to the isle of Corsica for an alleged crime, he wrote the most excellent of all his moral tracts, "On Consolation,"³ to his mother Helvia in the first or second year of his exile, pointing out to that cultivated lady that she should not grieve for him either for her own or for his sake; for the evils of life as commonly regarded, such as change of place, poverty, disgrace, contempt, are not really calamities at all.

In the third year of the exile we have another moral tract "On Consolation," addressed to Polybius, a very influential freedman, about the Emperor Claudius making abject efforts for pardon. In the edition of his works published at Antwerp, A.D. 1632, in a short abstract of the tract, the criticism on it is most severe: "One is much ashamed of it; whoever was the publisher of it, was certainly the enemy of Seneca and of his fair fame."⁴

¹ "An Essay on Man," Alexander Pope.

² This subject has been treated by the Bishop of Durham in a scholarly and exhaustive dissertation attached to his Commentary on the Philippians.

³ "Ad Helviam matrem de consolatione liber."

⁴ "Pudet, pudet, inimicus Senecæ fuit et gloriæ ejus quisquis vulgavit."

His teaching, as impotent to influence practical life, is in marked contrast to that of St. Paul. The Apostle was an exile in Arabia for a good part of three years; he suffered the loss of all things; he had to bear every form of hardship from Jew and Gentile, persecuted in every possible way, passing through countless perils by sea and land; and all this he bore for thirty years of his own free will, that he might preach the Gospel and win souls to Christ. His state of mind was, "As sorrowful, yet always rejoicing; as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, and yet possessing all things."¹ If we wonder how he did all this, he tells us from his prison in Rome, "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me."²

(b) In that time of abandoned luxury Seneca's abstinence was most praiseworthy. He and a friend appear to have made a little tour. He writes to Lucilius about the journey, the subject of the letter being frugality:

With no more servants than one carriage could hold, and no manner of luggage, not the least thing but what was on our backs, have my friend Maximus and I spent two most agreeable days. A mattress lies upon the ground and I upon the mattress; of two cloaks, one serves for an under blanket, the other for a coverlid. Our repast was such that nothing could be spared from it, nor did it take up much time in dressing. I am satisfied with a few dried figs and dates. When I have any bread, the figs serve me for a dainty dish; when I have no bread they supply its place.³

In the society of his day, Seneca is a teetotaler among drunkards. The brief description of the Roman intemperance is very disgusting. They eat that they may vomit, they vomit that they may eat.⁴ The fair profligate Poppæa, a sort of American skunk, the mistress and afterwards the wife of the Emperor Nero, kept five hundred she-asses in attendance to supply her milk bath.

In the time of Seneca, some of the rich people played at poverty, and had in their mansions what has been called a chamber of poverty—"la chambre du pauvre,"⁵—to which they could retire on certain days, and in their listless life of jaded satiety indulge the sentiment of poverty. Seneca would turn this into a real thing. With all his wealth he had a true sympathy with the poor. He often conversed with his slaves; at times dined with them, in order to know their feelings and their way of looking at things. "He regards a slave as a friend of lower rank."⁶ He felt no doubt, quite truly, that the rich in his day were too rich, and that the poor were too

¹ 2 Cor. vi. 10.

² Phil. iv. 13.

³ Letter lxxxvii., "On Frugality."

⁴ "Edunt ut vomant, vomunt ut edant."

⁵ "Les Moralistes sous l'Empire Romain," par Constant Martha.

⁶ Quoted by Zeller, p. 330.

poor—a view forced on many in the present day. St. Paul touches the difficulty indirectly. The cure is in the *spirit* of his teaching. His first convert in Europe is a working woman, Lydia, “a seller of purple;” and the mercy of his work is seen in the relief granted to the poor slave girl, “which brought her masters much gain by sooth-saying.” From his prison he wrote in favour of the runaway slave Onesimus, “not now as a servant, but above a servant, a brother beloved.”

Seneca is very much to be thought of in that most cruel age for his teaching that, “of all the virtues, mercy was most suited to man, and was most human-like.”¹ His doctrine was impotent to reform the times or to redress the unequal state of society. The spirit of the Apostle’s teaching carried into practical effect is entirely in favour of the poor. It is the leaven in society, influencing it more or less, as man has more or less of its spirit.

(c) The population of Rome in the time of Seneca and St. Paul was, say, about a million. The vast number of suicides speaks very loudly of the weary spirit of the people and of their jaded dissatisfaction with life. A very large part of the population were slaves and outcasts from all nations, tossed together into the cesspool of the world. So weary of life were they that they felt themselves “past hope, past cure, past help.”

The setting forth a future state as a reality, with all its hopes for the good and all its fears for the bad, would be to these as life from the dead, and be a great lever to lift them to good things. No such lever was in the hand of Seneca. As regards the weary, wretched life around him, he says to his friend: “Nay, even when reason persuades us it would be happier for us to die, we must not be rash and hurry precipitately on a supposed relief. A truly brave and wise man ought not cowardly to fly from life, but to make a decent exit.”² In his treatise on Providence his teaching is more decided, and is in substance: “If you are weary of bearing the ills of life, who detains you at your post? The door is open; you can walk out.”³ Such language is not to be looked on as a rant, as it has been sometimes called, but as the expression of despair. There is little in his teaching on the soul to counteract it either in the way of comfort or of strength. “Innumerable,” says he, “are the questions concerning the soul; whence it is; when it begins to be; and how long it shall continue in being; whether it be subject to transmigration; whether it performs no more than one service, and being set free wanders about the universe; whether it be a body or

¹ Zeller, p. 316.

² Epistle xxiv., “On the Fear of Evils to Come.”

³ “De Providentia, sive, Quare bonis viris mala accidunt.”

not; what it will be employed upon when it ceases to act in conjunction with the body." In this we have a summing-up of what learned men had thought out in the various philosophic schools of the old world. The passage shows us how much and how earnestly he had thought on the subject. With every possible effort he had tried to follow the course of the soul going out on its last great journey. His efforts, great and praiseworthy as they are, show that reason alone is not equal to the task, and that, in pursuing such a subject, it is, with it, "out of the darkness into the darkness."

These curious but unpractical questions of the philosopher are swept away by the strong, plain words of the Apostle: "to depart, and to be with Christ, which is far better."¹ This gives the weary and the heavy-laden the information so greatly needed for practical life, that the immortal spirit goes forth from the body at death, active, conscious, capable of happiness in the paradise of God. The philosopher had no teaching but "it may be:" "it may be this way; or it may be that way; or it may not be at all." The Apostle, as the mariner, with clear, steady voice, rings out the word: "The new world is before us, the world of virtue, purity and happiness." Thousands, like disheartened seamen lying in despair, leapt to their feet at the words, and the clear, plain lesson brought in converts in large numbers to the Church. St. Paul's teaching as surely met the crying wants of a sorely-tried world as Seneca's certainly did not.

(d) The last scene in the philosopher's life is most touching, as indeed is that of the Apostle. The death of the philosopher is one of the great heroic events of the old world. As an alleged member of a conspiracy against Nero, he was condemned to death, the horrid sentence being that he should kill himself. His writings teach the horrid and unnatural doctrine of suicide, though in a hesitating way, and in some places more vigorously than in others. His wife, Paulina, insisted on dying with him, having her veins opened also. The soldiers who were to see the sentence carried out on Seneca bound up her veins in her swoon, and she survived a few years. Her pale, bloodless face, as it appeared ever after, was a more affecting monument to the worth of her great husband than any record of brass or marble. When not granted time to make his will, the philosopher's bequest to his friends was the example of his life, and the moral lessons spoken to his secretaries in his last moments. Some have thought that this last act has in it a touch of dramatic effect. I would not think so. He had been a great moral teacher all

¹ Phil. i. 23.

his life, though in that life one is grieved to say there were some great crimes. The hour of the enforced suicide was surely a most solemn one for such a purpose. Why not teach then, too? Like a grand, sombre ship he passed away into the darkness, A.D. 65. He is certainly a most commanding figure in the history of Rome, like its other great monuments. He has made little practical impress on the world. The moralist did not and could not reform mankind. He left them pretty much as he found them.

Three years after the Apostle sank into the martyr's grave, A.D. 68, being beheaded at Rome. Every Christian remembers well his inspiring words as he looked forward to such an end of his course: "I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness."¹ His mark on the world was then very great, for, "from Jerusalem and round about unto Illyricum," he had fully preached the Gospel of Christ, and that mark of his has been ever deepening. He has been the great friend of man in every quarter of the world, for the keynote of his teaching is, "There is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free; but Christ is all, and in all."² Being dead, he yet speaketh. His words have ever been a life-inspiring power, leading people to hate sin and to love godliness, and they will be so to the end of the world.

Of this the Apostle had himself an assured conviction. In his last Epistle, written in sight of his martyrdom, he puts the standard of missionary work, in the most solemn way, into the hand of Timothy, his own son in the faith.

In his extremity, some of his friends were failing and faithless. He had no such proof of devoted attachment as helped the dying philosopher. It is to be hoped that Timothy was able to be with him. He longs very much for his presence: "Do thy diligence to come shortly unto me." "Do thy diligence to come before winter."³ Of the labourers in the Gospel, only Luke was with him. Still, several friends—members of the Church in Rome—are remembered: "Eubulus greeteth thee, and Pudens, and Linus, and Claudia, and all the brethren."⁴ He is himself in living union with the Lord, who stood with him and strengthened him, and who will deliver him from every evil work.

Thus the lines on which the two stood part more and more widely. The difference of the two grows broadest in the end. The teaching of the philosopher, great as it is, begins with the

¹ 2 Tim. iv. 6-8.

² Col. iii. 11.

³ 2 Tim. iv. 9-21.

⁴ *Ibid.*, iv. 21.

earth and ends with it. It is the wisdom of this world at its best. The Apostle's teaching had its beginning on the road to Damascus, when, with the miraculous light of heaven suddenly fallen upon him, he said, "Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do?"¹ It went on in the spirit of Him Who said: "He is a chosen vessel unto Me." As with the man in all his hardships, as an Apostle even to the last most trying scene, so with his teaching, too, the promise is true: "I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."

THOMAS JORDAN, D.D.



ART. IV.—"CLERGY AND THE MASSES."—THE CURATE QUESTION.

THE subject "The Clergy and the Masses," which the Rev. H. T. Armfield so ably brought before the readers of *THE CHURCHMAN* in June last, is one of very considerable importance, and must, ere long, be taken up vigorously by our authorities, both clerical and lay. And closely allied to this is another subject of equally great and pressing importance, viz., the "Curate Question." We are forcibly reminded by Mr. Armfield that there is a marked "drop" in the number of men ordained last year even to the extent of fifty; and it must be remembered that a diminished number of men ordained means, at no very distant day, a diminished amount of work, fewer opportunities of instruction and edification for Christ's servants, lessened influence brought to bear by the Church upon the world, and at no remote period, a collapse of much of the good which is now being effected by the active, zealous, and assiduous efforts of Christ's servants.

Before dwelling further on this point and its bearing on the "Curate Question," let it be premised that the Curate² occupies a very anomalous position in the Church. That he suffers from many disabilities, and has many disadvantages to contend with, will be granted by all. His position is uncertain; his income is precarious; his opportunities of distinguishing himself are limited; he has no voice at the Diocesan Synod, because he is denied the right of admission; he does not possess the franchise for the election of Proctors; in the

¹ Acts ix. 6.

² In using the term "Curate" it will be observed that it is not in the sense that it is used in the Prayer-Book, "Bishops and Curates." It is used in its modern popular sense, and means "an assistant" to the one in the Cure of Souls.

majority of Dioceses he is excluded from Diocesan Conferences; and though he may be present at a Ruridecanal Chapter, yet he is naturally shy of offering an opinion, feeling that, having no *locus standi*, his beneficed brethren may look coolly on him, whereas in point of reading, research, experience, culture and inherent power he may not be one whit behind the best of their circle.

And why is all this? Simply because the Curate system is the growth of modern times; it is the outcome of a great want; it is the adoption of a temporary expedient to meet a great pressing necessity. The necessity is a rapid and almost incredible increase of population, combined with a great revival of religion in the Church, demanding more work and ministrations. And the expedient adopted to meet this necessity (*not* the legitimate extension of the pastorate of the Church on its own lines by an adequate increase in its permanent endowments) is an effort on the part of the incumbents to supply a great national and spiritual want, by calling in a new class of Church-workers, whom we term "Assistant Curates," *i.e.*, one clergyman assisting another in the self-same church and parish at the same time. The inevitable result has been to lay increased burdens on the already over-taxed resources of the incumbents, and to postpone the prospect of preferment to the curates.

It is of the utmost importance to the right understanding of the "Curate Question" to set forth clearly this fact: that assistant curates, holding the position and performing the duties which they now do, are, as a class, a creation of the present century. Our Curate system, both in itself and in the mode in which it is supported, is unknown to the ancient constitution of the Church. Curates there were, it is true, in former times; but they were merely the representatives of the incumbents, who, holding two or more benefices together, were non-resident. So extensively did this state of things prevail, that in the year 1810, from Parliamentary returns of the 10,159 livings held by incumbents, more than half of the parishes were supplied by curates-in-sole-charge. After the passing of the Pluralities Act this state of things became gradually changed: hence, in 1838 some 3,078 curates-in-charge acted for non-resident incumbents: in 1864 only 955 so acted: in 1881 only 387; and in all probability there are not more than 330 now, and the number is rapidly diminishing. It will therefore be seen that, simultaneously with this change—which thus, by reclaiming the services of so many beneficed clergy, has gradually done away with the occupation and means of support of a body of upwards of 4,000 curates-in-charge—so great an increase of population

has taken place, that a requirement has arisen for the services of even a greater number of assistant curates, to perform duties in parishes over and above those provided for by the ancient endowments of the Church. A great and remarkable change, therefore, has taken place in the body of the clergy, and in their relation to their parochial charges. Instead of having non-resident incumbents and a multiplicity of pluralists, with curates-in-sole-charge, we now have resident incumbents, and but a very few pluralists, with assistant curates: instead of having means of support for the whole of the clergy, both beneficed and unbeneficed, we have only the beneficed provided for, and no fixed and certain provision for the assistant curates. In some eighty years or so the number of benefices has been increased from 10,159 to about 14,000, and the parochial clergy from 10,300 to about 21,000. Another factor we must not overlook. In addition to these regular parochial clergy, we have a column of free-lances, moving on the body of the regular army, numbering something like 4,000, many of whom have left the regular force to seek a better means of subsistence than the Church provides in her regular parochial machinery.

