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

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

THAMES CHURCH MISSION.

INSTITUTED 1844.

"Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners."
1 TIM. i. 15.

"For though I preach the Gospel, I have nothing to glory of: for necessity is laid upon me: yea, woe is unto me, if I preach not the Gospel!"—1 COR. ix. 16.

THE Gospel MUST be preached to the perishing souls who, day by day, are working on our Great River, and the Committee of the Thames Church Mission find NECESSITY LAID ON THEM to ask those of the Lord's servants who possess their Master's gold and silver to assist as in their power this imperative command. The Mission has during the past year, from many causes, suffered financially. An urgent need is the reason for this appeal.

Subscriptions or Donations to be sent to the Secretary,
F. PENFOLD, R.N.,
31, NEW BRIDGE STREET, LONDON, E.C.

ELLIOT STOCK'S NEW BOOKS.

In demy 8vo., paper cover, price 1s. net.

THE LORD'S SUPPER: What it is, and what it is not. By WERNER H. K. SOAMES, M.A. Cantab., Vicar of St. George's, Greenwich.

In crown 8vo., cloth, gilt-lettered, 6s.

THE NOBLE EIGHTFOLD PATH. By the Rev. W. ST. CLAIR TISDALL, M.A. Being the James Long Lectures on Buddhism, 1900-1902.

"The book is admirable alike for its scholarship, its temper, and its assistance to the student in the way of references."—*Dundee Advertiser.*

In stiff paper cover, 1s.; cloth gilt, 2s.

THE SECRET OF THE CROSS; or, How did Christ Atone? By J. GARNIER, Author of "Sin and Redemption."

THIRD THOUSAND. In paper cover, price 3d.

"OBSTA PRINCIPIIS."

PRACTICAL HINTS TO DIVINITY STUDENTS. By the Rev. J. H. GIBBON, B.A.

"Useful and practical."—*Bishop of Exeter.*
"Contains much that is most excellent advice. . . . Have read with pleasure."—*Dean Maclure.*
"The straightest piece of much-needed advice to students and young parsons I have ever seen.—*Dean Howell.*

In crown 8vo., cloth, gilt-lettered, 5s.

HYMN-WRITERS OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY. With Selections and Biographical Notices. By G. A. LEASK, M.A.

"A book worthy of a place in every Christian home. Both the writers and the hymns have been chosen with excellent judgment, with the result that we have a unique and thoroughly representative collection of beautiful hymns."—*Family Churchman.*
"Both interesting and informing."—*Daily Chronicle.*

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

BOOKS FOR LENT.

THE DEATH OF CHRIST: Its Place and Interpretation in the New Testament. By JAMES DENNEY, D.D., Professor of New Testament Language, Literature, and Theology, United Free Church College, Glasgow. **Second Edition, completing Fifth Thousand** 6s.

"We may say at once that the volume is the work of a most powerful and accomplished theologian. Dr. Denney is a New Testament scholar of the first rank, and moves easily among the critical problems now present to the minds of scholars. His tone throughout is that of calm seriousness. . . . Dr. Denney's book will take rank with that of Dr. Dale, and ranks higher as a masterpiece of exegesis."—*British Weekly.*

THE SEVEN WORDS FROM THE CROSS. By the Rev. W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A., LL.D. **Third Edition.** Cloth, price 1s. 6d.

"Particularly suitable for perusal in Holy Week. There is a freshness about the manner in which old lessons, comfort, encouragement, and warning are drawn from our Blessed Lord's utterances which is very attractive."—*Record.*

THE LAMB OF GOD. Expositions in the Writings of St. John. By W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A., LL.D. **Third Edition.** 2s. 6d.

"Replete with the richest thought and finest feeling."—*Aberdeen Free Press.*

THE TRIAL AND DEATH OF JESUS CHRIST. A Devotional History of Our Lord's Passion. By the Rev. Prof. JAMES STALKER, M.A., D.D. **Fifth Edition, completing Eleventh Thousand.** Crown 8vo., cloth, 5s.

"We have here an exquisitely beautiful picture of the sufferings and death of our Blessed Lord. . . . It is just the sort of book which, however one may be familiar with the subject, throws fresh light upon it."—*Church Times.*

COMPANIONS OF THE SORROWFUL WAY. By the Rev. JOHN WATSON, D.D. **Seventh Thousand.** Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 2s. 6d.

"Sympathy is stamped upon every page of the book, for the author feels what he writes."—*Church Family Newspaper.*

THE PRINT OF THE NAILS. By the Rev. T. H. DARLOW, M.A. **Third Thousand.** Cloth, price 1s. 6d.

"A valuable work. . . . In wealth of thought and teaching it has the qualities of a great book."—*Christian.*

SPIRAL STAIRS; or, The Heavenward Course of the Church Seasons. Devotional Studies on the Christian Life. By the Rev. J. H. TOWNSEND, D.D. With an Introduction by the Right Rev. HANDLEY C. MOULE, D.D., Lord Bishop of Durham. Crown 8vo., cloth, 3s. 6d.

"They are essentially bright sermons, and set before the reader the great spiritual truths of which the Church seasons speak."—*Record.*

THE ANGLICAN PULPIT LIBRARY. Volume III, Sexagesima to Passiontide Small 4to, price 15s.

*** Vol. III. contains complete Sermons, Outlines on the Epistles, Outlines on the Gospels, Outlines on the Lessons, Outlines for the Day on various passages of Scripture, and Illustrations for Sexagesima, Quinquagesima, Ash Wednesday, the Sundays in Lent, the Sunday next before Easter, Good Friday, Sermons and Outlines for Passiontide and Holy Week, the Seven Words from the Cross. Set 1, containing Vols. I., II., III., price 24s. per set net. Set 2, containing Vols. IV., V., VI., price 24s. per set net.

Full Prospectus, with Specimen Pages and Order Form, sent on receipt of post card.

HODDER & STOUGHTON, 27, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

ELLIOT STOCK'S NEW PUBLICATIONS.

A Representative Volume of the late Archbishop's Writings.

SECOND EDITION.—In foolscap 8vo., tastefully printed and handsomely bound, price 5s.

HELPS TO GODLY LIVING: A Book of Devotional Thoughts.

From the Writings of the late Right Honourable and Most Reverend FREDERICK TEMPLE, D.D., LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY. Selected and arranged, with His Grace's permission, by J. H. BURN, B.D.

"We shall be surprised if this quiet little book does not do a solid amount of good on these lines. Churchmen will receive it with a cordial welcome."—*Guardian.*

"A distinct aid to devotional literature."—*Family Churchman.*

"A good and suitable aid to meditation."—*Church Family Newspaper.*

"A helpful addition to devotional literature."—*Aberdeen Journal.*

"A beautiful book. The best possible souvenir of Archbishop Temple."—*Expository Times.*

In crown 8vo., cloth, gilt lettered, 2s. 6d. net.

VITAL RELIGION; or, the Personal Knowledge of Christ.

By the Rev. G. H. S. WALPOLE, D.D., Principal of Bede College, Durham.

"We have no hesitation in saying that Dr. Walpole has given us a work of real spiritual value, and we heartily recommend it to all thoughtful readers."—*Guardian.*

"Well written and illustrated from many sides of familiar contemporary life."—*St. James's Gazette.*

"The perusal of this high-toned book has been to us a source of refined pleasure."—*Weekly Leader.*

"Will be found suggestive and useful."—*Life of Faith.*

"Contains many new and helpful thoughts."—*Mission Field.*

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON E.C.

KENSIT'S WICKLIFFE PREACHERS.

(Founded by the late John Kensit, 1898.)

Enterprising! Educational! Evangelistic!

The prayerful sympathy and practical support of all Protestants is asked for the great work of the Wickliffe Preachers. Since their formation they have traversed all parts of England, arousing the people and preaching the Word. The need of the work was never more demonstrated than at the present time, when the Protestantism of our Church and Constitution is being assailed, and our liberty of speech denied.