What do we gather from all this? First, that we have some 14,000 beneficed clergy, who are partly provided for by the ancient endowments of the Church; second, that we have close upon 7,000 assistant curates, for whom there is no fixed and certain provision; third, we have a large rolling-stock, consisting of some 4,000 unattached clergy, most of whom ought to be engaged in direct spiritual work in parishes, but who are lost to the Church, because, for some reason or other, they do not seek curacies, or are not accepted by incumbents, or are disqualified by age or other cause for the active service which is now required from every licensed curate.

With a rapidly increasing population, the universal cry goes up, "*More clergy*;" but this can only be met by a better maintenance and improved prospects of those already at work. If a feeling of hardship and disappointment prevails amongst the clergy, the natural consequence will be what Mr. Armfield tells us is the case, a deficiency in the supply of candidates for holy orders. We must remember that the world is not so destitute of openings for young men of talent and industry that they will be driven to seek a livelihood among the clergy if they have in the Church no fair and reasonable prospect of a competence after years of hard work and self-denial. To insure a constant and sufficient supply of good candidates for the ministry, we must hold out some attractions to the poor as well as to the rich, to the man without friends or patrons as well as to the possessor of both. We must bear in mind, more-

over, that this question of supply pertains not so much to the candidates themselves as to parents, who have to consider for what professions in life they will prepare their sons; and if they find that this profession does not provide a proper maintenance for its members, then it is but natural that they will give that little bias which is required to deter their sons from entering this particular profession. Even the clergy themselves take this view of the matter in the case of their own sons. Though they feel that they can themselves bear hardships, privations, and disappointments, yet they shrink from subjecting their sons to trials of such severity. It is all very well for thoughtless people to quote the hackneyed saying that a clergyman should devote his life to the work of the ministry and think nothing of his pay, but be ready to toil through life for wages that no skilled mechanic would take. What is the use of talking of "what men should do"? We have to deal with facts and realities, and not with fine-spun theories and quixotic absurdities. It is folly to expect from any body of men, whether in orders or otherwise, a superhuman elevation of disinterestedness and self-denial. We have to deal with a system that recognises a married clergy, and not a body of monks and mendicant friars. Clergy are only men; they require food and clothing like other people; they may endeavour to be, and succeed in being, spiritually minded, but they are not spiritually bodied; and it is an undisputed fact that hundreds of talented young men are lost to the Church because their common sense and their parents' advice deter them from taking holy orders under the present system of patronage, with the possibility of receiving no more than a curate's paltry stipend for life, with the unhappy knowledge, too, that after a certain time of life not only will his small income get less, even at the rate of £5 every five years, but his prospects for preferment will grow worse. Owing, also, to these miserable stipends which curates get, numbers of talented men who have taken orders are lost to the Church in this country, and leave her shores for work in other lands, or have gone to swell out that large body of "unattached clergy." There are many clergymen living now who have given up clerical work entirely, either for tuition or literature—men who might have been useful parish priests had the Church paid them better or recognised their long and faithful services. We must, as Mr. Armfield so well puts it, view "the sacred profession not" always "in its higher spiritual relations, but rather in its professional, its non-religious aspect."

Looking at it in this light, what are the deterrent causes so far as the clerical profession is concerned?

They may be put under three heads: (1) The scanty

remuneration to men in middle life, decreasing with age and experience if they continue curates. (2) The uncertainty of preferment to the great bulk of the clergy; not because they do not deserve it, but because it is not there for them. (3) The insecurity of a curate's position, and the extreme liability to change of locality, with a fast-decreasing income as he gets older; in other words, he goes down in marketable value. A man may remain, from no fault of his own, a curate from the day he preaches his first sermon to the hour when, old and feeble, he preaches his last; only, he will receive some £140 or £150 a year when he preaches his first sermon, but will in all probability have considerably less than £100 when he preaches his last.

There is no mistake about it that the country needs more clergy; but it must be borne in mind that while we increase the number of clergy without a proportionate increase of fixed positions, we at the same time diminish the hopes of preferment of those who are already in the profession. While we are claiming from the Church, and rightly claiming, more activity and more men—while we are swelling the ranks of the working clergy, and introducing into the Church additional curates through the two great societies, the "Additional Curates" and the "Pastoral Aid"—we are at the same time diminishing the chances of promotion for those already in holy orders; and we are indirectly impoverishing them unless we multiply the number of benefices and create more vacancies by the retirement of the old and infirm, and have some great national or diocesan fund for them when they are getting up in years.

If with the staff of clergy we had five years ago it took twenty years on the average, as Bishop Lightfoot said, before all the clergy could be promoted—and with the present staff now, as the Bishop of Winchester said the other day, at the annual meeting of the "Curates' Augmentation Fund," it will take upwards of twenty-one years on the average—then it will take a longer time if we multiply their number; and if promotion be exceeding slow, we have necessarily inefficiency amongst the older members, and discontent amongst the younger ones. No wonder that the Bishop of Winchester said "he felt sure that the Curate Question was one which was becoming more and more important."

This consideration, although of vital importance to the Church and country, appears to be lost sight of by the majority of Churchmen, both clerical and lay; and therefore there is great need that it should be urged on our attention.

The hardship of the curate is twofold, and arises, first, from the fact that, as a body, the curates are almost entirely depen-

dent on the resources of the beneficed clergy, whose usually narrow professional incomes oblige them to offer a stipend to their curates utterly inadequate not only to the value of the services rendered, but insufficient to meet the inevitable claims of their position as clergymen of the National Church; second, from the further fact, that whilst the parochial clergy have been increased by one-third or more, there has been no corresponding augmentation in the creation of permanently endowed posts, thus postponing almost indefinitely the prospect of preferment. It cannot, therefore, be matter for surprise if these concurring causes have issued, and are likely to do so, in a considerable falling off in the number of candidates for holy orders.

It was with these circumstances of the Church fully in view, and in the absence of any large scheme for extending the permanent endowment of the Church, that the society called the "Curates' Augmentation Fund" was founded twenty-one years ago, for it meets one of the greatest financial weaknesses in the Church of England, it ministers to one of her most pressing needs, and is doing a most excellent and necessary work. It is only a society based on such principles as it is that meets the cry for more clergy in a fair, straightforward and statesmanlike way. We have no right to entice young men into the ministry by providing decent stipends—stipends far in advance of those of "ordinary recruits" in other professions—for them when young and in their early training and bachelorhood, and when they get old, and their best energies are exhausted, to leave them to do as best they may, or throw them upon the tender mercies of the "Poor Clergy Relief Corporation," and the other two hundred and fifty charitable societies founded for the relief of the clergy. Unless there is an increase of fixed positions, or an increase in the maintenance funds of the Church, or we get men with private means, then a large increase of her clergy, instead of being a blessing and a subject of congratulation, would be a positive evil. We should, in no great length of time, only have a pauper staff of clergy ministering to the spiritual wants of the wealthiest nation in the world.

What said a leading layman in Liverpool at a public meeting held some short time ago? "So long," said he, "as all other walks in life offered comparative comfort and affluence as compared with the incomes of the clergy, it must be expected that there would be a falling off in the supply of clergy, for, as a rule, the laity did not encourage their sons to enter a profession which, in this age, was practical poverty. When all things are considered, it could not be wondered at that the supply of clergy was not equal to the demand."

If we are not careful, one of two things will happen: (1) we shall either have fewer good men coming forward for holy orders, or (2) we shall have to put up with a supply of ill-trained, half-educated, ill-cultured men, and the laity must not grumble if, in the near future, they find the tone of the clergy plainly deteriorating. If good men are worth having, they are worth fair pay. This is a self-evident proposition. In the words of one of our Bishops: "It will be a fatal day to the Church of England when she shall be obliged to recruit her ministry from men of lower education and social position." Further consideration of this subject will be taken up in a future paper.

J. R. HUMBLE.



ART. V.—THE SUFFICIENCY OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

ANY sufficiency to which the Christian minister can attain is, of course, only of a relative kind. According to New Testament usage, the word always conveys the idea of fulness or adequacy with regard to a given standard. But what is this standard as it regards the minister's office? It so happens that the two Epistles to the Church of Corinth alone afford us the fullest answer to this question. The true evangelical ideal of the Christian ministry in relation to Christ is that of an agency devoid of any meaning or worth, save only as it receives strength and energy from Him, the whole Source of any motive power it may possess. Hence this ministry, if not a life-like or real representation of its great Prototype, is nothing at all.

In the fourth chapter of the first Epistle we have what we may call a formal definition of the estimate which St. Paul wishes us to take of such an office. The Christian minister is a *ὑπηρέτης* (*lit.* "an under-rower;" "a servant"). This name had long previously been commonly applied to anyone who bore a responsible office under a higher authority. But in the beginning of St. Luke's Gospel we have the first instance of its consecration to religion; and in the twenty-sixth chapter of the Acts we find Christ Himself designating St. Paul by this title of honour on his election to the Apostleship.

But what an apt expression is this word of the dependent place which a minister fills under the only Leader and Commander, the only effective Worker, Priest, Pastor, and Bishop of the Christian Church!

Ministers are mariners and stewards in God's ship under the direction of a Divine Captain. They are appointed to render service to the passengers of this ship during the

dangers, risks, and difficulties of an earthly voyage till they reach their destined haven of rest. They must work this ship till it, at last, reaches the eternal shore, and convey messages from their Master to all on board. Hence the name "angels," or "messengers," as they are sometimes called. And further, they have a commission to feed the passengers under their charge, as stewards, with the supplies provided for the voyage, and in the distribution of which fidelity to their Lord must be a special feature of their stewardship. God's mysteries of salvation from sin, of the righteousness, sanctification, and redemption, never openly revealed till brought to light in the Gospel, are the heavenly stores which they have thus to deal out to needy souls.

The names of "pastor" and "shepherd" and "overseer," also, by which "ministers" are often distinguished, have each a significance of their own.

But there is another aspect of the minister's service which belongs to the very essence of his office. He must be always on the alert to receive the Master's commands, to run through the dust of the road, and to endure the humblest toil of the travel-worn in their execution. He thus commends himself as Christ's *διάκονος*.¹ But he is even more: he is Christ's *δούλος*, or slave. Yet this is a glorious title. No higher has been sought by the holiest and best in every age; and so honourable is it, that no better can be found even for the saints in heaven. But, as applied to the Christian minister, it bears a specially significant meaning. It indicates at once his absolute servitude to one Master, and his freedom from all others. No ancient monastic rules of self-denial and obedience could be more complete and rigid than those by which in spirit and truth he feels bound to serve one Master, even Christ. He can know nothing about the troubles of a divided service or an undecided will. If he bears branded on his soul, and on his body too, the *στίγματα*, the slave-marks which betoken, as in the case of St. Paul, the Owner to whom he belongs, he can hear of no allegiance or obligation but such as he learns in the fellowship of the Cross of Christ. This idea, then, of a life entirely dedicated to one exclusive purpose and work is at the very root of the Christian ministry.

But passing now from these titular characteristics of a minister's sufficiency, let us give a few thoughts to the nature of his service and the signs which point him out as one who labours with the ability which God giveth. And, first of all, he must be in sympathy and living touch with that new

¹ 2 Cor. iii. 6, *ικάνωσεν ἡμᾶς διακόνους*. "Made us sufficient as ministers," R.V.

covenant under the authority and power of which he ministers—"not of the letter, but of the spirit." No religion revealed to persons in contact with this material world can possibly dispense with outward forms and ceremonies: Christianity has therefore, of necessity, taken and consecrated to its use certain earthly symbols of the great facts and living truths of which it bears witness and affords pledges to men. But the Gospel minister feels assured that, in so far as he has to do with such forms, he only fulfils his office effectually when they are the mere outward tokens of an inward communion between Christ and those who in them draw near to Him. He is not a minister of the letter, but of something infinitely deeper and better; of that invisible grace, and anointing with power and the Holy Ghost, which are at the bottom of all forms. He is not a minister of the law, but rather of that which is the spirit and body of all law, namely, Christ, and Him crucified. Very fitly, then, is his ministry described as that which is able or sufficient.

We have now reached a point at which, perhaps, we are in the best position to form a sound opinion on a subject which has exercised the thoughts of many—I mean that of Apostolical succession in the Christian ministry. But what are we to understand by Apostolical succession in its true sense? Does it signify that unless a minister can trace his descent to the Apostles by an outward chain, from link to link, whether or not it may be the medium of any vitalizing spiritual influence, his sacred commission is not valid? If so, I fear, a task almost impossible to fulfil is imposed upon us. The Jews may have been able to do this, in tracing their lineal descent from Abraham; but we know how little that availed those who were not also the spiritual children of his family. John the Baptist was the true successor of Elijah, even though we cannot trace the order of Abia to the great prophet of fire.

In reference to the ministers of the Irish Church, their orders have doubtless been transmitted to them from the most ancient and indubitable sources of authority. I am satisfied that this Church is the only religious body which can point to anything like an unbroken historical continuity, identifying the orders of its ministry with those of the men who adorned primitive Christianity in our land. But yet, can we positively affirm that there have been no technical flaws and irregularities in the line of their succession? The annals of mediæval Ireland, I fear, do not justify any very positive presumption under this head.