We are holding over 50 Meetings every week

with increasing success in our large cities, small towns, and country villages. We intend to still go forward in this great fight for Gospel Truth, in the face of all opposition, with the assurance, "God is our Refuge and Strength," knowing if "He be for us we need not fear those against us."

Another Band of Five Preachers will be sent forth on Easter Monday

from Lutterworth, where John Wickliffe first sent out his Preachers. This will make a total of four Bands, in addition to our many vigorous Branches throughout the country.

The Ladies' Union of Protestant Workers,

formed through the indefatigable exertions of Mrs. John Kensit, needs more Lady Helpers to make articles for the Wickliffe Preachers' Annual Sale of Work. Will you start a branch in your district?

The John Kensit Martyr Memorial Training Home

for the thorough equipment of the Wickliffe Preachers. Contributions are earnestly pleaded for towards this very practical memorial. Collecting Cards for this object will be sent on application.

A Popular Life of the late John Kensit

has just been issued, and is written by the Rev. J. C. Wilcox, B.A., Chaplain to the Crusade. This work should find a place in the Library of every Protestant. In cloth and fully illustrated, One Shilling. We need more subscribers to our general fund for work in Ritualistic Parishes, our dark Rural Districts, and among the Children. Who will take one of our Collecting Boxes or Cards to collect small items for the advancement of the work ?

The movements of the Preachers and the aggressive action of the Crusade is fully reported in

Our Two Illustrated Official Organs,

The Churchman's Magazine and *The Beacon Fire.* Price One Penny each monthly, or yearly subscription Three Shillings, post free.

These Magazines are up-to-date and interesting, and deserve the support of all friends.

Head Offices (J. A. KENSIT, Secretary):

18, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

NEW VOLUME OF THE "CHURCH'S OUTLOOK SERIES" NOW READY.

Crown 8vo., cloth, price 2s. 6d. net.

THE POSITION OF THE LAITY IN THE CHURCH.

By ALFRED BARRY, D.D., D.C.L.,

Canon of Windsor and Assistant Bishop in the Diocese of London ; formerly Bishop of Sydney and Primate of Australia.

The object of this work is to examine briefly the true position of the Laity in the Church of Christ, in regard both to rights and responsibilities. This examination renders it necessary to consider that position ideally, as a part of the Apostolic Constitution of the Church of the New Testament and of primitive times, and also to trace in slight outline the historical developments of that position in times past and present, especially in relation to our own branch of the Catholic Church. The task is undertaken under the strong conviction that, with a view both to Church Reform and to Church progress, it is urgently necessary for us to secure for our Church some organization of self-government in which clergy and laity shall be adequately represented and rightly co-ordinated under Episcopal direction.

The following list of contents of various chapters will best indicate the idea and the plan of the work.

CONTENTS.

"It was in the highest degree fitting that the series of handbooks on current ecclesiastical problems which is in course of publication under the title of *The Church's Outlook for the Twentieth Century* should include a volume on "The Position of the Laity in the Church," and to no one could the writing of it have been more suitably entrusted than to Bishop Barry."—*Record.*

"Canon Barry writes in a simple and popular way, and has done well, we think, in not overloading his pages with notes and references."—*Bookseller.*

"The book before us is a competent and able one."—*Aberdeen Free Press.*

"His book should be widely consulted. He is a very fair-minded writer, urbane in style, and always clear in exposition."—*Sussex Daily News.*

"Canon Barry gives a brief, learned, and clearly written account of the English doctrine as to 'The Position of the Laity in the Church.' "—*Scotsman.*

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

A SELECTED LIST OF PUBLICATIONS

Handsome bevelled cloth gilt. 3s. 6d.

WONDERLAND WONDERS. By the Rev. JOHN ISABELL, F.E.S., Author of "The Insect World," etc. Many first-class Illustrations by Louis Wain and others.

Cloth gilt, for Presentation, 3s. 6d.

"THE POET OF HOME LIFE." By ANDREW JAMES SYMINGTON, F.R.S.N.A. With Centenary Papers by the Very Rev. DEAN FARRAR, D.D.; the Rev. JOHN CALLIS, M.A.; Canon WILTON, M.A.; the Rev. CHARLES BULLOCK, B.D., and others. With Twenty-four Fine Art Illustrations.

Crown 8vo., printed on antique paper, red border, forming a Handsome Volume for Gift or the Library. Price 5s.

NEW CENTURY HYMNS for the Christian Year. By the Rev. F. W. ORDE WARD, B.A., Author of "Matin Bells," etc.

By the same Author. New Edition. Cloth gilt, with Seven Portraits, 5s.

THE CROWN OF THE ROAD. Leaves from Consecrated Lives.

"We wish it a wide work of such cheering, sanctifying influence on the crown of the road of Christian literature."—*The Churchman.*

By the same Author. Now Ready. Third Thousand. In rich cloth gilt, bevelled boards, gilt edges, with Illustrations, 1s. post free.

THE FORGOTTEN TRUTH; or, The Gospel of The Holy Ghost. With selected Hymns of the Spirit.

In large crown 8vo., bevelled cloth gilt. Price 3s. 6d.

"MATCHES THAT STRIKE." Edited by the Rev. CHARLES BULLOCK, B.D.

Seventy-fifth Thousand. In Fourteen Chapters. Richly bound in cloth gilt, 1s. 6d.; paper covers, 8d.

THE WAY HOME: The Gospel in the Parable. An Earthly Story with a Heavenly Meaning. By the Rev. CHARLES BULLOCK, B.D.

By the same Author. Cloth gilt, with Portrait, 2s.

"THE MAN OF SCIENCE THE MAN OF GOD." Leaves from the Life of Sir JAMES Y. SIMPSON. A valuable little work for all interested in Christian Missions.

Now Ready. With Portraits and Illustrations, 2s. By the Rev. CHARLES BULLOCK, B.D.

"NEAR THE THRONE." Frances Ridley Havergal: The Sweet Singer and the Royal Writer.

Handsomely bound. With Illustrations. 346 pages. 3s. 6d.

THE SHADOW LIFTED; or, The Home Magnet. By ANNIE LUCAS, Author of "Leonie."

"The special purpose of the tale—to promote home happiness and throw light upon the 'shadows' of home discipline—the 'clouds' which so often, as Cowper sang, 'break with blessing'—may fittingly be regarded as an expression and a memory of one whose life's ministry of loving service was a source of sunshine to many."

New Edition. 285th Thousand. Cloth, thick bevelled boards. 1s. 6d. By the Rev. CHARLES BULLOCK, B.D. Editor of "Home Words," "The Fireside," etc.

THE QUEEN'S RESOLVE, and Her Doubly Royal Reign. With England's Welcome to our King. Containing Leading incidents in the Life of Queen Victoria, and nearly 50 Portraits and Illustrations. His Majesty the King and the Prince and Princess of Wales have graciously accepted the volume "with much pleasure."

Cloth gilt. Illustrated. 1s. 6d. each.

THE STORY OF OUR CHURCH. By CHARLES BULLOCK, B.D. Three Volumes of this work are now ready.

I. Sunrise in Britain: How the Light Dawned.
II. The Eclipse of Truth: How the Light was Obscured.
III. Dark Days in England, and the Dawn of Reformation Light.

Bishop Ryle wrote: "I am heartily glad 'Sunrise in Britain' has been published."
Bishop Pakenham Walsh wrote: "A clear and reliable book like this is invaluable. I have read it with great interest."
"Every Englishman should read it, and every school should make it a standard book."—*Review.*

By the same Author. New Illustrated Edition Just Ready. Crown 8vo., cloth gilt, 1s. 6d.

"HOLD FAST BY YOUR SUNDAYS. By the Author of "Deepdale Vicarage," etc. This striking tale was originally published as a Half-Crown Volume, and at this price reached an issue of 22,000 copies. It is now fully illustrated.

New Edition Now Ready, with 32 extra pages and three additional Illustrations. Crown 8vo., cloth gilt, 1s. 6d.

"CROWNED TO SERVE." By the Rev. CHARLES BULLOCK, B.D. A Book for Young England. The King and Queen "have been much pleased" to accept copies. Companion volume to "The Queen's Resolve," which has reached a circulation of about 300,000 copies.

*** The Key-thought of the new Book is the Royalty of Service—ICH DIEN; perhaps *the* lesson most needed to make a Happy Home or a Happy Nation.

The National Protestant Church Union.

To Maintain the Principles of the Reformation as set forth in the Prayer Book and Articles of the Church of England.

President—W. D. CRUDDAS, Esq.
Chairman—The Rev. Prebendary WEBB-PEPLOE, M.A.
Treasurer—T. F. VICTOR BUXTON, Esq.
Secretary—Sir C. ROBERT LIGHTON, Bart.

The National Protestant Church Union witnesses for—

1. The supremacy and sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures as the Word of God.
2. The sole and sufficient efficacy of the sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ upon the Cross.
3. The justification of man by faith only in the Lord Jesus Christ.
4. The right of every believer to direct and unimpeded access to God, through Christ.
5. The freedom and sovereignty of the work of the Holy Spirit in sanctification.

WILL YOU HELP THIS IMPORTANT WORK?

For List of Publications, Terms of Membership, etc., apply to the Secretary, N.P.C.U.,
324, REGENT STREET, LONDON, W.

THE SURGICAL AID SOCIETY.

CHIEF OFFICES: SALISBURY SQUARE, FLEET STREET, E.C.
Patron—HIS MAJESTY THE KING.
PRESIDENT—**The Right Hon. the EARL OF ABERDEEN, G.C.M.G.**

This Society was established in 1862 to supply Leg Instruments, Spinal Supports, Trusses, Elastic Stockings, Artificial Limbs, etc., and every other description of mechanical support to the Poor, without limit as to locality or disease.

Water Beds and Invalid Carriages and Couches are Lent to the Afflicted.

It provides against imposition by requiring the certificate of a Surgeon in each case.
By special grants it insures that every deserving applicant shall receive prompt assistance.

Over 360 Patients are relieved every week.

Annual Subscription of ... ... £0 10 6 | Life Subscription of £5 5 0
Entitles to two recommendations per annum.

CONTRIBUTIONS ARE EARNESTLY SOLICITED.

Bankers—Messrs. BARCLAY & Co., Ltd., 54, Lombard Street. RICHARD C. TRESIDDER, Secretary.

ORPHAN WORKING SCHOOL.

FOUNDED 1758.

Patron—HIS MAJESTY THE KING.
Treasurer—SIR HORACE BROOKS MARSHALL, M.A., LL.D., J.P.
Bankers—LONDON JOINT STOCK BANK, Princes Street, E.C.

Senior School—MAITLAND PARK, HAVERSTOCK HILL, N.W.
Junior School—ALEXANDRA ORPHANAGE, HORNSEY RISE, N.
Convalescent Home—HAROLD ROAD, MARGATE, KENT.

Maintains and educates 500 Orphan and other necessitous Children, of both sexes, varying in age from infancy to fifteen years. 5,500 have been trained.

NOW IN URGENT NEED OF FUNDS.

Two Votes allowed at each half-yearly election for every Guinea subscribed. **Contributions** thankfully received, and all information given, by **ALEXANDER GRANT**, Secretary.
Offices—73, Cheapside, London, E.C.

ECCLESIASTICAL INSURANCE OFFICE, LTD.

11, NORFOLK STREET, STRAND, LONDON, W.C.

FIRE INSURANCE. BURGLARY INSURANCE. GLASS INSURANCE.

The Surplus Profits are devoted to Institutions, etc., which are for the benefit of the Clergy and of Church bjects.

For Information and Forms, apply at the Joint Offices of the Ecclesiastical Insurance Office, Ltd., and the Clergy Pensions Institution, 11, Norfolk Street, Strand, London, W.C.

JOHN DUNCAN, F.I.A., *Secretary.*

"This is a serious attempt made in good faith to help the Clergy to help themselves, and to husband the existing resources of the Church."—*Guardian.*

CLERGY PENSIONS INSTITUTION.

11, NORFOLK STREET, STRAND, LONDON, W.C.

The distinguishing characteristic of the scheme of the Institution may be concisely stated in the three words, "Self-help aided." Clergymen who wish to secure the benefits of the Institution for themselves or their families exercise self-help by making payments in purchase of Benefits; while Honorary Contributions are applied to augment the Benefits so purchased. The Institution comprises the following:

1. Clergy Pensions Fund; 2. Sickness Fund; 3. Widows and Orphans Fund; 4. Daughters Fund; 5. Other Benefits Fund; 6. Personal Accident Assurance (Clergy); 7. Accidents to Employees (Assurance of Liability of Clergy as Employers).

For Information and Forms, apply at the Joint Offices of the Ecclesiastical Insurance Office, Ltd., and the Clergy Pensions Institution, 11, Norfolk Street, Strand, London, W.C.

JOHN DUNCAN, F.I.A., *Secretary and Actuary.*

CHOLERA IN SOUTH PALESTINE.

GREAT DISTRESS among poor Jews at Jerusalem. FOOD AND FUEL ***URGENTLY NEEDED AT ONCE.*** Provisions and Fuel have greatly risen in price owing to strict quarantine and stoppage of traffic most strictly enforced.

THE SOCIETY FOR RELIEF OF PERSECUTED JEWS

(SYRIAN COLONIZATION FUND)

EARNESTLY APPEALS for FUNDS to alleviate this distress.

Contributions thankfully received by—

F. A. BEVAN, *Hon. Treasurer*, 54, LOMBARD STREET, E.C.
E. A. FINN, *Secretary*, 41, PARLIAMENT STREET, S.W.
Messrs. DRUMMOND, *Bankers*, 49, CHARING CROSS, S.W.

"LIBERATOR" RELIEF FUND.

Patron: H.R.H. PRINCE CHRISTIAN.

£10,000 required to Relieve New and Urgent Cases.

HUNDREDS of aged and afflicted victims, so cruelly robbed of their life-savings by the great Liberator Fraud, just as they were hoping to enjoy the fruit of their industry and thrift. Many of them are members of the Church of England. Cheques and P.O.'s should be sent to the Secretary, Rev. J. STOCKWELL WATTS, 16, Farringdon Street, E.C.

THE MISSIONS TO SEAMEN.

Patron: HIS MAJESTY THE KING.

Vice-Patrons:
H.R.H. THE PRINCE OF WALES, K.G.
THE FOUR ARCHBISHOPS, THE BISHOPS, etc.

Labours afloat and ashore, at home and abroad, among seamen of all classes and nations, fishermen, bargemen, and emigrants. Seventy-three harbours are occupied. Expenditure in 1901, £40,770.

Increased Contributions and Offertories, urgently needed, should be forwarded to the Secretary, Commander W. DAWSON, R.N., 11, Buckingham St., Strand London, W.C.

BOOKS PURCHASED

In response to many applications from persons in different parts of the country, MR. ELLIOT STOCK *has arranged to Purchase Libraries and Cases of Books from those who wish to dispose of them. On receipt of a list of the Books for Disposal, an estimate of their value will be forwarded, and the agreed amount will be paid in cash, or given in new books, as may be desired. All applications for the Sale of Books should be made to—*

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, Paternoster Row, London, E.C.

THE

CHURCHMAN

MARCH, 1903.

ART. I.—DEFINITE RELIGIOUS TEACHING FOR THE YOUNG: THE CHURCH CATECHISM AND THE FREE CHURCH CATECHISM COMPARED.

THE moral of the comparison which I am about to make in this article is that the views and language of both parties in the Education controversy, alike of the denominationalist Churchman and of the undenominationalist Dissenter, need revision.