Consider the story alone of the way in which St. Columba, then a deacon, obtained his priest's orders. He is sent by St. Fennian of Conarld to Etchin, Bishop of Clonfad, to

receive consecration to the episcopal office. When Columba reached Clonfad for this purpose, he learned that the Bishop was out ploughing in the field. He went after him, received a hearty welcome; but, lo! in the subsequent course of his proceedings, the good agriculturist and Bishop so lost his head that, by a mistake, he only ordained Columba a priest instead of a Bishop. If the man after God's own heart were precluded from raising up an earthly temple to His glory, because he was a man of war and had shed blood, the claims of the blood-stained Phelim, Bishop of Cashel, and his no less sanguinary successor, King Cormac, also Bishop of Cashel, to transmit the sacred deposit, were not such that, did I fail as a builder on the true Gospel foundation, exactly to trace my holy orders to them, I should thereby feel in the least disqualified to discharge my pastoral office. This Phelim, and even Cormac, with all his taste for literature and art, as well as many of their primatial brethren in Armagh, and who, I suppose, were only samples of many other ninth century bishops, would just as coolly seek conquest or revenge by the sword as any worldly chieftain who never heard or professed allegiance to the Gospel of peace.

By these remarks, however, I would by no means seek to weaken any of those strong historical ties which bind the Church of Ireland to that of SS. Patrick, Columba, and Columbanus, and which identify our religion with that which once gained for this country the distinguished title of "*Insula Sanctorum.*"

It is the worthy, able man who now adorns the high position of provost in Trinity College, Dublin, that has said, "It so happens that we can recall with more pride the religious than the political history of our island." True, but all periods of our religious past are not fitted to awaken such pride. The chain of a literal ecclesiastical succession is very long; and it has undoubtedly come down to us through some very dark and turbid mediums. I therefore, for one, am persuaded that the more excellent way of proving the genuineness of my commission is that which shows it to be in conformity with the spirit rather than the mere letter of Apostolical authority.

The marks of true Church communion which distinguished primitive Christians were, their steadfast continuance in Apostolical doctrine and fellowship, "in the breaking of bread, and in the prayers." We need no other standard. The family likeness to St. Paul which I want is that which proves I am one with him in faith, love, zeal, singleness of purpose, and devotion to the Master's work, rather than in any material identity between the outward credentials of his ministry and

mine. The miraculous call to the Apostleship, which he received from the Chief Shepherd, gave him a title to his office which none could gainsay or resist. Yet he delighted, also, to appeal to other "letters of orders," *ἐπιστολαὶ συστατικάί*, in commendation of his claims on human souls, which were not, however, written on parchment, but rather on the hearts of those whom he won to Christ. He indeed, with unutterable gratitude, could say that he received not only grace, but Apostleship as well, from Christ. Yet he felt it also a testimonial of the highest value to be able to declare that he commended himself to every man's conscience in the sight of God, and that the signs of an Apostle were wrought by him in all patience.

From his teaching we can further learn tokens of a minister's sufficiency which may well claim our deepest attention. If we rightly grasp the great central truth, which shines so brightly in his life and doctrine, we find it to be this—that he regarded himself as one who lived the life of Christ over again on this earth. He as much as proclaimed to the world, "The Lord Jesus now lives in heaven, therefore I live. He works for, in, and with His Church, now at the right hand of God. Consequently I work;" and therefore could exhort his hearers, saying, "We, then, as workers together with Him, beseech you." Hence it was not in his successes, or in any of his mighty labours for Christ, that he so much rejoiced as in those sufferings which brought him into conformity with Christ. And as I can never read his recital of such sufferings without feelings of the deepest self-abasement and humiliation, I can only here fervently pray that the same spirit which fired his soul may also burn in mine and in those of my brethren at the present day.

But there is one great element in the ability of a Christian minister which we cannot pass over, and that is, *spiritual influence*. All who came in contact with the Chief Pastor when on earth felt at once that they were in the presence of such power, and such as that in the unlimited exercise of which He now bears sway in heaven and on earth. Hence the true minister, I believe, is now armed not only with the spirit, but in measure with this power of Christ. There were giants on the earth in those pentecostal and reformation days, when valleys of dry bones rose up like mighty armies at the call of God, and went forth conquering and to conquer in His service. We may not, indeed, again see an Elijah, a John, a Paul or a Luther amongst us. They may not be the want of our times; but we may and must have that which lay at the root of all their glorious triumphs, that is, spiritual influence over the souls of men. Well may we pray and long for this power. Define it

I cannot. It is not the praise of men, it is not eloquence or popularity, or the mere power of attracting large congregations; it is something invisible, intangible, but most real; it is that to which the wills, hearts and consciences of men really bend and pay homage; it is that by which people instinctively distinguish the true from the false shepherd. Perhaps its real secret lies in what St. Paul calls "the simplicity that is in Christ Jesus;" and the man who has found it out, is he who in private and public, in life and doctrine, has always managed to hide himself behind the Master.

We cannot omit to notice one function or gift of an able Christian ministry which gives it an especial claim upon the acceptance of mankind. This office is not that of the bygone and temporary Jewish priesthood. The minister of Christ is never designated a sacrificing priest in the New Testament. Here the term is only applied to all glorified saints in common. The only Priest of our Confession is that unchangeable, ever-living Priest Who has no need to delegate His office to others. But there is an ancient, precious ministry as old, at least, as the days of Enoch, which Christ has ended with mighty power; and invigorated with the energy of a new life, purpose and work. That is the place filled, of old, by the prophet, and handed down to the pastors of the Church at the present day. The essence of the prophet's office consisted not in his being a foreteller of future events, but rather in the fact of his speaking for or instead of God, in his being the mirror to men of the true mind of God. Now, the very greatest importance is attached to this function in the New Testament. St. Paul tells us that it is the highest gift bestowed by Christ on His Church, and is that which he exhorts us specially to covet or desire above all others. He who rightly uses this gift introduces us into an atmosphere far above the clouds of religious doubt and speculation, and makes us feel that he has brought us into the very presence of Christ, and face to face with God. Of him who possesses the true prophetic instinct, it can be said:

Who took the suffering human race,
And read each wound, each weakness clear,
And struck his finger on the place,
And said, "Thou ailest here and there."

In that priesthood of prayer whereof all the Lord's people are partakers, it is, of course, the minister's place to take a foremost part. In the ministry of the sacraments, a lot is assigned to him by the heavenly Householder of indispensable value to perishing, needy souls. But I think if we can at all interpret the signs of our times, and take account especially of the masses as yet untouched by anything like the supreme

power of spiritual religion, we must see that the want and desire of this age at large is not so much the ministry of the priest as of the prophet.¹ Men are jealous of any claim which would put a fellow-sinner between them and their God, and which would as much as say to them, "Stand aside, I am holier than thou;" but at the same time, in their secret hearts, they long for some guide who would pour in true light upon their blindness and ignorance, and with authority and power point out to them the way of peace. A prophetic caste no longer exists, and is no longer needed; but a prophetic order of men able to speak what they have seen, and to testify what they know of heavenly realities—men faithful and wise, well instructed in the things of God, and qualified to "prophesy according to the proportion of faith" and the spirit of Christian charity—perhaps never stood more in demand than they do at the present time. If we fail then, now, to reach cold and rigid hearts, to inspirit the apathetic, to stir the dull consciences of sinners, and direct them into the path of well-doing, we must look somewhere else for the cause rather than in the message we have to deliver. Wherever we turn, whether in the world of our respective parishes, or to that of this earthly sphere, the deeply-felt, earnest, though unspoken cry of men and women to us is: "Come over and help us, if you can." And if we have something real and solid, something sufficient for the cravings of the inner man to offer, no former generation in the Church's history could more thankfully appreciate such help than that of our own day.

Space does not now permit the further pursuit of this wide and most instructive subject; therefore with some remarks regarding what has been advanced, I shall conclude.

No thoughtful pastor, indeed, can consider the high calling he has received, and the tremendous responsibility which belongs to it, without great searchings of heart and a sense of the deepest awe. Even that prince of Apostolical labourers, the noble-minded Paul, when he looks at the terrible issues dependent on the faithful discharge of his office, exclaims, "Who is sufficient for these things?"² A too sensitive recoiling from such a charge led a holy man once to say, "For all the riches of the world, I would not have the charge of souls for one night;" and another to declare that "few, if any, priests can be saved." But without sharing in such morbid sentiments, I am sure, as we think of our Master, ourselves, and the work before us, we cannot but see what a lot of thrilling solicitude and magnitude

¹ The late Bishop Fraser, in common with many most influential divines held this view.

² 2 Cor. ii. 16, *πρὸς ταῦτα τίς ἰκανός;*

is ours. The example set before us seems unattainable. The difficulties in our way seem unspeakably great. To say nothing of outward trials, see what infirmities of body and mind compass us round and keep us in on every side. We walk by faith. Ours is a testimony which declares that beyond, in the future, is the Christian's golden age, is the time for which men should prepare and live; but how sorely beset and hindered are we by that world which has "Now!" written on all its attractions! How little, apparently, have we to learn, except the discipline of failure, in many of our undertakings! The successes of yesterday become but too often the reverses of to-day. Evidently the whole mass of the evils which afflict mankind are at war with us. Here is that misfortune and poverty we cannot cure. There is that stubborn perverseness in irreligion, drunkenness, or some other crying sin, upon which we can make no seeming impression for good. Here is that want of sympathy and coldness from professed friends which is as ice upon our souls. Then, amidst our dark musings, comes the chilling suspicion that perhaps the power of religion is failing, that its force is all but spent—at least in our hands—or that the awakening and influential efficacy which once attended our own ministry is now no longer visible. Will the experienced minister say that this picture of his lot and inner life is overdrawn? I think not. But it is doubtless well that we should have our *de profundis clamavi* experiences like the great and good in times gone by. Seeing, however, that our way passes through these valleys of Baca, we must be on the watch to gird up the loins of our mind in all sobriety and calmness, to arm ourselves with the self-possession and strength needful for such *dies mali*, and the despondency which they bring to our minds. But whence our fears and misgivings? Our work is not of to-day, or yesterday. That which the Master began both to do and teach long ago on the shores of the Galilean lake, He continues now to teach and do through us. Is not our office altogether His institution? That consecration of life to the service of men for the advancement of their spiritual and everlasting welfare, which is the meaning and intent of our ministry, has no counterpart in human inventions. Nothing like it has ever been thought of by man. Is not the ordinance, therefore, divine? We exist to spread the true light, to stand up for goodness and truth, and to carry on the old war of bygone saints against error, iniquity, and wrong. As long as the Bible and the Gospel are a force in the world, our place cannot be dispensed with. We may not gain the success we so ardently desire in our several spheres. But fidelity is ours; success belongs to the Disposer of all things. We may not accomplish the results we aim at

in our undertakings ; but our part is now rather that of the husbandman who sows, than of him who reaps. Like Abraham, we must follow our Master, often not knowing whither we go. The Christian servant gains no advantage by knowing the why and the wherefore of the work assigned to him, or the exact purpose which that work is designed to serve. In fact, I hope and believe, as in a country like Ireland, the indirect influence of God's ministers is often more important in His sight than any visible and direct ends they might accomplish. Let us learn, then, to look above the surface, and to sow seed which we ourselves may not reap in this life. Let us be not only teachers, but examples of that eternal patience which belongs to our present destiny, and which clearly marks that divine rule beneath which we now live. Let us aim at the mark, the golden centre of ministerial excellency now, and the prize, the due reward, will be ours in good time. Meanwhile, let us remember who and what we are, entrusted with a stewardship held direct from Christ, in a glorious household as wide and embracing as this earth, as far-reaching as Christ's whole family in heaven and earth. Let us always behave with an ever-present knowledge of the dignity and responsibility which pertain to us. Let us know our own minds and not be afraid to speak them. Let us not fear to point out boldly the way of life and the way of death ; and whatever we do, let us not lose that inner sacred fire of the soul which lights up the vista before us into things unseen, which keeps Christ, truth, and immortality at all times clearly in our view. Whilst our work is on earth, yet let Augustine's noble sentiment be ours : "Anima mea magis est ubi amat quam ubi animat" (*My life is more where it loves than where it lives*). An eloquent divine has said : "Our awful ministry starts from the foot of the Cross on which Jesus Christ died, from the grave from which He rose, from the mountain whence He went up, and it looks forward as to its close and goal to the day when we shall all stand before Him. We are the messengers of a divine forgiveness—ministers of a divine reconciliation—heralds of an everlasting peace. We are sent to feed the flock of God—to be gatherers of wandering souls into their Father's house, the stewards of His mysteries, the preachers and prophets of the Light of the World. There are many orders of work in God's world, and that is our work."¹ "Raise up, O Lord, we pray Thee, Thy power, and come amongst us." *Veni Creator Spiritus.*

FRANCIS BURKE.

¹ Dean Church.

ART. VI.—EWALD'S "OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY."

Old and New Testament Theology. By HEINRICH EWALD. Translated from the German by the Rev. T. GOADBY, B.A. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1888; pp. viii., 458.

THIS is one of the newest volumes of the valuable Foreign Theological Library, being the first issue for 1888. It is a companion volume to "Revelation: its Nature and Record," by the same author and translator. The volumes are selections from Ewald's *Die Lehre der Bibel von Gott, oder Theologie des Alten und Neuen Bundes*, which was published, 1870-75, in four volumes, of which the last was still in the press when the writer died. The translator promises us an analysis of the whole work; but meanwhile he offers to English readers these selections from what was the last and ripest, though not the greatest, work of Ewald's most laborious and productive life. The translator is probably wise in not venturing to give the whole of it to the English public. Even Germans have found the diffusiveness of Ewald's final review of Biblical religion, with its digressions upon the political and ecclesiastical questions of the day, somewhat trying. To those who have less patience and less interest in the questions discussed, it would no doubt be still more so: and the selections given are sufficient to give the reader a comprehensive knowledge of the main ideas of the work. They are set forth with Ewald's characteristic ability, confidence, earnestness, and love of truth.