In an advertisement issued by the Christian Knowledge Society, the "special aim" of a magazine which it publishes is said to be "to present, not a colourless Christianity, but the definite teaching of the Church of England." There is a controversial ring in these phrases, such as warms the heart of militant Churchmen. "Colourless" is a term of reproach, evidently aimed at undenominationalism; "definite teaching" is the pride of the denominationalist. My purpose is to note the instruction provided by our Church for children, and to compare it with what may be supposed to be the colourless Christianity which the Christian Knowledge Society is at this time anxious to repudiate.

The fight for Church schools has made us familiar with these epithets. Churchmen insist upon the definiteness of Church teaching as a treasure which they will never surrender, undenominationalism is denounced as a moral monster, "Cowper-Temple religion" has been spoken of with a certain disgust, and it has been declared that the Church conscience is hurt by the payment of a rate for the teaching of it.

The Church's teaching for children, such as is to prepare them for Confirmation, is authoritatively declared to be set forth in the Church Catechism. There we have our definite, coloured, denominational instruction. Can we find anything to represent similarly the moral monster, the colourless

Christianity, the indefinite undenominationalism from which the children of the working classes are at all costs to be protected? Yes, we have now a Free Church Catechism "for use in home and school." It is said to have been prepared to "meet the widespread, growing demand for a modern manual in the much-needed catechetical instruction of our children." This is one of the multitude of things in which the Free Churches have been during the last fifty years imitating the Church of England. So we are able to put side by side and compare together the Church Catechism and the Undenominational Catechism.

The word "undenominationalism" gives an advantage to the controversialists whose object it is to score off the Dissenters. They fasten at once upon the Unitarians. The Unitarians, they eagerly exclaim, are a denomination. Your principle, they say to the undenominationalists, binds you to teach nothing to which a Unitarian can object. But, as a matter of fact, Unitarians are left out of account by the main body of Cowper-Temple religionists. They are very few amongst the working people; and it would seem from the readiness of Unitarian parents of the upper class to send their children to our public schools that Unitarians are not very anxious about protecting their boys and girls from contact with Church worship and teaching. There is no serious obstacle to our leaving Unitarians out of account.

And the Free Church Catechism is able to claim for itself a remarkably representative character. It has been drawn up by a committee which includes the admitted best men for the purpose of the Congregationalists, the Wesleyan Methodists, the Baptists, the Primitive Methodists, the English Presbyterians, the Methodist New Connexion, the Bible Christians, the United Methodist Free Church. And the chairman, Mr. Hugh Price Hughes, who has been recently followed to the grave with so much admiration and respect, is able to say at the end of his preface: "In view of the distressing controversies of our forefathers, it is profoundly significant and gladdening to be able to add that every question and every answer in this Catechism has been finally adopted without a dissentient vote."

Let us look first at the Church Catechism. It has been common with Dissenting critics to charge our Catechism with being deplorably defective. It has nothing definite, they complain, about the Bible, about the Fall, about the Atonement, about the necessity of a change of heart, about the duty of attending public worship, about the prospects of the converted and the unconverted after death. On these heads, it is true, the Church Catechism lays down nothing. Nor

has it any definition of the Church or of the Trinity. What the Church Catechism does is this: It takes the child as a Christian. It says: "You have been baptized. You were baptized into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. That means that you are the heavenly Father's child, a member of Christ or the Son, a subject of the Holy Ghost. You have to be true to what God makes you; to be loyal to the Father, to Christ, and to the Holy Spirit." That is a summary of the Church Catechism as it was in its original form. The portion which treats of the Sacraments is an appendix added afterwards, and having no connection with what has gone before. It is hardly suited to young children, but it contains the instruction which our Church appoints to be given to those who are looking forward to Confirmation. This part contains the one definition which we find in the Catechism. A Sacrament is therein defined, and an admirable definition it is, but quite the most difficult answer in the Catechism for a young learner to understand. The original Catechism is singularly coherent; it takes for granted the Christian calling, and teaches what that means. It says to the child: "You have had the name of the Father, the Son, and of the Holy Ghost put upon you. You are to know and to act in accordance with what you have thus been made."

Our Nonconformist fellow-Christians have for some time been drawing away, each sect from its own peculiar standing-ground, and all towards the theology and the worship and the pastoral practice of the Church of England. But their old denominational habits cling to them. The denominations had their origin in attachment to certain doctrines or views. The particular views round which the association gathered were formulated, and religion became to the Dissenting bodies bound up with peculiar propositions or doctrines. Children were a rather troublesome anomaly to the sects in general; the denominational systems were for grown-up persons. To the Baptists especially childhood was an awkward problem, and it has proved too much for the strict Baptist creed. Having been all so largely Anglicized and Catholicized, the Dissenters have turned their attention to the catechetical instruction of Christian children, and they have succeeded in making a catechism which they can all agree to adopt.

Naturally, they have looked to the Church Catechism, and they have found there nothing with which they have any serious difficulty in agreeing. A formal exception, it is true, must be made with regard to infant baptism, which is assumed in the Church Catechism, and which the Baptist creed rejects. It is hardly reasonable that a child of Baptist parents should be taught to speak of having been baptized. But though the

Baptist tradition would no doubt still be followed by those who belong to the Baptist denomination, I feel pretty sure that Baptists in general are not very unwilling that children, including their own, should be treated as God's children, and members of Christ's body, and subjects of the kingdom of heaven. In the Free Church Catechism, to Question 19—"What is the mystery of the blessed Trinity?"—the children's answer is: "That the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, *into whose name we are baptized*, are one God." I do not press this as necessarily implying that the children who say it have already been baptized, but I think it is significant that Baptists like Dr. Clifford, Dr. Tymms, and Principal Gould should be heartily willing that their children, looking forward to a possible baptism, should be thus mixed up with children who are looking back upon their actual baptism, and that they should accept the Divine threefold Name as underlying the condition and the education of children. In the mouths of all other Free Church children "we are baptized" will naturally mean "we have been baptized."

Looking through the Free Church Catechism, we see that its framers have incorporated in it nearly the whole of the Church Catechism; but they have not adopted its simple method. Their denominationalism clings to them, and they are still bound by the spirit of definition; and the happy rudiments of Christian teaching for children which they have found in the Church Catechism are overlaid by them with patches of propositional theology. The Free Church Catechism begins ominously, "What is the Christian religion?" Young children do not need to be troubled with religions and their distinctions. How, I wonder, should we answer that question? The answer is: "It is the religion founded by our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." One almost expects this to be followed by, "Who was Jesus Christ?—The Founder of the Christian religion." It is more historical and Scriptural, I think, to regard the Apostles as the founders of the Christian religion, which might, perhaps, be defined as the faith and worship of which Jesus Christ is the proximate object. Then follows a definition of God, of which I will only say that I prefer to it Question 3 and its answer: "By what name has Jesus taught us to call God?—Our Father in heaven." Question 6 defines sin. "What is sin?—Sin is any thought or feeling, word or act, which either is contrary to God's holy law, or falls short of what it requires." Defining is a difficult art. Could we admit that every thought or feeling which falls short of what God's holy law requires is itself a sin? Our godliest feeling, I should fear, would be a sin against God, in being inadequate. The answer to Question 11, "How did the