To a certain extent the present volume covers the same ground as a work which appeared almost simultaneously with it, Canon Mason's "The Faith of the Gospel," (Rivingtons, 1888); but Canon Mason's treatise is much more compact, and his handling of the various topics which are common to the two works is naturally very different from that of the Göttingen professor.

The main subjects treated of in "Old and New Testament Theology" are: the Divine Nature and Man's Knowledge of it; Creation; Order and Progress; Faith; the Trinity; the Doctrine of Immortality.

When Ewald was in Oxford some forty or more years ago, one of the many persons who were invited to meet him asked him whether he thought that St. John wrote the Fourth Gospel. "I know that he wrote it," was the answer, delivered with the air of one who had conversed with the Apostle on the subject. This dogmatism is bracing and cheering when it exists in those who have full knowledge respecting subjects in which certitude is possible. Few men of real genius and learning have had more confidence in their own opinions than

Ewald; and he sometimes exhibited it in spheres in which no one has the right to dogmatize. Thus, he is quite certain that angels are not created beings, and have no variability of character. Bad angels are angels who execute Divine punishment on man (pp. 67, 80).

But this positivism is not always accompanied by clearness. At times, what is given with one hand seems to be taken away with the other, or else thoughts are obscured rather than expressed by amplitude of language. Take, for instance, his remarks upon a belief in miracles: "There are scholars so infatuated and so blind to the wonders of the Bible that they wholly refuse to admit their reality, and would extirpate the word 'miracle' from all ancient and modern tongues. But the Divine order of the world and its progress, to which all Biblical wonders point, is itself the supreme and *only true wonder* for men. Every instance of it, however small, is a wonder; how much more the whole sweep of it!" (P. 220.) But if the order of the universe is the "only true wonder," and if every detail of it is a wonder, where is there any room for miracle? To say that everything is miraculous is much the same as saying that nothing is: in either case "miracle," in the ordinary sense of the term, is denied.

Most readers will find what Canon Mason says respecting the angels more in harmony with their own view of what Scripture teaches on the subject. After quoting Job xxxviii. 4-7 (the beautiful passage about "the sons of God shouting for joy" at the Creation), Canon Mason continues: "It is precarious, of course, to press the language of such a poetical apostrophe for purposes of doctrine; but what we learn elsewhere of the relation of angels to the world makes it seem natural that the purely spiritual creatures should be the first to come into being. . . . We may consider them as a kind of spiritual substratum, in which the material things are planted. They form a preparatory creation, to receive what is to follow. It is, perhaps, for this reason that, in the vision of Jacob, and our Lord's interpretation of it, the angels are seen ascending first, and descending after: their natural place is in the world below" (St. John i. 51). And then after mentioning speculations as to the share which angels may have had in developing the material universe out of chaos, and may still have in the regulation of it, he wisely concludes with the remark: "Definite knowledge upon this point has not, however, been given to us" (pp. 67-69).

With regard to miracles, it is less easy to compare the two teachers, for Canon Mason says very little on the subject. He contends for the miraculous mode of Christ's birth; and even goes so far as to say that "for the true Incarnation no other

entrance into the world is imaginable but that which was chosen" (p. 114): and also for the reality of Christ's resurrection as a return from the dead, with a body that could be seen and handled, "into a living relation with material and palpable things" (p. 198). But of the nature of miracles in themselves and in their relation to what Ewald calls "the Divine order of the world and its progress," there is little or no discussion. The translation of Ewald's work, however, has an index, whereas Canon Mason's book has none; so that in looking for notices of any particular subject it is easier to find them in the one volume than in the other.

Of this "Divine order" Ewald says finely in another place: "No doubt there is much of detail in the sum of things in the world and the Divine order that man is little able to understand, and cannot at all conceive how it can be of God. The dark questions by which Job was overwhelmed, as his poet represents him, might be repeated to-day. In reality, however, all this is only as a summons to man to pursue his inquiry from point to point, and ascertain with growing certainty how far everything is of God—a course of action the Bible does not forbid, but rather demands. . . . But how certainly everything is of God all human action confirms in a sense doubly strong. For if free will moves and works in man as if he were God, and may, indeed, embolden itself to contravene God's will, yet this is so only because God has given to the will such power, at the same time prescribing its limit. If, then, the whole life and conduct of the unrighteous has its possibility only through God, it must serve in the course and issue of things to advance the ultimate aim of the Divine order, and so prove in the long run only an instrument in the hand of God for good" (pp. 197, 198). There are also some fine passages towards the end of the volume respecting the world to come; but, on the whole, it is not a book that carries the reader on from page to page with the desire to have more.

It is by his contributions to Hebrew philology, and by his "History of Israel," that Ewald's fame will live. This last work of his will not add much to it.

ALFRED PLUMMER.



ART. VII.—THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SPIRITUAL LIFE OF THE CHURCH.

THE development of the spiritual life of the Church is the manifestation in the Church of the life of Jesus Christ. And that manifestation has no other possible mode of taking place than by the production in the great community of "the fruit of the Spirit." And what the fruit of the Spirit is we well know. The Spirit Himself has described it and detailed it (Gal. v. 22, 23).

Again, and yet again, let this great Church Principle be written by the grace of God in our hearts, and put into our minds. The development of spiritual life, the manifestation of it, the evidence of the presence of it, lies only and wholly in spiritual fruit; and that fruit is described for us by Him who cannot err, either in excess or defect of description and definition. We are to observe that the question before us is not concerned immediately with religious work, with ecclesiastical activities, considered in themselves. It is concerned with that which, in the right state of things in the Church, lies beneath and antecedent; it relates to the development, the coming out, of the Life which is by the Spirit from the Son of God. I know no sort of activity which, as mere material action, may not in given instances be put forth where yet there is no development of this Life. It is possible to speak with the tongue of angels, and to give away the last coin, and to go to the martyr's pile, without this life, whose inmost element is love. Much more is it possible to compass ecclesiastical reforms, and to carry out a vigorous, perhaps a rigorous, programme of external Church government, and to erect and restore innumerable holy fabrics, and to magnify and glorify every detail of exterior worship; yes, and to plan with energetic practicality how to relieve poverty, how to brighten life for the people, how to attach them to a system—and yet not to possess the life which is hid with Christ in God, and therefore certainly not to develop it.

For genuine work and genuine workers in the Church, God be praised! But the very movement of the time, the very stir of multifold energy to which the severest critics of the Church of England now bear witness, has, of course, its danger. There is danger of confusing action, which in given cases may be wholly due to causes as natural as those which stimulate the modern zeal for education and art, with things—or rather with conditions of things—due to the indwelling life of Jesus Christ; to the true Church's life hid with Him in God. The decisive proof of the development of that life lies not in so much expenditure of energy, but in the growth of the un-

alterable fruit of the Spirit; fruit, let us remember, not fruits; not a separable collection, but an indissoluble harmony of life.

Approaching the topic of development more directly, let me first remind my readers of a principle which might almost "pass without saying," were it not a thing not only obvious, but vital. I mean, that the development of spiritual life in the Church is profoundly connected with the development of it in the individual. I well know that the case might be stated the other way, and we might dilate upon the blessing to the individual of a warm while pure air around him in the community. But for Churchmen as individuals, clergy, or laymen, it is nine times out of ten far more important and to the point to recollect, each for himself, that a lifeless unit—yes, and a unit, if you please, with life in abeyance; yes, further, a unit with life not developing—a man who has said, "It is enough," as to his life in and by his Lord—cannot possibly contribute to the development of the total life. Nay, he positively obstructs and retards it. Practically, at least, he may be as it were a "foreign body" in the organism (to use a metaphor of St. Augustine's), hindering and vitiating its growth. Therefore I point to this vital and antecedent necessity. It is for Christians, whether of the clergy or of the laity (all of us alike being, in the holy theory of the Gospel, priests and kings to God, though not all called or commissioned to act in the same way in that wonderful position), to look, in a profound sense, at home; to take measures, to take pains, to give play and way to the life eternal which is in us, for "Christ is in us, unless"—if I may so render the Apostle's soul-piercing word (2 Cor. xiii. 5)—"we be counterfeits—*ἀδόκιμοι*." Let us see to it, that we, each man, are "growing in the grace and in the knowledge" (sure test of the grace) "of our Lord Jesus Christ;" that we are developing love, joy, peace, and the rest of that sacred fruit; that our yieldingness as to self-interest is better and better known, or knowable, to all men; that the fire of love is rising; that conscience grows tenderer, duty more sacred, our neighbour more honourable in our eyes, our self more base; and all this as in the presence, and for the sake, and by the sought and expected power of our Lord and Life.

Such individual diligence need never be carried on in forgetfulness of the total, of the community. In the nature of the case it cannot terminate in itself. The state of things I mean is, in a delightful paradox, an attentiveness to self, an "accuracy" (to use a word of St. Paul's) about self, which is nothing if not a ceaseless going out to every real claim of others; a loss of the thought of our rights in the light of their claims, and, above all, in the light of His. But for all that, it

is a thing that begins in a most practical sense at home. And in a thousand ways we shall best consult for the community by thus, in the secret of the presence of Jesus Christ, and in the most secret places of heart and of chamber above all, consulting for self; taking thought for our own growth in love, in and unto Him.

Nothing can take the place of this. Memorable are the words of St. Augustine on a passage in St. John's first Epistle: "Love alone distinguishes the children of God. . . . Let all sign themselves with the Cross; let all chaunt Amen and Alleluia; let all be baptized; let all enter the church walls: the children of God are distinguished from the children of the evil one only by love." And no one can be divinely loving by belonging to a community which contains other men who divinely love.

Another remark concerns an important detail rather than the first principle. I have referred to the secret of development—development not of work, but of life, as beginning at home. May I take up those two familiar words, "at home," and make them the suggestion? One profound characteristic of the Gospel is its reverence for home. True, there are stern words, spoken by the Lord Himself, about His own rights as *against* home: "he that hateth not his father and his mother cannot be My disciple." But what does this mean? Anything, in the end, rather than the annihilation, nay, or the depreciation, of home. The Lord must have His rights; and anything, however dear, must give way—must be crushed, if need be, into giving way to Him. On the throne of home, as of all things, He absolutely must sit. But He once there, all other rights group themselves around Him, and are only more legitimate, more sacred than ever, for their new relation. And so it is Jesus Christ who endorses the spirit of the Mosaic precept, "Whoso curseth father or mother, let him die the death." And His Apostles are never weary of inculcating the claims of home—claims as against which, so far as I can recollect, they seem to recognise no rights of intrusion on the part even of the Church itself, certainly not on the part of the officers of the Church.

We are considering the development of spiritual life in a mighty community. Now the unit of communities, in the view of the Gospel, is the family. Deep in this fact lies the principle that the development of the spiritual life of the Church is in intense connection with that of the spiritual life of the home.

See this illustrated at large in the very Epistle, that to Ephesus, which dilates most largely upon the life and growth of the mystical body of all faithful Christians. It is just that

Epistle which almost closes with an inspired manual of directions how to live the life of Christ at home.

We are placed in a time when many tendencies have invaded the sacredness of the family, and it is possible that the process of invasion may quicken in the future, whether from the civil side or otherwise. Let it be at least our care, as true followers of Christ, to remember what the Gospel thinks of home. May it be no casual part of the work of the clergy as teachers to place with respectful urgency before their people, as parents and as children, the claims and sanctities of home. May no false jealousy for the clerical office misguide us into forgetting that in the idea of the humblest home the father and the mother are for it God's delegated heads; that every man is God's minister, or ought to be, at his own hearth, at his own table, in gathering his own house round him for worship and the Word of God. Let no just esteem for the public ordinances of the Church be so distorted as to lead us to undervalue, or to teach others to undervalue, the priceless good of a reverent, simple, living and loving family worship, wherever it is the least possible, if but once a day. That occupies a place in this sacred development which nothing, I am sure, is meant to usurp. It has at least this benefit, that, if it is not the very barest form, it commits the head of the household in the eyes of his nearest circle to the responsibility of a Christian life day by day, as few other things can do. An admirable friend of mine, in a country parish in Dorsetshire, has made it a part of his wise and friendly pastoral work to offer himself to call of an evening at any cottage in his parish, and set family worship going, by taking it, in the simplest way, himself. Many a "Cotter's Saturday Night" has he originated. And I am very sure that such nights, whether in cottage or in hall, have a deep and vital function in the development of the spiritual life of the Church.

I hardly need point out that these few thoughts on a great subject are most manifestly, and necessarily, a fragment. I have spoken of the presence and of the development of the divine Life, the gift of God alone, in the individual and in the family, not attempting to follow it into wider circles. And I have said little in detail on means of promoting the development of it, beyond the one important means of domestic worship. But for the present this fragment must suffice; and I conclude by recurring to my main plea for a remembrance of the incalculable importance of home.

In the name of Jesus Christ, which has so often to be invoked in holy love against the set and fashion of a period, let us reverence and cherish for ourselves and others the sanctities of home; even if but a fragment of them remain

anywhere to be rescued and employed. More secrets of blessing for the Church and the world than we often realize lie hid in that recess. The home where parents manifestly honour Jesus Christ in act and spirit, before the keen eyes of children and of servants; where His Word is plainly revered, and that often neglected Sabbath of which He is still the Lord is loyally honoured, and where His presence invoked at the board checks there and everywhere the easy sins of tongue and temper—that home is a true vehicle of the spiritual life. The development of such a home, and of such homes, is an aim supremely worthy of the devoted purpose of the true Church-teacher, and of the true Church-man.

I often heard from my now blessed father, for fifty-five years a faithful and laborious presbyter of the English Church, a proverb, old enough, but not out of date: "*An ounce of mother is worth a pound of clergy.*" The words are the homely concentration of the principle I now press. They carry with them the truths at once of grace and nature in the matter. They at least remind us of the ample teaching of the New Testament on the power and fruitfulness of that school of love and duty, that seed-plot of the growing life of grace, growing into the whole Church's spiritual growth—a Christian, a holy, HOME.

H. C. G. MOULE.

Reviews.

The Supernatural in Nature. A verification by free use of science. By J. W. REYNOLDS, M.A., Prebendary of St. Paul's, etc. Third Edition. London: Kegan Paul, Trench and Co. 1883.

The Mystery of the Universe our Common Faith. By J. W. REYNOLDS, M.A. 1884.

FEW things are more noteworthy in connection with the Christian faith than the strength of reason, the width of learning, and the power of argument which have been called forth in its defence. The direct appeal of the Gospel is so much more to the heart than to the head, to the moral than to the mental forces of our nature, that it would not have been strange if its preachers had been content to rest here and to trust thus indirectly to win the intellectual sympathies of mankind. The actual result, however, has been so very different as in itself to be hardly less striking than the Christian scheme from which it sprung. Within a short time, comparatively speaking, after the Church went forth upon her mission, the intellect of the then known world was ranged directly and beyond dispute upon the side of the new and majestic revelation committed to her charge. The wisdom of the heathen, in all its varied forms, gave way before the faith of Christ; and hitherto, at any rate, in spite of

many later kinds of subtle opposition, the mental no less than the moral victory has remained in favour of the Christian's creed. Even on this ground, therefore, the believer has much cause to look with confidence for success in the stern, and in many ways mournful, fight with unbelief in which his faith is now again engaged. At first, indeed, and for a time success may seem to be deferred. The foe has the advantage of choosing his own time and place of attack, and almost as a consequence comes far more fully fitted for the fight than most of those who are put on their defence. Neither the mass of Christians nor their natural guides can be expected at a moment's notice to possess that intimate knowledge of many branches of inquiry which belongs of course to special students, or to divine beforehand at what precise point their faith may be assailed. The common duties of everyday life, as well as the close pressure of the spiritual work to which the Church is called, stand in the way of so fortunate a state of things as this. As soon, however, as the point of an assault is fully understood, and men of science have announced the grounds on which, to say the least, they differ from some portion of the Church's creed, defenders have been raised up quickly by Almighty God with wisdom, zeal and knowledge, equal to fulfil the distracting and sometimes unwelcome task to which they are thus called. Our own age, accordingly, is growing fast to be as rich in masterly defences of religious truth as any of the ages which have passed away, and among these works of special worth a very high place is justly due to those of Prebendary Reynolds. In the books which are before us, as well as in his other writings, he shows an uncommon union of piety and knowledge, of the widest acquaintance with the sciences and a glowing zeal to use his rare acquirements to the utmost in the interests of Christian truth. To do full justice, therefore, to such a writer, is not of course within our power in the compass of a few short pages, even if on other grounds we thought ourselves at all sufficient for the work. Books like the "Supernatural in Nature" and the "Mystery of the Universe" need not merely to be read, but to be studied—to be chewed and digested, to use the often-quoted words of Bacon. To understand their worth, our readers need to master for themselves their clear and forceful arguments; nor can the separate "Themes" and "Studies" into which they are broken up be thrown without much loss into a simpler, or condensed into a briefer, form.

Foremost, however, among the more general aspects of Mr. Reynolds's writings is the fearlessness with which he welcomes freely all the facts and many of the conclusions of those various sciences with which he shows himself so well acquainted. He dissents, indeed, distinctly from conclusions which are rash, and really therefore unscientific, and he feels no sympathy with those vague, un-Christian theories into connection with which facts and conclusions, in themselves quite true, are sometimes forced by men of science more eager to decry revealed and even natural religion than to search into the solid grounds on which they can be shown to rest. But, whatever be his estimate of unproved theories, his recognition of the claims of every form of scientific truth is full, resolute and undoubting. It is stamped as clearly on almost every page of what he writes as his unshaken faith in that early revelation of God to man with respect to the general order and method of creation, which it is one great purpose of his "Supernatural in Nature" to illustrate, and so to verify by science. In his judgment, the wonderful and well-nigh all-embracing truths of modern knowledge are not so much human discoveries as Divine disclosures, and so he receives them with gratitude and awe as an ennobling and most fruitful portion of at least the physical side of the manifold wisdom of God. In this view we can hardly doubt that he is right; nor do we see, if it be not admitted, how the truths of inspiration can in the end be so firmly rooted in the mental as to be thence transplanted to the

spiritual consciousness of men. After making every due allowance for errors in the interpretation of the facts which form the subject-matter of the sciences, for differences of opinion on the relative worth of those interpretations which are at least provisionally received, as well as for the later corrections to which the progressive character of the sciences makes them always liable, it is surely quite impossible for the Christian, or even for the Theist, to doubt that the amazing growth of modern knowledge, in the by-paths as well as in the highways of inquiry, represents a true and most significant revelation on the part of God to man. The works which men of science study are confessed to be the works of God; the powers by which they are studied are the powers which God has given; the results, moreover, are not only results foreseen by God, but are such as clearly justify at once His wisdom and His grace by the undenied and otherwise unattainable blessings which have thence abounded to mankind. All that is here assumed is that general truthfulness of the workings of the human mind which is not only bound up with the commonest concerns of life, but which gives its strength to the defensive literature of the Church as well as moral certainty to her doctrinal expositions. In the end, therefore, it would be fatal even to religion to deny to the human mind in one department of inquiry that power to ascertain truth which is eagerly claimed for it in another. But if this be so, it plainly follows, on the assumption of their Divine authority, that no real opposition can exist between the statements of the Scripture and those teachings of science which have received the firm assent of all whose training and acquirements entitle them to give a judgment. These separate forms of revelation differ indeed in the methods they employ, in the subjects they unfold, in the kind and degree of certainty they induce; but, so far as they touch on the truths which are in some degree common to them both, they cannot contradict each other. In this conviction Mr. Reynolds writes, and full of interest is the varied learning which he summons forth to illustrate that early story of creation which God made known to man.

Meantime it is not only quite natural, but in the highest degree needful, that the Church should watch with even jealous eyes the course of scientific thought, and scrutinize with eager strictness the claims put forth in its behalf by those who truly represent its teaching. She knows full well by personal experience, on the one hand, the priceless worth of the revelations entrusted to her care, and, on the other, that men of science, for several reasons, are often quite unable to estimate aright either the rational foundation or the spiritual power of the truths which they deny. As a chosen depository of religious truth, she is set apart by God, like the Hebrew race of old, in the interests of the world—the trustee of a great endowment, not for herself, but for mankind at large. She dare not put aside her office, or leave to science to give back, by fragments and at leisure, the truths which at least at first sight it often seems to take away. Even narrowness of mind, therefore, and an unwise neglect of other forms of knowledge, however lamentable, ought not to seem surprising; nor do they deserve unmeasured censure from opponents who are often just as one-sided as those whom they condemn, and as little comprehensive of all the conditions of the problems to be solved. Strictly spiritual truth, moreover, is for the most part quite outside the field of science; nor can the time come when this latter can do more than at most confirm the truths which it cannot discover. Science can never really take the place of Scripture in its collective mental and moral, and still less in its spiritual, influences, except with those who set themselves against all spiritual truth, renounce the higher intuitions of their nature, and bind themselves in fetters to the teaching of the senses and the lower understanding only. No one, accordingly, sees more clearly than Mr. Reynolds

at once the impotence of men of science beyond their own just sphere of thought and action, and the supreme importance to mankind of keeping firm and sure the spiritual heritage contained in Scripture.

The real difficulty, therefore, lies in the practical adjustment of these separate claims of Scripture and of science in such subjects as are in some sense common to them both; and it presents, of course, more room for difference of opinion than the settlement in the abstract of the light in which the discoveries of science should be regarded by religious men. But even here a general principle may be reached, sufficient as a basis of agreement to all but violent partisans, and carrying with it an approximate solution of many of those complicated questions which beset alike the men of faith who will not do dishonour to the teaching of God's works, and the men of science who dare not waive their trust in the record of His words. Nothing, surely, can be more reasonable than the interpretation of many-sided and, as the event has shown, obscure statements of Scripture by all those varied lights of modern knowledge which God has given for the special instruction of the Church quite as much as for the general blessing of the world. In the historical, the lingual, and even the merely grammatical aspects of Scripture, all wise men have long rejoiced to use whatever aids of strictly secular wisdom the providence of God has placed at their disposal. The principle is so far granted. Fundamental spiritual truth, indeed, is not directly furthered very greatly by this manifold elucidation of the sacred text. But indirectly even this has largely gained, while it is hardly possible to overrate the benefits which have thus accrued to a rational and manly faith on many questions, in themselves secondary, yet so connected with distinctly spiritual truth that doubt in many minds upon the one reacts with fatal injury upon the other. True, moreover, though it be beyond dispute, that the oracles of God are primarily given for the enlightening, training, and saving of men's spirits for the life to come, yet it is quite impossible for men, made as God has made them, to separate the action of their natural reason from the workings of their quickened spirit, or to receive by one faculty that which they reject by another. Human nature cannot thus be rent asunder. Not only is our reason the only power we possess whereby to test the worth and certainty of those outward evidences on which any professed revelation from God must be first presented for our acceptance, but it is plain that only by this power can be wrought an intelligent acquaintance with its contents, apart from which the heart and will cannot be deeply moved. Religious truths which claim to influence commandingly the present acts and all the future hopes of men ought not to be received mechanically and without the rightful exercise in due proportion of all the forces of that complex nature to which they are addressed by God. As soon, therefore, as it is found that Scripture touches, though it be but incidentally, on any subjects which fall within the natural compass of unaided reason, it seems at once distrustful and unwise to refuse to illustrate these passing statements by the fuller knowledge which indirectly, yet most really, Almighty God has given to man. To act thus is not in any way to dispute the special and supernatural character which marks the revelation of Scripture. This remains, and so far may remain, exactly where it was before. It is merely to draw out, by the light of later revelations, the fulness of that meaning which the earlier, and of necessity more popular, announcement held concealed within its brief but pregnant statements.

So far, therefore, as the interests of religion are concerned, it is not surprising that Mr. Reynolds finds but little fault with the theory of evolution in that sober sense in which only very timid or very cautious Christians would hesitate to accept it. Here in fact, as elsewhere, everything depends upon the sense in which the term is used. If, for instance, it be

used collectively to express the action in the universe of known and unknown natural forces, to the exclusion of the mind and will of a personal Creator, the term is then directly atheistic and opposed to any form of real religion. But it is not needful so to use it; nor, of course, was it in this sense that it was used by the colossal Leibnitz, who was at once the true founder of the theory and the masculine defender of even the subtlest specialties of the Christian's creed. On the assumption of the truth of those facts and processes it is intended to express, it may stand as neither more nor less than a convenient symbol for the highly probable—in some respects the certain—way in which Almighty God is pleased to work. In this sense—and if the sustaining action, as well as, when need be, the special intervention, of God be understood at every part of the process—the theory of evolution is as consonant with Christian Theism as the rival it has striven to displace. To many minds, moreover, of the highest order, as notably to that of Leibnitz, the mental conceptions and physical methods which it involves seem more noble, and, if we may so speak, more worthy of the majesty of the Most High, than the methods and conceptions connected with the older theory. Nothing, in any case, can be more irrational than fierce denunciations of this theory on the ground of its inherent tendency, if not to atheism, yet to the rejection of revealed religion. God is equally the true Worker and the only efficient Cause of the wonders of the universe, whatever be the nature of the process which He follows and the variety of the instruments which He uses. The argument from design, again, is really unaffected, whether God be thought to work by the way of continuous evolution or by that of discontinuous creations, if in some respects, perhaps, it may not be even strengthened in the eyes of many on the former view. But, anyhow, the force of this great argument rests upon the marks of design which a certain class of results exhibits, and is not dependent on the nature of the processes by which the results are reached. The question, accordingly, of the truth of evolution, as a theory, is clearly one of fact and evidence, and it therefore seems idle to dispute a principle which, more or less limited, is admitted by almost all the greatest masters of modern science in those departments of inquiry to which it is applied. Reasonable minds can hardly doubt that it must rest in part upon a sure foundation; and those who claim to judge from Scripture only may learn from Mr. Reynolds how slight is the support which Scripture really yields to that specific theory of creation which they have hitherto embraced. Nor should it be forgotten that the simpler the material machinery from which, in terms, the universe is said to be evolved, the more amazing really to the Christian, or even to the Theist, become the power and the wisdom which must lie behind the veil.

Mr. Reynolds, however, in his "Supernatural in Nature," and yet more fully in his "Mystery of the Universe," dissents on many grounds of a strictly scientific kind from the theory of evolution as a full and adequate explanation of the infinitely varied facts and forces which the phenomena of the universe hold forth to view. Not merely, as it is commonly stated, does it fail to give a rational account of the primeval origin of things, but, in his judgment, it does not reduce to order all known facts under a general principle. While, therefore, he admits its partial truth and adequacy, he yet presents himself another formula as better fitted to explain, at least approximately, the past and present history of the world. Those who would see this formula enforced must read his books, which they will find enriched with every form of vivid illustration.

¹ See THE CHURCHMAN for May, 1888, where Mr. Reynolds has discussed with great force the theory of evolution, and has restated his own principle as "the distribution and redistribution of matter, by differentiation of the Eternal Energy into the infinite and varied forces of the universe."

Nothing, finally, can be more admirable than the clearness with which Mr. Reynolds constantly points out, what is as constantly forgotten, that science leaves the universe to thoughtful minds as full of mystery at the end as it was found at the beginning of its researches. Though it has prodigiously enlarged man's knowledge in a great variety of ways, and is thus fulfilling, doubtless, vast purposes of God in His gradual development of the destinies of our race, it is utter folly to imagine that its light goes far to dissipate the darkness which surrounds the ultimate problems which perplex us in the spheres of spirit, mind and matter. Its own conceptions and conclusions are often quite as unthinkable (to use the modern word) as those which it proposes to replace. Divines, indeed, have never claimed to pass the bounds which God has set to human thought, nor to render fully thinkable those wondrous truths of Holy Writ whose practical relations are notwithstanding plain enough. Men of science are really just as powerless; and the result, therefore, in their hands is no explanation of the deeper mysteries of life and being, or of the past and future fortunes of the universe, but for the most part only a change in the terms in which these mysteries and their relations are expressed. The vocabulary from which the terms are drawn is no longer theological but scientific—scientific, moreover, in a sense so narrow that they are drawn no longer even from the sphere of mind, but almost solely from the sphere of matter. The mysteries, however, still abide unchanged, as well as the inevitable need of reasoning with respect to them in some terms of human thought and language, though the nature of these terms will vary with the thinker's standpoint. To the man of science, as much as to the man of faith, the Universe is still a Mystery, and the more closely Nature is studied the more clearly is the Supernatural seen.