Son of God save His people from their sins?" is rather a surprise, but a welcome surprise. It is a simple rehearsal of the middle articles of the Nicene Creed. The answer to Question 14, "What did our Lord accomplish for us by His death on the cross?" is obviously a very cautious one—"By offering Himself a sacrifice without blemish unto God, He fulfilled the requirements of Divine Holiness, atoned for all our sins, and broke the power of sin." "Fulfilled the requirements of Divine Holiness" is a sonorous phrase; whether it would mean anything to a child or not, I think no one could object to it. The Ten Commandments are made the occasion of a welcome tribute to the Revised Version by being given in the words of that Version; but the introduction, which is really a part of the First Commandment—"I am Jehovah thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage," and without which the command, "Thou shalt have none other Gods before Me," is incomplete—is omitted. The explanations of the Commandments seek to improve upon those given in the Church Catechism, but some things stated in them are open to exception. The Second Commandment is said to teach us "to worship God . . . not by the use of . . . devices of men, but in such ways as He has Himself appointed." Would it be easy to distinguish ways of worship which God has Himself appointed from ways which men have devised? When Free Church people stand up and sing one of Wesley's hymns to an organ accompaniment, are they worshipping God, not by the use of devices of men, but in a way which God has Himself appointed? The Third Commandment is explained as teaching us to regard and use with deep reverence the holy name of God. Apparently, it is the name "God" that is meant. But the name of the Jewish God was Jehovah. The word "God" was not a very sacred one to the Jews, nor was it to the first Christians. St. Paul writes: "Though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or on earth; as there are gods many, and lords many; to us there is one God, the Father, . . . and one Lord, Jesus Christ." In the Apostle's view, the name that had taken the place of Jehovah to those who believed in Jesus Christ was the Father. And this—to which we may add Jesus Christ and the Holy Ghost—is the name which Christians are to hallow. The name God has also, it is true, acquired a secondary sacredness, because we use it to designate the heavenly Father. To say that the Fourth Commandment teaches us to keep one day hallowed for rest *and worship* goes beyond the letter of the Commandment, which says nothing about worship, but only enjoins hallowing the seventh day by rest. The Sixth Commandment, it is said, teaches us "to hold human life sacred."

That is a doubtful doctrine. Human life is sacred, in that it ought to be dedicated to the Divine Will as its creature and instrument; but it has no sacredness in itself, so that it should not be taken or given without scruple. Modern civilization has bred a reverence for human life, as animal and mortal existence, that is excessive and unwarranted. Where, as in most cases, the explanations of the Commandments given in this Catechism challenge no other criticism, it may, perhaps, be doubted whether the phraseology of them is such as to bring home the meaning of what they expound with additional force to the minds of children. Take the last of them: the Tenth Commandment teaches us "not even in our heart to grudge our fellow-man his prosperity, or desire to deprive him of that which is his, but always to cultivate a thankful and contented spirit."

The answer to Question 29, "What special means has God provided to assist us in leading a life of obedience?" has, it will be perceived, a good Anglican sound. The answer is, "His Word, Prayer, the Sacraments, and the Fellowship of the Church." But all these have to be defined. God's word, it is cautiously laid down, "is written in the Holy Bible, which is the inspired record of God's revelation." That is in accordance with our sounder modern views about Holy Scripture. But the definition goes on to add that the record is "given to be our rule of faith and duty." There is no indication in the Bible itself that the literature illustrating the two Covenants was given to be a rule. Being such a record as it is, the Church may very reasonably determine that —in the words of our Article—"whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the faith." The right way of regarding the Bible is that it should be read as a multiform series of records of God's gradual revealing of Himself; the wrong way, that it should be turned into a rule of faith and duty, for which it was not intended and is not well fitted. The zeal for definiteness and definition goes to a great length when it asks, What is Prayer? Again, the final words of the answer seem questionable. In prayer, it is said, we ask for such things as the Father in heaven has promised. A child who should take this to mean that we ought not to pray for anything which God has not promised would be needlessly embarrassed. The Lord's Prayer is given and explained in the Catechism. There is a marked variation from the Church Catechism in the explanation of "Give us this day our daily bread." We pray, it is said, that God would "provide what is needful for the body." Why it should not be "needful both for our souls and bodies" I do not understand.

When we come to the fellowship of the Church, we have two answers, the terms of which might be accepted even by High Church Anglicans—"The Holy Catholic Church is that holy society of believers in Christ Jesus which He founded, of which He is the only Head, and in which He dwells by His Spirit; so that, though made up of many communions, organized in various modes, and scattered throughout the world, it is yet one in Him." "Our Lord united His people into this visible brotherhood for the worship of God and the ministry of the Word and the Sacraments; for mutual edification, the administration of discipline, and the advancement of His kingdom." The compilers have not emancipated themselves from the obligation of defining how a true branch of the Catholic Church is to be known; but as the essential mark—according to them—is "holy life and fellowship," it would be difficult to pronounce that any society, as having in no part, at no time, and in no degree had holy life and fellowship, is not a true branch of the Catholic Church. But a Free Church has also to be defined. It is "a church which acknowledges none but Jesus Christ as Head, and therefore exercises its right to interpret and administer His laws without restraint or control by the State." This definition has the appearance of presenting the State as a power distinct and separable from Jesus Christ, arguing, as it does, that for those who acknowledge Jesus Christ as their only Head it is impossible or wrong to be subject, so far as His laws are concerned, to the control of the State. But in fact, according to the principles of the Catechism itself, the State is subject to Christ, its laws should be laws of Christ, and its spirit the Spirit of Christ. "To Jesus Christ has been given all authority in heaven and on earth" (Answer 17). "We pray that the Gospel may spread and prevail until Jesus Christ governs every relation of human life" (Answer 32, ii.). "The duty of the Church to the State is to observe all the laws of the State unless contrary to the teaching of Christ . . . and to imbue the nation with the Spirit of Christ" (Answer 37). As well might it be said of a local corporation that it acknowledges the nation only as its head, and *therefore* exercises its right to interpret and administer its laws without restraint or control by the Local Government Board or the Courts of Law. The Church of England acknowledges Jesus Christ as the only Lord to which it owes absolute obedience, and so, indeed, does every individual Christian. But the allegiance of the Methodist to Christ does not make it impossible or wrong for him to be subject to the Legal Hundred; and we of the Church of England do not feel that we are disloyal to Christ, the Head of our English State, in accepting Bishops nominated by the

Crown or in our other submissions to the control of the State. We know of no reason, in the teaching of Scripture or in historical experience, for believing that the Divine authority is exercised more certainly through the Wesleyan Methodist Conference or a Presbyterian assembly or the Pope of Rome than through the British Crown and Parliament.

After defining the Catholic Church and Free Churches, the Catechism has the Christian ministry to define. And again the definition is one that will pass muster amongst Christians in general, including Anglicans—"A Christian minister is one who is called of God and the Church to be a teacher of the Word and a pastor of the flock of Christ." But the next question surely shows how little thought there has been of children in the framing of this Catechism—"How may the validity of such a ministry be proved?" The word "validity" is a prize word of controversy. It lends itself to interminable arguments, and may mean anything or nothing. According to this Catechism, a ministry is decisively proved to be valid by the conversion of sinners and the edification of the body of Christ. Yes; but is there any invalid or non-valid ministry? If an individual minister—say a missionary—after two years, or five years, or ten years of labour cannot appeal to the conversion of sinners and the edification of the body of Christ as having been manifestly wrought by him, is his ministry to be pronounced non-valid? Then, valid will not be a word of much practical meaning.

In its treatment of the Sacraments of the Church the Catechism follows the Church Catechism very closely, omitting the question and answer about infant baptism.

As might be expected, the Catechism concludes with the future state. But the compilers show the influence of that modern theology, which is, in fact, the revived theology of the Church of England, and their falling away from what their fathers would have insisted on as faithfulness, by looking only on the bright side. They describe what those who are saved through Christ may hope for, but they say not a word of what any who are not saved have to fear.

On the whole, I think it will be evident that those who have expressed with such wonderful unanimity the present views of the Free Churchmen of England have had in their minds grown-up persons, and the evangelical theologies, and the changes wrought of late years in those theologies, far more than the children for whom the Catechism is professedly written. Their Christianity is, in substance, what I have called the revived theology of the Church of England, but coloured by worn-out controversies and cumbered with ineffectual definitions.