ARTHUR C. GARBETT.

The Divine Programme of the World's History. By Mr. and Mrs. H. GRATTAN GUINNESS. Hodder and Stoughton. Pp. 448. 1888.

This joint production of Mr. and Mrs. Guinness is likely to be received with a more widespread approval than some of their previous publications; because it deals mainly with undisputed facts of history, and only slightly enters into the tangled controversy on the interpretation of inspired prophecy.

Accepting Holy Scripture as intended to unfold God's plan for accomplishing MAN'S redemption, these authors set themselves to trace the development of that plan, through seven great epochs "*associated with seven memorable names: Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, Daniel, and last, but not least, our Lord Jesus Christ—the second Adam, the Lord from heaven.*"

(1) "The ADAMIC foreview," as they explain it, predicted "the recovery of the fallen race by means of a suffering but triumphant member of it." (2) The programme of NOAH foretold, as to the three sections of the human family which sprang from him, "for the Semitic races *religious supremacy* . . . for Japhet's posterity . . . *political supremacy*, and for the descendants of Ham *servile degradation.*" (3) After several centuries, ABRAHAM, who left his country in trustful obedience to God's command, was informed that he would be the father of many nations . . . and that in *his* seed all nations would be blessed. (4) Five hundred years later, MOSES was enabled to reveal that Abraham's descendants, after obtaining Canaan, would be "plucked off their own land" and be "scattered among all people," yet maintain their distinct nationality, and have raised up for them A GREAT PROPHET, like Moses, but requiring implicit obedience from all. (5) Then came, after another lapse of

centuries, the revelation by King DAVID, that the expected deliverer would be one of *his* descendants ; would have an eternal kingdom, extending over all the earth ; and would be Divine as well as human. (6) Yet later, DANIEL foretold that though (the Davidic privileges having been forfeited by some of David's posterity) a succession of four Gentile monarchies would have power on the earth during the temporary humiliation of David's race, that David's Son would, notwithstanding the suffering of an ignominious death, be eventually everywhere supreme. And (7) as the conclusion of *the Divine Programme*, JESUS CHRIST, either personally or by Apostles under His control, declared that, during Jewish humiliation (the consequence of sin), the Christian religion would spread widely, by the instrumentality of preaching ; which some would reject, whilst individuals, here and there, would welcome it, *under the power of the Holy Ghost* : so that there would be a mixed condition of things—genuine godliness side by side with a *growing* Christian apostasy.

Each stage in this important series is vigorously described in seven chapters of a large octavo volume. Proof is forcibly adduced that the successive predictions, though improbable at the time when they were uttered, have already been largely fulfilled. And the reasonable conclusion is very eloquently maintained, that the Book containing these superhuman predictions being evidently from GOD, the message of salvation which accompanies them should be welcomed with unwavering joy.

Even readers who cannot sympathize with the authors in all their prophetic views will feel the force of precious argument in such sentences as these (on pp. 440, 441, 446, and 448) :

That a Redeemer should arise from a mixed race, capable, through the woman's seed, of grappling with the mighty foe of God and man ; that of the three races of mankind the mightiest should become the meanest . . . and the least conspicuous the most . . . influential ; that an aged and childless couple should become the parents of many nations, and especially of one . . . important people ; that a fate terrible as that predicted by Moses for Israel should overtake that special nation, through whom the world was to be blessed ; that a Jewish King who lived three thousand years ago should have a son who should sit on the throne of God in heaven . . . ; that this great Heir of the throne of Judah should exercise . . . universal sway, though a suffering and dying man ; . . . that He should depart, yet remain with His people to the end of the age ; that Christendom should become so corrupt as to oppose Christ . . .—all these things seemed, when announced, *paradoxical*, so unlikely were they ever to occur . . . Yet none can question that the course of history, broadly regarded, *has run precisely on these lines* . . . then, beyond all question, WE ARE BOUND TO HOLD THE BIBLE TO BE FROM GOD. . . . But . . . the faith or revelation thus evidenced ! what thought can measure its unspeakable preciousness ! what tongue can utter, what pen can write, its glorious soul-satisfying world-transforming nature and effects ! . . . Man *without* a revelation from his Maker, like a rudderless and dismasted vessel . . . drifts helplessly, hopelessly towards destruction. Redeemed man, enlightened by the beamings of the Sun of Righteousness, steers steadily and peacefully into the desired haven. The pilot is at the helm, home is in sight, and though the voyage has been dark and dangerous, it is all but over, and its blessed end and eternal issue is the kingdom of righteousness and glory, prepared and promised "from the foundation of the world."

D. D. S.

The Key-Words of the Bible. By A. T. PIERSON, D.D., author of "The Crisis of Missions," etc. Hodder and Stoughton. 1888.

We have long been convinced that the best method of learning a subject is to fix its central thought in the mind, and to group other parts round that according to their greater or less importance. It is this method which has made such school-books as Collier's "Great Events of History"

so admirable for their purpose, forming, by-the-bye, a striking contrast to most of the elementary works on Scriptural or Ecclesiastical history. Dr. Pierson applies it in the volume before us to the interpretation of Scripture itself. He chooses a key-word, with a corresponding key-verse, as a general guide to the contents of each book, and sketches in bold outline and large print its main features, adding in smaller type the minor details and divisions.

By far the best part of Dr. Pierson's work lies in the choice of key-words and key-verses. What, for instance, could be happier than on 1 and 2 Samuel, key-word, "The Kingdom;" on 1 and 2 Kings, "Royalty;" key-verses, 1 Kings ii. 12; xi. 13 ("Then sat Solomon upon the throne of David his father, and his kingdom was established greatly." "I will not rend away all the kingdom; but will give one tribe to thy son for David my servant's sake, and for Jerusalem's sake, which I have chosen"); on 1 and 2 Chronicles, "Theocracy," key-verse, 2 Chron. xv. 12 ("The Lord is with you, while ye be with Him; and if ye seek Him, He will be found of you; but if ye forsake Him, He will not forsake you")? Or, in the New Testament, Ephesians, "In Christ, One," key-verse, i. 3 ("Who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ"); Colossians, "In Christ, Complete," key-verse, ii. 10 ("And ye are complete in Him, which is the Head of all principality and power")?

But in his explanations Dr. Pierson is not so good. "The word 'Passover,'" he tells us, for instance, "has a threefold significance: God passed over the blood-sprinkled houses; then He caused to pass over, or be set apart to Himself, all first-born (xiii. 12, margin); and He made Israel to pass over the Red sea (xv. 16)"—from which it would naturally be concluded that the same word was used in the Hebrew of all three places, whereas the Hebrew word for "Passover" in Exod. xii. is quite different from that found in Exod. xiii. and xv. On page 37, also, it is inaccurate to say that "the Psalms include five poetical books, from Job to Solomon's Song inclusive." If Dr. Pierson were to look at a Hebrew Bible, he would find a great deal more included under the third division of the Old Testament. Misprints, too, are rather serious blemishes in a book of this kind, where great exactness is requisite. In a future edition, Dr. Pierson must correct "A.D. 67" as the date of the Epistle to the Corinthians, and the statement that *Hesekiah* was vainly warned by Jeremiah of the captivity.

Still, on the whole, it is a decidedly useful little volume; and it will give much striking information to those who have not made a special study of the primary meaning of the Biblical books. Many of his sentences are full of suggestiveness; e.g., "The *Rod* was Moses' symbol; the *Spear*, Joshua's;" in contrasting the Books of Kings and of Chronicles, the former, "as a record of history, *analyzes*;" the latter, as a philosophy of history, *analyzes*." "*Miriam*, *Aaron*, and *Moses* all died before the passage of the Jordan: Prophecy, Priesthood, and Law bring us to the borders; but only Jesus, our Joshua, leads us into our inheritance." "Here" (in 2 John) "home and household are honoured as spheres of service. Woman is tempted to envy the wider public service of man. But her hand is on the potter's wheel, where vessels are shaped for the master." But why not "Master"?

A. LUKYN WILLIAMS.

The Bible and the Baptists. By R. W. KENNION, M.A., Rector of Acle. Seeley and Co. 1888.

In this age of little books there are some which are very little indeed. Their size is only too often matched by the spirit in which they are written, and the attenuated arguments which they contain.

This, however, cannot be said of Mr. Kennion's little book. It is as

admirable in spirit, being a true plea for unity, as it is clear and incisive in argument, being a true plea against a doctrine of unreason.

In it the leading points of difference between the majority of Christian Churches and our Baptist brethren on the Baptismal question are taken up, and they are dealt with on the lines of St. Augustine's well-known sentence—"Contra rationem nemo sobrius, contra Scripturas nemo Christianus, contra Ecclesiam nemo pacificus, senserit" ("no sober man will think or hold an opinion against reason, no Christian against the Scripture, and no lover of peace against the Church").

The points which Mr. Kennion chiefly makes are these :

That as to the "mode," Baptism does not only or always mean "immersion ;"

That the analogy of the "inward grace," conveyed as it is by the "pouring out" or "shedding forth" of the Spirit, suggests the ideal of affusion rather than immersion ;

That as to the "subjects," the Scriptures teach, if not directly, yet by the directest of all inference, the Baptism of Infants ;

That the substantial identity of the rite of Circumcision with the rite of Baptism fully bears this out ;

That the Covenant to which admission was given by Circumcision, and subsequently by Baptism, is neither merely legal nor national, but spiritual and world-wide ;

That Apostolic practice, and, by the showing of the Fathers, primitive custom, appear to have favoured Infant Baptism ;

That the doubts expressed as to its benefits are more sentimental than well-grounded ;

That there is no valid reason for rebaptism.

All these, and divers other points, are handled with a truth of touch which ought to be convincing. If not exhaustive, this little book is at least suggestive ; and many a district visitor, and for that matter, many a parson, too, who cannot give time for condensing "Wall on Infant Baptism," or the various treatises of St. Augustine and others which bear upon this point, may find these "smooth stones from the brook" very much to their hands.

For it is an honest attempt to deal in a small compass with a large question. The truth advanced is great, though it may not prevail. Our Baptist friends are not, in a general way, of the persuadable kind. They will, as a body, cling to that which makes them Baptists, with quite as much tenacity as some of them will hold to a demonstrably erroneous "down-grade" theology. But truth is truth for all that ; whether it makes for us or against us.

It were well for the Church of England, and all who symbolize with her on this question, if her members, and especially those who minister, would give more heed to the great cardinal truth of the Covenants of Grace, as set forth in such works as "Bishop Hopkins on the Two Covenants" and "Goode on the Better Covenant." They would then see more clearly, and appreciate more fully, the place and value of the great initiatory rite.

And it would be still better, and would tend much to the removal of objections, if more heed were given to the selection of fitting sponsors, the due preparation of parents, and the after-instruction of baptized children. Good old Philip Henry's practice, endorsed as it is, as to its value, by the experience of his son, should not be forgotten. "In dealing with his children about their Spiritual state, he took hold of them very much by the handle of their Infant Baptism, and frequently inculcated upon them, that they were born in God's House, and were betimes

dedicated and given up to Him, and therefore were obliged to be His servants."

We confidently recommend this little "pugio fidei" as being anything but "pugio plumbeus."

M. A.

Lectures on the History of Preaching. By the late Rev. JOHN KER, D.D. Pp. 401. 1888. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

There is a good deal of interesting matter in this volume, though when we put it down we confess to a feeling of considerable disappointment. Seeing that the writer goes back to preaching in the Old Testament, and enters fully into that of Christ and His Apostles, we expected from the title to find its history continued to the present time. It is not so. There is a tolerably full account of preaching up to the time of the Reformation, but after that date Dr. Ker deals exclusively with German preaching. There is no account whatever of either the English or the Scotch pulpit. Considerably more than half the book is occupied with German preaching since the Reformation. A whole lecture is given to Luther, and another to Spence, who has been called "The Reformer of the life of the German Church, as Luther was the Reformer of its doctrine." There is a very full account of Pietism, Illuminism, of the Transition period of Schleiermacher, and of the Mediating School of Nitzsch and Tholuck, etc. The accounts of the last named and of Schleiermacher are specially interesting, and very suggestive, but surely the title should have been "The History of Preaching before the Reformation, with an Account of German Preaching since." The explanation no doubt is, that the lectures have been edited since the writer's death, and he, had he lived, would have added many additional lectures. Generally speaking, the space devoted to any period is most unequally apportioned. The writer deals most fully with Chrysostom, his life, style and matter, and passes over other celebrated preachers very quickly. No modern preacher, outside Germany, is, as far as we can remember, even alluded to. England, Scotland, and France, and even America, have surely produced preachers worthy of mention in a volume of the kind indicated by the title.

We see but little else to criticize in the volume. We think the author has overlooked the meaning of the word "schism" when he writes (p. 82): "Those are chargeable with schism who exalt their outward unity into a denial of the Christianity of those who are not within it. And we may say that those also are guilty of *schism* who persist in remaining in a community when they have abandoned its principles"—guilty, but surely in the latter case of something different from schism. Speaking generally, the writer seems to us hardly to realize the value of the corporate unity of the Church. On the other hand, many of his thoughts are most true and suggestive; for instance, when he argues that you get a far truer view of the preachers from their sermons than from their controversies, as detailed in the pages of Gibbon (p. 6), and (p. 8) that the history of preaching may teach us to avoid paths that have led others astray—the paths, as he points out, of excessive allegorizing, extreme self-inspection, exclusive moral essay-preaching, etc.