A "colourless Christianity" sounds like something wrong, but I am not quite sure what character the word "colourless" represents. If the colour intended is of the kind which marks different countries on a map, and therefore denotes what is peculiar to a community or an age, then we might say that we find in the Church Catechism a colourless Christianity. The teaching contained in it is free from the raw colours of denominational and dogmatic Christianity with which the Free Church Catechism is lingeringly patched. It is, moreover, almost entirely without such definitions as those which the Free Church representatives have thought themselves bound to offer to the children of their communions. It does not define Christianity, God, Sin, the Atonement, the Trinity, the Bible, Prayer, the Church, the Ministry, the Future State. Its one definition is that of a Sacrament, which is not in the Catechism which the Office for Baptism had in view. The Church Catechism is so far undistinctive that it might be used—with the single exception that its implying of infant baptism would not suit the Baptists—by all the evangelical bodies, by the Roman and the Greek Churches, and even by some of the Unitarians.

But if the word "colourless" is taken as meaning anæmic, then the teaching of the Church is not that to which it ought to be applied. The calculated statements of propositional theology do not exactly beat with a living pulse or glow with a living colour. Our Church teaching assumes that God has revealed Himself in Jesus Christ, and has taken us from earliest infancy into fellowship with Himself—a fellowship which calls for ever-growing knowledge of God and His ways, and demands a life in accordance with it; a fellowship which covers all human relations and activities, and which is charged on God's side with helps and promises. It seeks to awaken our children into a consciousness of their connection with the living God. It is emphatically undenominational and undogmatic because it is catholic, personal, and vital, because it instructs in a Gospel rather than in a religion.

J. Llewelyn Davies.

Art. II.—OUR LORD'S VIRGIN BIRTH AND THE CRITICISM OF TO-DAY.—II.

IN the preceding paper attention was drawn to the proposal to omit vers. 34 and 35 from the first chapter of St. Luke without a shadow of documentary evidence, and thus to get rid of any statement of a supernatural birth. In the rest of the same chapter we are asked to see merely an account of the way in which the Evangelist places the birth of Jesus at Bethlehem, because it was necessary that He should belong to the house of David and be born in David's city. Thither Joseph goes, accompanied by Mary his wife, for both Schmiedel and Usener, of course, accept as "the indubitably earlier reading" the statement of the Sinaitic Syriac palimpsest, "he and Mary his wife being great with child, that there they might be enrolled" ("Encycl. Biblica," Art. "Mary," 2955). But both writers are entirely silent as to the possibility that even this reading might be quite compatible with a belief in our Lord's Virgin birth.

Mrs. Agnes Smith Lewis, to whom we owe the discovery of the palimpsest in 1892, has discussed this, and also the reading of the same codex in Matt. i. 15, 16, in the *Expository Times*, 1900, 1901. She fully allows that the word "wife" is more explicit than the expression used by the Greek MSS. or by the Peshitta, but she adds: "It shows clearly that Mary was under the full legal protection of Joseph." The force of this comment will be more fully seen when we turn to the same writer's remarks on Matt. i. 15, 16: "Unless our Lord had passed in common estimation for the son of Joseph, the latter could not have gratified his wish 'not to expose Mary,' v. 19." And so again: "Joseph was without doubt the foster-father of our Lord, and if any register of births was kept in the Temple or elsewhere, he would probably be there described as the actual father. Such he was from a social point of view, and it was, therefore, no wilful suppression of the truth when the most blessed amongst women said to her Son: "Thy father and I have sought Thee sorrowing." The illustrations which Mrs. Lewis adduces from Eastern social custom give additional value to her comments.

It is not surprising in this connection that Mrs. Lewis describes the genealogy of St. Matthew as a purely official one, and points out that only our Lord's social status is under consideration in it.[1]

[1] The reading in the Sinaitic palimpsest of Matt. i. 15, 16 is as follows: "Jacob begat Joseph; Joseph, to whom was betrothed Mary the Virgin,

It is, therefore, entirely beside the question to assert that the genealogies both of St. Matthew and of St. Luke are based upon the supposition that Joseph was the actual father of Jesus, as if no other explanation was within the bounds of possibility.

We may gain some satisfaction in turning from such a dogmatic assertion to the words of an authority whose claims to speak on Jewish questions will scarcely be disputed: "A case such as that of Jesus," writes Dr. Dalman, "was, of course, not anticipated by the law; but if no other human fatherhood was alleged, then the child must have been regarded as bestowed by God upon the house of Joseph, for a betrothed woman, according to Israelitish law, already occupied the same status as a wife." In the light of this statement there is no difficulty in accepting the now generally prevailing opinion that both genealogies belong to Joseph, and neither of them to Mary. The Jewish view undoubtedly was that right of succession does not depend upon descent on the mother's side, and the recognition by her husband of the child supernaturally born to Mary conferred upon that child the legal rights of a son.[1]

---

begat Jesus, who is called the Christ." One or two brief remarks may here be added. Even if it could be shown that the original genealogy ended with the words "Joseph begat Jesus" (as Schmiedel maintains), or if we hold that the Sinaitic Syriac in itself postulates such a clause, it would present no difficulty in view of the explanation given by Mrs. Lewis, with which we may compare Mr. Rackham's remarks in his exhaustive examination of the text before us in the Bishop of Worcester's "Dissertations," p. 272-302. Moreover, the greater part, at all events, of the reading in the Sinaitic Syriac codex is much more easily explained as secondary than as original. It is much more easy, *e.g.*, to suppose that the words "husband of Mary" would be altered into "to whom was betrothed" than the opposite, and a writer might desire to lay stress upon the virginity of Mary and the Virgin birth, and might alter and add to the text for this purpose. No words could be more emphatic as to the virginity of Mary, since the reading is not simply "a virgin," but "*the* Virgin," as the description of a person already well known; and in this case the scribe could allow the words "Joseph begat Jesus" to be retained without danger of any misunderstanding. These words described our Lord's relation to Joseph by the same phrase as that which described the relation of Joseph to his ancestors, a phrase implying, as is easily seen, not physical descent, but legal heirship; but still they might easily have been misunderstood if they were allowed to stand alone. Mr. Conybeare has recently maintained that the original form of Matt. i. 16 is to be found in the "Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila," but see in answer Mr. J. R. Wilkinson's acute criticism in the *Hibbert Journal*, January, 1903, pp. 354-359. Reference should also be made to the articles of Dr. Sanday, "Jesus Christ," and "Gospel of Matthew," Professor V. Bartlet in Dr. Hastings', B.D.; and W. H., "Select Readings," p. 140.

[1] Dalman, "Die Worte Jesu," p. 263; E.T., p. 319. B. Weiss still maintains the Davidic descent of Mary; and see, to the same effect,

But to proceed a little further. Schmiedel and Usener both admit that twice in the beginning of Luke's story Mary is spoken of as a virgin (*cf.* i. 27). How is it, then, they ask, that in Luke ii. 5 she is spoken of as Joseph's wife? This is the answer: "We are in a position to infer with certainty from Luke ii. 5 that in the original form of the narrative after i. 38 stood the further statement, hardly to be dispensed with (even though judged inadmissible by the redactor who interpolated i. 34, 35), that Mary was then taken to wife by Joseph, and that she conceived by him." Here we notice that another of the characteristic indubitable inferences is based upon the same reading of Luke ii. 5 to which attention has been drawn above, and upon a supposed interpolation which "ought to come between Luke i. 38 and i. 39" ("Encycl. Biblica," iii., Art. "Mary," 2960, and *cf.* Art. "Nativity," 3350). This is the method of reasoning which Schmiedel and Usener pursue in justification of their paradoxical conclusion that Luke, so far from telling us anything of a supernatural birth, presupposes the very opposite. Their reference to such a passage as Luke ii. 48 in support of their position is quite beside the mark, as the verse is easily intelligible on the view already mentioned.

But if we are thus to rule out any reference to the supernatural birth from St. Luke's narrative by conjectural interpolations or omissions, where are we to look for the origin of the story? To St. Matthew. The redactor in Luke i. 34, 35 is really effecting a compromise with the legend as set forth by St. Matthew; in St. Matthew's narrative we have something entirely new—viz., that Jesus was conceived and born of a virgin; in chap. i. 18-25 this theory is set forth from first to last with full deliberation ("Encycl. Biblica," iii., Arts. "Mary," 2960, "Nativity," 3350).