His summary of the characteristics of Christ's preaching is admirable. There is great simplicity, and yet there is a never-fathomed depth. There is great variety, and yet there is one constant aim. There is great sympathy, and yet just faithfulness; the whole Lecture (No. 3) is admirable. There are many pithy sentences, such as "The East tended to ascend from the human to the Divine, the West to descend from the Divine to the human" (p. 56); speaking of men who in their day have

produced the most remarkable effect, "They had the individuality, the fire of electric power, which no writing can reproduce" (p. 76). Again, how true is the following: "If you ask the difference between a doctrine and a dogma, I should say it is this: a doctrine is a truth held for its practical value; a dogma is a truth held merely for its place in the creed. The dogma is *ut credam*, the doctrine is *ut vivam*!" And then he illustrates by the difference between the recitation of the Athanasian Creed and the personal acceptance of the precious promise contained in St. John xiv. 16. Again, "In times of decay and failing faith, the zeal of the missionary brings in new tides of life" (p. 86).

Dr. Ker values very highly Augustine's "De Doctrinâ Christiana," and gives copious extracts from it. He strongly urges that those who suggest to preachers to give their hearers the sermons of others would rob them of their power (p. 119). He repeats in two different lectures, with evident approval, a saying of Tholuck, "Every sermon should have heaven for its father and earth for its mother."

Our readers will see that though we criticize the title, and must regret that in more than half of a volume of 401 pages the writer should have dealt so exclusively with the preachers of one country only, and though some lectures, especially No. 5, are rather on Church history than on preaching, we yet can warmly recommend them and heartily thank Mr. Macewen for editing them.

Two short extracts shall conclude our notice:

Let me only hope that you will take a different way; that you will speak to men, feeling that they have souls, and knowing that you have a message from God to them: and that you will endeavour to declare simply, faithfully, and earnestly the word of eternal life. If religion is to be preserved, if we are to be delivered from reaction to a dead ceremonialism, and from stumbling forward into an empty paganism, it must be by living preachers, and the preaching of life. (P. 146.)

Let us then preach salvation by faith, and regeneration through the Holy Spirit; let us seek to search the depths of the soul with the Gospel of Christ; let us bring all God's truth to bear on the life of men, in plain practical speech, and we shall be workmen that need not to be ashamed. (P. 401.)

Let all who preach, preach in this spirit.

It is easy for preachers to grow careless about their sermons—to slip down the hill:

Sed revocare gradum superasque evadere ad auras
Hoc opus, hic labor est. (See p. 265.)

C. ALFRED JONES.

Life of the Right Hon. William Edward Forster. By T. WEMYSS REID.
2 vols. London: Chapman and Hall.

Anything like a full review of these deeply interesting volumes we are at present unable to give. We must content ourselves with a brief notice of the biography and a few extracts, taken mainly from that section of it which is headed "The Irish Secretaryship." At this juncture, of course, the documents relating to Mr. Forster's Irish administration, including confidential letters from Mr. Gladstone, have an absorbing interest.

In April, 1880, Mr. Gladstone returned to power, and Mr. Forster was appointed to the post of Chief Secretary for Ireland. With the demand of the Irish people for Home Rule, says Mr. Reid, "no member of the New Government showed any sympathy. It was the conviction of all that to grant any kind of local autonomy to Ireland would be ruinous to the interests of the United Kingdom as a whole. But there was a strong disposition to believe that the Home Rule Party would be prepared to co-operate with the Liberals upon most questions of Imperial

policy, and that by making to Irish demands such concessions as were "in themselves equitable and wise, the feeling of the people in favour of "Home Rule might be modified, if not altogether removed." The hopes of the Irish Secretary and his colleagues, as everybody knows, met with a bitter disappointment. Mr. Forster's career, begun on his own part with a feeling of warm sympathy with the Irish people, was destined to end in gloom.

In October, 1880, Mr. Forster writes to the Premier: "Parnell and Company have clever law-advisers of their own. It is not even easy to find technical proof of the connection of any one of them with the Land League, and the Land League has hardly any written rules, and publishes no list of officers. The speeches are, in fact, almost the only evidence, and these are framed as carefully to keep within the law as they are to tempt others to break it." He proposes proceeding against "Parnell and Co.," and in the course of his letter he says: "Parnell has incited to these outrages; but they may now be beyond his control." Mr. Gladstone's reply has this passage:

I do not see why legislation should mean, necessarily, only suspension of the *Habeas Corpus*. We are now, I believe, inquiring whether the law allows, under certain circumstances, of combinations to prevent the performance of certain duties, and the enjoyment of certain rights. If it does not, as I understand the matter, we prosecute. If it does, why may not the law be brought up to the proper point by an amending Act?

This language concerning combinations may be compared with Mr. Gladstone's recent declarations on the subject. Among the "Land League leaders," whom it had been resolved to prosecute, were Mr. Parnell, Mr. Dillon, Mr. Biggar, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Patrick Egan, Mr. T. Brennan, and Mr. P. J. Sheridan. The "charge against them was one of conspiracy to prevent the payment of rent, and to defeat legal processes for the enforcement of rent, to prevent the letting of farms from which tenants had been evicted, and to create ill-will between different classes of her Majesty's subjects." Again, it may be said, let this be compared with Mr. Gladstone's recent language.

In introducing the Protection Bill, at the beginning of the Session of 1881, Mr. Forster said: "The men who have planned and perpetrated the outrages to which I have referred are the men without whose help the speeches of the honourable members for the city of Cork, Tipperary, and Cavan would be merely harmless exhortations and vapouring. It is these men who have struck terror into the heart of the districts in which their operations have been carried on, and we must strike terror into them, in order that outrage may be stopped, person and property may be protected, and liberty may be secured. We must arrest these criminals. We cannot do it now, because they have made themselves safe by the enormity of their crimes and the power which those crimes have enabled them to acquire. They know that they would be perfectly foolish to fear the law when no man dares to appear and give evidence against them." There was "a real reign of terror." In March the Protection Bill became law.

Mr. Reid refers to the absurd charge, not infrequently in those days brought against the Chief Secretary, that he used his authority under the Protection Act to arrest leading men because they were his political opponents; and we gladly quote that never during Mr. Reid's intercourse with Mr. Forster did he hear one word of bitterness or animosity fall from his lips with regard to those who had shown something more active than mere political enmity in their dealings with him. He was invariably, in private conversation, generous and gentle in his allusions to his rivals and his foes. "It is strange," repeats Mr. Reid, "that I should

have to defend such a man from the charge of having violated the law— for if the charge had been true, such would have been his offence—in order that he might avenge himself upon his political opponents in Ireland.” Mr. Reid well adds that not the slightest evidence has ever been advanced in support of a statement which, repeated since Forster’s death, may be branded as a malicious and mendacious calumny.

The correspondence between the Chief Secretary and the Premier during the autumn of 1881 has a peculiar interest. “At Leeds,” writes Mr. Gladstone, “I shall do my best.” How he did his best, the biographer describes as follows :

Amid enthusiastic cheers from the vast audience the Prime Minister [after referring in general terms to Forster] went on in clear and forcible language to denounce the conduct of Mr. Parnell and of the other Land League leaders, in striving to stand between the people of Ireland and the Land Act, in order that the beneficial effects of that measure might not be allowed to reach those on whose behalf it had been passed. Such conduct, however, Mr. Gladstone declared, would not be tolerated. “The resources of civilization” were not exhausted, as Mr. Parnell would yet discover if he continued to maintain his attitude of uncompromising hostility to the law . . . Even Mr. Gladstone’s colleagues in the Cabinet did not know at the moment when he spoke that he and Mr. Forster had at that time practically decided on the arrest of the Land League leader.

The pages which relate the history of “The Kilmainham Compact” (the “new departure”) and Mr. Forster’s resignation contain tempting extracts ; but we can only say they appear to afford the fullest justification of the manly and straightforward course pursued by the Chief Secretary. Five days after Mr. Forster’s resignation, his successor, Lord Frederick Cavendish, was foully murdered in the Phoenix Park by a band of assassins. Nobody could wonder at the emotion which Forster displayed when he heard of the tragedy. But it was “just like” Forster to go next morning to Mr. Gladstone, and offer to return to Dublin that evening, temporarily to fill the vacancy caused by the loss of Mr. Burke. Remembering all the circumstances, the offer was one which Forster’s friends may well recall with pride.

It is not wonderful, writes his biographer, “that in the lurid light of the great crime of May 6th, men should have viewed the policy and actions of Mr. Forster very differently from the way in which they regarded them before that event.” Numberless Radicals had been inclined to scoff at his warnings ; and others, without going so far, were now for the first time enabled to realize the gravity of the task in which he had been engaged. As for the “new departure,” it came to an end when the cowards’ blows were struck in the Phoenix Park on the 6th of May. The Coercion Bill, introduced by Sir William Harcourt, was in many respects more severe and stringent in its character than anything which Forster had proposed.

When Carey, in February, 1883, turned Queen’s evidence, and revealed the whole ghastly truth with regard to the Phoenix Park murder, the measure of the risks which Mr. Forster had run became known. It was really “Buckshot Forster” who was the object of the vengeance of the Dublin “Invincibles ;” and marvellous was the story of his repeated escapes from their attempts upon his life.

The matters which during the present month have been brought before Parliament, in connection with an action against the *Times*, give to certain statements in this portion of the biography a peculiar importance. The manner in which Sheridan was to be employed as an agent of Mr. Parnell is one of the facts in the O’Shea negotiations which now stand out with special significance.

The chapters of this biography which describe the passing of Mr. Forster's Education Bill are full of interest. Other very readable sections are those which relate to the Colonies and to Gordon at Khartoum. But for many admirers of Forster, the supreme interest of the work lies in the touching narrative of his closing days; in the prayers of his pain and weakness, in his listening to hymns and the reading of the Psalms, and other portions of the Word of God.

Short Notices.

Sermon preached in Westminster Abbey at the opening of the Lambeth Conference, on July 2nd, 1888, by the Archbishop of CANTERBURY. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

ONE passage from this noble Sermon, rich in suggestions, may here be quoted. His Grace says:

Never more necessary than now to use the world as not abusing it. To abuse it gracefully is the temptation of the age, and to gild the abuse with philanthropy. The philanthropy of the Gospel without its Philotheism is popular. But its philanthropy will never live without its Philotheism, any more than the form of a Church will live without the spirit.

To say "Christianity is not a Theology" is in one sense true, because Christianity is a life. But it would be just as true to say Christianity is not a history, or Christianity is not a worship. But you cannot have the life without the worship, without the history, or without the theology. The spiritual life is the Life of God. As material life has its science of biology, so has spiritual life its science of theology. Without theology, Christian life will have no intellectual, no spiritual expression, as without worship it will have no emotional expression, without history no continuous development. Intellectual expression is necessary to the propagation and so to the permanence of the faith. To know it is the profession of the clergyman, and the most living interest of a cultured layman.

The Expositor. Vol. VII. Hodder and Stoughton.

This volume contains several admirable papers. We are particularly pleased with the one by Dr. Plummer, on the rendering of *τοῦτο ποιέτε*. From this welcome paper many of our readers will be glad to see an extract. We give it from the section which relates to Justin Martyr. The whole paper is good; and it will have special weight with many because Dr. Plummer is candid and impartial. Some readers, indeed, will think he might press a point or two rather more. We quote from the Justin Martyr section because we have always thought some Anglican divines, resisting notions now repeated in such organs as the *Church Quarterly* boldly enough, have been too timid in regard to Justin.

All the Greek Fathers, with the exception of Justin Martyr (it is said), treat the words as meaning "Perform this action." Dr. Plummer says:

"But does Justin Martyr really differ from the other Greek Fathers on this point? The fact that none of the others even notice the sacrificial rendering, at once creates a presumption that his words do not imply that he adopted it. Some of them had read Justin. If those who had read him had understood him to advocate so striking a rendering as 'Offer this sacrifice in remembrance of Me,' would not some of them have called attention to the fact? But let us look at Justin himself, and form our own conclusions as to his meaning:

“ἡ τῆς σεμδάλεως δὲ προσφορά, ἡ ὑπὲρ τῶν καθαιριζομένων ἀπὸ τῆς λέπρας προσφέρεσθαι παραδοθείσα, τύπος ἦν τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαριστίας, ὃν εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ πάθους, οὗ ἔπαθεν ὑπὲρ τῶν καθαιριζομένων τὰς ψυχὰς ἀπὸ πάσης πορνείας ἀνθρώπων, Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν παρέδωκε ποιεῖν” (‘Trypho,’ xli.).

“Mr. Sadler, in contending for the rendering ‘Offer this,’ translates Justin thus :

“The offering of the flour commanded to be offered (προσφέρεσθαι) for persons cleansed from leprosy was a type of the offering of the bread of the Eucharist which our Lord Jesus Christ gave command to offer (δο, ποιεῖν) for a memorial (ἀνάμνησιν) of the sufferings which He underwent for those whose souls are cleansed from all iniquity’ (‘Comm. on St. Luke,’ p. 561).