Now, hitherto we have been accustomed to regard the narrative in St. Matthew as Jewish Christian in its derivation, and to recognise that whilst St. Luke's account is written from the standpoint of Mary, St Matthew's is written no less plainly from the standpoint of Joseph. It is not only that St. Matthew gives us the more public account as con-

---

Edersheim's "Jesus the Messiah," i. 149; also F. Delitzsch, "Messianische Weissagungen," p. 69, second edition, 1899. Dr. Charles, it may be noted, has lately maintained ("Ascension of Isaiah," p. 75), that whilst the descent of Mary as well as of Joseph from David cannot be conclusively deduced from the New Testament, yet Mary's Davidic descent was a belief early established and accepted in the first half of the second century, and even earlier still. Dr. Dalman shows in a most interesting manner the trustworthiness of the Jewish tradition of the Davidic descent of Joseph.

trasted with the recital of the facts known only within the family, and gained, no doubt, from within the family circle or its intimate surroundings, but St. Matthew alone tells us that it was Joseph who proposed to put Mary away secretly; how an angel appeared unto Joseph in a dream; how Joseph arose from his sleep and obeyed the commands of the Lord; how, too, on two subsequent occasions an angel of the Lord again appears to Joseph in a dream, warning him to flee into Egypt with "the young child and his mother," and afterwards bidding him to return. But all this obvious setting of St. Matthew's narrative, and its dependence on information which presumably points to Joseph, as also the intensely Jewish background of St. Luke's early chapters, is to go for nothing—"Paul being unacquainted with the doctrine of the Virgin birth, scholars long reckoned it to be Jewish Christian. That, however, was a mistake" (Art. "Mary," *u.s.*, 2963). Nothing need be said for the moment as to this calm assumption of St. Paul's ignorance, but it is of interest to note at once that while in earlier days Keim was convinced that the belief in the Virgin birth had its rise on Jewish soil, the origin of this belief, according to Schmiedel and Usener, is to be sought in *Gentile* Christian circles. According to both of these writers, Isaiah vii. 14 could not possibly have given occasion for the shaping of the birth story, unless the doctrine of the Virgin birth had first commended itself on its own merits. The passage in the prophecy was only adduced as an after-thought in confirmation (Arts. "Mary," 2963; "Nativity," 3351).

With regard to these statements one or two remarks may here be made. In the first place, it is exceedingly convenient for Schmiedel and Usener thus to take their stand upon the derivation of our Lord's Virgin birth from *Gentile* sources. In this way they escape the insuperable difficulties which must always be encountered by those who would trace the belief in question to a Jewish origin. "Such a fable as the birth of the Messiah from a *virgin* could have arisen anywhere else easier than among the Jews," wrote the great historian Neander, himself a Jewish convert, and no subsequent criticism has deprived these words of their force. We may compare with them the remarks of B. Weiss in the latest edition of his "Leben Jesu," i. 210, in which he emphasizes the fact that, according to the view of Judaism, not the virgin condition, but that of marriage was regarded as a Divine institution, and the children of marriage as a blessing from God.

But further: they thus escape the necessity of the hazardous attempt to find in the language of Philo a source for the belief

in the Virgin birth of Jesus amongst Jewish Christians. The wives of the patriarchs, according to Philo, have intercourse with God; but the wives for the interpretation advocated by Philo are not women of flesh and blood, but in his allegorizing language virtues, which, conceiving from God—*i.e.*, united with the knowledge of God—bring forth all moral perfection for them who are lovers of virtue—viz., the patriarchs. But such thoughts as these were not a product of Jewish soil at all, and Professor Usener, in commenting on this same passage in Philo's "De Cherub." *13*, is careful to point out that the philosopher himself speaks of his doctrine as something quite new, and that we must look for its origin, not to the influence of Palestine, but to the Hellenistic atmosphere of Alexandria.

The same consideration—viz., the wide and impassable gulf which separates the definite statements of the Evangelists from the spiritualizing language of Philo—also discounts another attempt to trace the Virgin birth to Jewish sources. We are asked, *e.g.*, by Beyschlag, to take such expressions as Gal. iv. 29—"he that was born after the spirit"—used of Isaac, and to see in them a first step towards assuming the generation without a human father of Him who, more than Isaac, was the Child of the promise. But the expression thus used of Isaac is found in close juxtaposition with the assertion that both Isaac and Ishmael were equally sons of one father, Abraham—one by a bondmaid and one by a freewoman (*cf.* vers. 22 and 30)—so that both were, in one sense, born after the flesh. In the same manner, it is equally arbitrary to argue from the language used of John the Baptist (Luke i. 15) that it was but a short step for Jewish thought to advance from such statements to the promulgation of the theory of a Virgin birth.

But, without laying further stress upon these considerations, we may, from one point of view, derive no little satisfaction from the position taken up by Schmiedel and Usener. For it is quite evident, on the showing even of the most destructive critics, that we can no longer be referred to Isaiah vii. 14 as the origin of the "myth" of the Virgin birth. No Christian, of course, can be debarred from looking back upon the record of that birth, and finding in it a *fulfilment* of Isaiah's prophecy. But this Christian interpretation must always be kept distinct from the current Jewish interpretation of the prophet's words. In this connection the verdict of Dalman will carry weight: "No trace," he writes, "is to be found among the Jews of any Messianic application of Isaiah's words concerning the Virgin's Son from which, by any possibility—as some have maintained—the whole account of the miracu-

lous birth of Jesus could have derived its origin" ("Die Worte Jesu," 226; E.T., 276).

But our satisfaction ceases when we further read concerning the Virgin birth, as recorded by St. Matthew, that "here we unquestionably enter the circle of pagan ideas" ("Nativity," 3350). Let us suppose, then, that the story does come to us from *Gentile* Christian sources. If this is so, we must at the same time remember that the only ground which St. Matthew —or, at all events, the Gospel which bears his name—adduces for introducing the story is the fulfilment of a *Jewish* prophecy—a prophecy which is applied in such a manner as to be totally at variance with the application hitherto given to it by the Jews themselves. In making this application, the writer runs counter, not only to Jewish feeling in the days of Jesus, but long after His time. Thus, in Justin Martyr's "Dialogue with Trypho the Jew," the Jew says: "We all expect the Christ to be a man of men." Nothing is said or intimated of a supernatural birth. Moreover, in Luke's narrative, which is much more full than that of St. Matthew, and comes to us admittedly from Jewish Christian sources, it will be remembered that no reference whatever is made to Isaiah's words. How are we to account for the amazing boldness of the writer, or editor of St. Matthew's Gospel, in thus introducing a prophecy of uncertain meaning in Jewish circles into the midst of a story with an unmistakably Jewish background, to support an element unmistakably un-Jewish—viz., the Virgin birth—unless upon the supposition that he felt sure of his ground, and that Isaiah's prophecy had received the fulfilment which he claimed for it?