“It will be observed that the words ‘of the offering’ between ‘a type and ‘of the bread’ are an insertion made by the translator. Justin does not say ‘was a type of the offering of the bread,’ but ‘was a type of the bread.’ It would have been quite easy for him to have written *τύπος ἦν τῆς προσφορᾶς τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαριστίας*, but he has not done so ; possibly because the idea of ‘offering of the bread’ was not in his mind. Secondly, it is by no means certain that Justin uses *ποιεῖν* in the sense of ‘offer.’ The words *εἰς ἀνάμνησιν* are an intentional quotation of the words of institution, and they naturally draw after them the verb with which they are there joined, viz., *ποιεῖν*. The same may be said of the similar passage in chap. lxx. of the same Dialogue.¹ Thirdly, it does not at all follow that, if Justin himself used *ποιεῖν* in the sense of ‘offer,’ therefore he believed that St. Paul and St. Luke understood the word in this sense. The question before us is, not whether Justin considered the Eucharist to be a sacrifice, nor yet whether he uses *ποιεῖν* for ‘to offer,’ but whether his language is such as to show that he believed *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε* in the words of institution to mean ‘Offer this sacrifice.’ The first question must be answered in the affirmative, and very possibly the second also ; but the third must be answered in the negative. A sober and cautious inquirer will require something much more definite than these two passages to convince him that, in the interpretation of a crucial text such as this, Justin differs from all the other Greek Fathers, and that this difference is *never once alluded to by any of them.*”

The *Quarterly Review*, which we have just received from Mr. Murray, opens with a very interesting and informing article on Admiral Coligny. The writings of M. Delaborde, M. Bersier, Professor Baird (“Rise of the Huguenots,” reviewed in THE CHURCHMAN when published), and others, are noted ; and the article concludes thus : “The character of Coligny was essentially the product and the property of his creed. It is the immortal glory of French Protestantism that, in the days of Alva and Granvelle, of Catherine de Médicis, and the Valois and Philip II., she should have developed such a hero, ‘sans peur et sans reproche,’ as Gaspard de Coligny.” The *Quarterly* article on the Local Government Bill is excellent, and the same may be said of that on the House of Lords. “Scotland and Scotsmen in the Eighteenth Century,” “Reminiscences of the Coburg Family,” “Fifty Years Ago,” and “The Chinese in Australia” are very readable. The article on the “History and Reform of Convocation” contains a good deal of information, and we hope to recur to it. The key-note of the closing portion is, “The Church’s Synods having the power to *speak in the name of the Church.*” After reading these

¹ The number of idiomatic uses of the verb “to do” in English should put us on our guard as to dogmatizing respecting the meaning of such a phrase as “to do the bread” in Greek.

words, we noticed in an influential newspaper some comments on the *Quarterly* "instructive and opportune" article. The *Standard* (July 18th) says: "The Reviewer seems to think that if Convocation were now placed on a more popular basis, its functions might be greatly extended; and, of course, we come at last to the question of Ritualism and the authority of the Ecclesiastical Courts. It is an old adage, says the writer, "that with whom rests the interpretation of the law, with him rests the making of the law;" and he seems quite to sympathize with the feeling which prompts so many of the clergy to reject the authority of the present Ecclesiastical tribunal. The Bishops, he adds, are showing some reluctance to enforce obedience to it; and we do not require to be told what must be the end of such a state of anarchy as the situation is calculated to produce. How far the remedy suggested by the *Quarterly Review* would really prove effective is a question which can only be tested by experience. The only point of which we feel sure is this: that no Convocation would ever be accepted as the final arbiter in matters of ritual or doctrine in which the laity were not largely represented. It is doubtful if the present House of Laymen would be regarded as an adequate security for such subjects being properly considered. At all events, we can hardly believe that any mere addition to the number of Proctors chosen by the parochial clergy would be thought by the public at large to place Convocation on a sufficiently wide basis to justify its being entrusted with such powers as the *Quarterly Review* describes. That a purely Ecclesiastical Assembly should review the decisions of the Privy Council is a proposition very unlikely to recommend itself to the public opinion of the present day." Another *Quarterly* article treats of the "Game" of India. "The number of persons killed by snakes in India," we read, "is appalling. The returns for 1886 show that 22,134 human beings perished from snake-bite. On the other hand, the number of cattle killed by snakes is returned at 2,514. The serpent is therefore specially the mortal enemy of man in India, and death from the bite of a snake comes to be regarded as an ordinary incident in human life." The mortality from snake-bite in Bengal is much larger among women than among men. Women are "usually bitten in the early morning, when they go out unseen, before daylight, either to fetch wood from the fagot-stack or for some other domestic purpose. During the rainy season, when nearly all the rice-fields are under water, the snakes take refuge on the higher plots of ground on which the villages are built, and they hide themselves in the little wood-stacks and granaries in the courtyards of the houses; whilst not unfrequently they take up their abode in the house itself, where they are allowed to dwell with impunity, and sometimes fed with milk, until on some unlucky day the wife treads accidentally on the snake in the dark, and it turns upon her and bites her. From the bite of a full-grown cobra death ensues in a very few minutes; and the natives have no such remedies at hand as English science might use, but they put a vain faith in the fanciful charms and incantations recommended by their priests."

We heartily recommend Canon David Stewart's essay, read at the Ipswich Clerical Conference in June, and published by request: *The Relation between Christian Work and the Coming of the Lord* (Elliot Stock). In tone and treatment admirable.

The *C. M. S. Intelligencer* contains an excellent article, by the editor, on the recent Conference on Missions.—In *Blackwood* appears an interesting review of "Robert Elsmere," and an able paper on the conspiracies of the nobles under Mary Queen of Scots.—The *Leisure Hour* is a good

number.—In the *Art Journal* appear, as usual, some very interesting short papers, with illustrations. The etching is excellent. Altogether, this is an attractive number.

The *Church Sunday-school Magazine* contains the sermon preached at the Festival Service by the Bishop of Marlborough. We quote a passage: "Strive after the most accurate knowledge, strive intellectually to gauge the definite doctrines of Christ's Church, but never forget that you are, as Sunday-school teachers, as definitely spiritual persons as the Bishops and clergy of your Church. We are, of course, spiritual persons in a peculiar way in our ministerial offices, but you must never forget that a baptized Christian is a spiritual person. This is one of the things which I have tried to drive home for years upon my people. God gives spiritual gifts of two different orders—those which are to sweeten and adorn the personal life of the believer, and also those which are not to be used for the adornment of the personal soul, but for the body of Christ, which is His Church. You, by becoming Sunday-school teachers, have sought that spiritual gift which is to make you faithful teachers, able exponents of the doctrines of the Church of Christ. Before you prepare your lesson, and before you go to school, recollect that you must ask for this gift of the Holy Ghost, the gift of teaching, and pray that God may stir it up, that as spiritual men and women you may minister your spiritual gifts." The Bishop adds: "I long for the day when you will have a well-recognised place as teachers in our Church. I would give you direct representation at the diocesan conference. I would do all that I could to make you and the Church realize that you are spiritual persons doing a spiritual work, admitting you by a service of holy dedication, and giving you representation in our councils."

The General Missionary Conference, an interesting pamphlet, is a supplement to the *C. M. S. Intelligencer*, giving brief reports of the recent "General Conference." Here is a specimen extract, in which reference is made to Professor Drummond's charming book:

"Professor Drummond, who next came forward, and who has written the most fascinating of recent African books of travel, received quite an ovation. He said that he would add a traveller's testimony to the value and success of the work going on in Africa. This opening statement of his should be borne in mind in connection with a very solemn question which he asked later on. The kind of stuff of which missionaries are compounded, he thought, might be discerned from the fact that poor Bain, fever-stricken and broken down, had put his foot on board the steamer on Lake Nyassa to journey home for furlough, and to be present at that conference; but when he heard of a fresh Arab raid he took his luggage back, that he might stand by the poor terrified natives. Mr. Drummond told again the story, which is so graphically narrated in his book, of the missionary graves he saw on the banks of Lake Nyassa, and then it was he asked his question, 'Are the missionaries unanimous that it is right to go on in the face of what is plainly a barrier of God in these regions against men being there at all?' Many a night, he said, he lay looking at the stars and pondering over that question, and it had haunted him every day since his return. Till we had evangelized safer portions of the globe, was it well to fight that African fever, which no one ever escapes, or gets the better of, or is cured of? He most impressively insisted upon the need of abounding love, as well as faith, in an African missionary. The strain upon character and spiritual life was tremendous, and there must be a profound love for and sympathy with the native in order to sustain a missionary in his task. The natives, too, were critical, and they watched every act of the missionary's life."

THE MONTH.

THE Lambeth Conference has been in session. It is an impressive assembly, says the *Guardian*, "impressive in itself, and yet more impressive in its contrast with all that most men could have anticipated in bygone generations for the Anglican Communion."¹

In an able article on the programme of the Conference, the *Record* says :

But the great problem of all, which every year and almost every month is rising into more urgent prominence, concerns the relation of authoritative Christian teaching towards the latest discoveries in science and the new or revived ideas in physics and philosophy. Religion is being called to give an account of itself and to show its credentials in an age when nothing is taken for granted, and when the means of testing historical evidence are somewhat different in nature and much greater in amount than formerly. . . . It is here that the Protestant Reformed Churches have, as it seems to us, their greatest opportunity. If only they knew the day of their visitation, the future of religion is with them. They will be the instruments used by God to keep alive and to enlarge the knowledge of Himself in the world. They are free—hence the supreme folly of the recrudescence of Romanism—from the superstitions which the Mediæva Church adopted, and which only the dim twilight of knowledge could tolerate. The great Western Church of Rome is committed body and soul to principles and ideas which the facts of nature as now ascertained have made simply impossible.

On Saturday, the 30th, at Canterbury Cathedral, the Primate formally welcomed the Bishops.²

The Conference was opened on Tuesday. Of the 141 Bishops who have accepted the invitation of the Archbishop, 130 were present when Holy Communion was administered, at eleven o'clock in the Palace Chapel.

A large number of the Bishops were present at interesting gatherings at the Church Mission Society's House and the Bible House. At the Bible House the concluding speaker was his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, who said :

Lord Harrowby has welcomed the Bishops from all parts of the world and myself to my great honour and joy, to this house. I have been delighted with the bright and beautiful idea of asking us to meet here with the outspread Bible for our symbol. We have among us, by God's providence, one whom I should like to join with us in acknowledging the Society's courtesy, Mar Gregorius, a Bishop of the Syrian Church. If there is one thing to emphasize what has been said about the common unity and agreement of the Christian Churches in one thing at least, it is shown by the presence of Mar Gregorius. It is surely a thing which ought to stir us to have here a prelate who is heart and soul with us from the Patriarchate of Antioch, where the disciples were first called *Christians*, a prelate who in his daily prayers uses the language of Abraham, "the father of the faithful." We rejoice to think that there is a voice on earth answering to the voice of heaven, the one sound which has gone out into all lands, a sound which is going out day by day from this house and from other centres, a voice which is going out unceasingly into all lands. And it seems to me that to-day in the Bishops that come thence we have, as it were, the echo of that sound returning whence it went forth.

A deeper and more important spiritual truth it is that, whatever the differences o

¹ When Fuller had finished his great work he began his Letter to the Reader with these words : "An ingenious gentleman some months since in jest-earnest advised me "to make haste with my 'History of the Church of England,' for fear (said he) lest "the Church of England be ended before the history thereof." In the chaos and tyranny of 1655 the words might well have been said with simple earnestness, but a century later men might have had still better ground for thinking that the end could not be far off.—*Guardian*.

² The Bishops were entertained at lunch at St. Augustine's College. Divine Service began at three o'clock.

Christians, there is one point of agreement in their common reverence for the Word of God, in their love and study of the Scriptures. We can even go beyond that. It has been said most truly that there are heart-breaking divisions among Christians. There is one mitigation of the sorrow. That consolation is the common reverence and love for the Holy Scriptures felt by all Christians. There are two great things, this common point of agreement and this high consolation. And then, thirdly, in the far-distant hope of the future, there is one basis of union on which we must all come together again, the Word, which can never pass away.

Three hundred years ago a few learned schoolmen determined that they would plunge themselves deep into the study of God's Word, and, cost what it might, they would know what God's Word said. They did come to know what it said. And the meeting of those few schoolmen studying God's Word has proved the foundation of Evangelical teaching throughout the world. This teaching is spreading, and the conviction of its truth is deepening in every heart. Let us not only take comfort in the thought that there is something in which we can agree, but let us in our prayers and hopes look confidently to the fact that in the Holy Scripture and its teaching, when deeply and thoroughly understood, is the basis of our reunion in the future.—*The Record*.

At the annual meeting of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel some most interesting papers were read.

In reply to Lord Harrowby, questioning the Government as to Eastern Equatorial Africa, the Premier said that our agreement with Germany was the best possible for civilization and commerce.

The action brought by Mr. O'Donnell, at one time a prominent Parnellite, against the *Times* for alleged libel, contained in the famous articles on "Parnellism and Crime," which appeared in that journal last year, came to an abrupt termination: verdict for the defendants.

A remarkable letter from the Pope to the Irish Bishops has been published. Leo XIII. is apparently resolved that the official condemnation of boycotting and the Plan of Campaign shall not be evaded. He has doubtless been informed that there is a good deal of quiet opposition to, or disregard of, its injunctions, although public denunciations of the rescript are no longer heard. But the letter lately read in the Roman Catholic chapels shows that the Pope is bent on vindicating the authority of the Vatican. The Bishops are admonished in terms from which there should be no escape. They are to "take all necessary steps that no room be left for doubt as to the force of this decree. Let it be understood by all that the entire method of action whose employment we have forbidden is forbidden as altogether unlawful. Let your people seek to advance their lawful interests by lawful means."

The annual meeting of the Church Defence Institution was held at the National Society's House, the Earl of Harrowby in the chair. In opening the proceedings, Lord Harrowby said:

He had endeavoured to take as calm and impartial a view of disestablishment and disendowment as he could, but the more deeply he thought upon it the more appalling did the catastrophe which such a measure would produce appear to him. There was nothing whatever to make him believe that the Christianity, the morality, and the religion of the country would not suffer terribly from the change that would be brought about; and hence it was that he hailed with satisfaction both the work of this Society and the basis on which it took its stand. The great object was to rally the Church quite independently of political considerations, and in doing so it asked no questions save whether those who were associated with it were faithful to the Prayer-Book and Articles. It was the more necessary that all should unite in defence of the Church at this juncture, because that had happened which at one time they would have thought impossible—a section of the Liberal Party had inscribed on its banners, as one of the things it had in view, an attack upon the Church in Wales.—*Guardian*.