But the prophecy, we are told, is merely an after-thought, and would not have been introduced unless the doctrine of the birth from a Virgin had already received confirmation. Before, however, we admit the validity of this confirmation, we may be pardoned for venturing to ask a previous question. "Here we enter the circle of pagan ideas": the whole sentence assumes that an entrance has been effected before even the possibility of an open door has been seriously considered. Is it a likely supposition that the Christian Church or its representatives would make an incursion into the circle of pagan ideas to derive therefrom the story of the birth of their Holy Redeemer from sin? No doubt it may be urged that the mythological conception of sons of the gods and of heroes might seem to afford an analogy which would tend to enhance the greatness of the origin of Jesus in Gentile circles, but Dr. Weiss expresses the verdict of the Christian consciousness of to-day, no less than of that of the early Church, when he repeats with no hesitation his earlier words: "The shame-

less glorifying of sensual desire in these myths could only provoke in the primitive Christian consciousness the deepest abhorrence; every endeavour to refer any such idea to Jesus must have appeared a profanation of what was most holy, by thus dragging it through the mire of sensuality" ("Leben Jesu," i. 211, 4th edit.). Fortunately, we can pass beyond even the most probable conjectures, and lay our hands upon statements in more than one early document which give us positive proof of this deep abhorrence. The earliest Christian "Apology" which we possess—that of the philosopher Aristides (126-140 A.D.)—plainly accepts the Virgin birth, and places it amongst the primary and established facts of the Christian creed. It may, no doubt, be urged that careful attention should be given to the different versions and the Greek text of the "Apology," but it would seem that, making all allowances for this consideration, we are justified in regarding the words "being born of a pure virgin, He (the Lord Jesus Christ) assumed flesh," as the actual words of Aristides himself; and it is evident from the context that this fact is placed upon a level with the facts of the Crucifixion, the Resurrection, and Ascension. It must, therefore, have been a fact which had been previously both known and established, as otherwise it would scarcely have found a place in a writing which took the nature of an "Apologia."

But the point with which we are more immediately concerned is that this same "Apology" which thus asserts most unequivocally the Virgin birth also emphasizes, and describes at length, the horror and disgust which inspired the Christians as they recalled the heathen legends of the doings of gods and goddesses. This is abundantly evident whether we have recourse to the Syriac or to the Greek. Thus, in the Syriac, chap. ix., we read, "By reason of these tales, O king, much evil has arisen among men, who to this day are imitators of their gods, and practise adultery and defile themselves . . . for if he who is said to be the chief and king of their gods does these things, how much more shall his worshippers imitate him?" and with these remarks we may compare similar utterances in chap. xi. of the Greek. A few years later we pass to the writings of Justin Martyr, and we note not only his frequent references to the Virgin birth, but also that, like Aristides, he regards that fact as occupying the same position in the Christian summary of belief as the other great facts relating to our Lord, and that, like Aristides, he speaks in a manner which shows the condemnation pronounced upon the coarseness of Greek mythology by representatives of the Early Church. An American writer who has lately examined at great length the testimony of the ante-Nicene writers to

the Virgin birth, emphasizes Justin's repudiation of the Greek mythological explanation of this doctrine; and "whether," he adds, "the Christian conception be right or not, Justin has, in so far as he represents the early second-century thought, freed it from the grossness of similar heathen stories, and has preserved in his own more explicit language much of the chaste quality of the Gospel narratives themselves."[1] Certainly it may be urged that there are other passages in Justin in which he refers to Greek mythological stories as furnishing a kind of parallel to the Christian acceptance of the Virgin birth, or in which he maintains that these pagan stories had been invented by the demons to imitate the truth or to detract from its significance. Schmiedel has strongly insisted upon these passages and ideas (Art. "Mary," 2964), but he has no comment whatever to make upon those other passages in which Justin differentiates the Christian belief from the gross fables of the Greeks. Moreover, it must be remembered that in all their references to pagan myths the Christian apologists started with a belief in the Virgin birth as an acknowledged fact, so that such references cannot account for the origin of that belief, although they may have been used to support deductions from it.

It is, of course, still asserted that similar stories of a miraculous birth have gathered round the name of a Plato or an Augustus. With regard to the former, there is no evidence that any such story of the birth of Plato was known in the days of Speusippus, Plato's nephew;[2] and even if Plato's mother is regarded in any of the accounts as a virgin, yet the authorities are so conflicting that it would be most precarious to build upon their statements. Diogenes Laertius, in his account of the life of Plato, mingles together history and legend, truth and fiction, in a wholesale manner, and the origin of the birth story in this case is most probably to be sought for in the eagerness with which in the Grecian world similar stories gathered around great and illustrious names.

The supposed parallel in the case of Augustus has again

---

[1] "The Virgin Birth," *American Journal of Theology*, July, 1902. The same writer points out the important fact that if Justin was in possession of some extra-canonical material, as, *e.g.*, in his mention of the birth of Jesus in a cave near Bethlehem, yet that he was evidently very little influenced by any such source of information, and that it supplanted or coloured in a very small degree his reflection of the canonical infancy stories.

[2] Whereas there is reasonable ground for believing that the information of the Evangelists came to them from the members and friends of our Lord's family circle.

been recently emphasized in a pamphlet ("Die Geburtsgeschichte Jesu Christi") published last year by Professor Soltau, whose name has been frequently referred to of late in connection with our Gospels and their contents. According to him, it is possible that the message of salvation in Luke ii. 14 was first derived from the words of some inscriptions in honour of Augustus, and that then the further step was easily made to transfer the belief in the supernatural birth of the Emperor to the case of Jesus. It really seems as if no absurdities are too great to be pressed into the service of the deniers of the facts relating to our Lord's birth. In the inscriptions to which Soltau refers it is quite true that reference is made to the Emperor as a saviour, that the day of his birth is described as a day of glad tidings for the world, that peace is spoken of as a prevailing blessing, and that the Emperor's benevolence and benefactions are duly celebrated. But it is not too much to say that every one of the words so much emphasized by Soltau may be paralleled from the Old Testament and the Apocryphal books. The word "Saviour," for example, finds a place, and a very frequent place, in passages which may be cited from these two sources; the expression "to bring glad tidings" is found again and again in the Old Testament, and sometimes in close connection with the thought of the salvation of God; and, to say nothing of the fact that if we adopt, in Luke ii. 14, the R.V. rendering, Soltau's parallel is apparently destroyed, the thought of goodwill towards men, expressed by the same Greek word as in the angels' hymn, finds a place in the Old Testament, as, for example, in Ps. cvi. 4 (*cf.* Ps. v. 12; l. 18). But Soltau apparently has nothing to say to the Jewish phraseology in the first clause of the same angelic hymn: "Glory to God in the highest." If anyone desires to see an account of the fantastic dreams and portents which were associated with the birth of Augustus, he could not do better than consult the extracts given at so much length in the closing pages of Soltau's pamphlet. In addition to all this, it must never be forgotten that no parallel of any weight can really be instituted between the Gospel narrative and the story in question, because in the latter case no birth *of a virgin* is in question.

(*To be continued.*)

R. J. KNOWLING.

ART. III.—"THE STRENGTH OF THE PEOPLE."[1]

"There is a connection between a high state of character and a high state of economic comfort; but an important mistake is often made in the order of causation. It is often conceived that comfort is the cause and character is the effect. Now, I hold that character is the cause and that comfort is the effect."

UPON these words of Dr. Chalmers this book may be said to be a commentary. By a most careful investigation into the present conditions of the so-called "very poor" and into the causes which have contributed to these conditions, the writer seeks to prove—and we believe she is entirely successful in proving—that Dr. Chalmers' assertion is amply borne out by facts. The book is one to be read and studied by all who have at heart the improvement and well-being of the poorer part of the community. Especially will it be found useful by those whose official position places upon them the responsibility of doing all they can to solve the many painful social problems which at the present time are calling for solution.

For this reason the book seems to have a special claim upon the attention of the clergy, because Mrs. Bosanquet, like Dr. Chalmers, believes that the *causes* of our present economic difficulties and troubles are not primarily economic, but *moral;* and that the true method to be pursued in the solution of these difficulties lies not in attempting, in the first place, to improve the economic conditions, but the *characters* of the sufferers. This method of procedure is, of course, directly opposed to the methods fashionable at present—methods which, I fear, are growing in popularity. "Feed the people first, and then teach them"; "improve their circumstances, and you will find their characters will rise in proportion with better surroundings"; "it is the awful atmosphere, moral and physical, in which the very poor are compelled to live which prevents them from doing better." Such are some of these principles which are commonly being put forth to-day. But readers of this book will, I believe, come to see that they are false. They will learn that the present painful economic conditions are the symptoms of a deep-seated social, or, rather, moral, disease, and it is this disease, or, more correctly, the *cause* of this disease, which must be attacked. Remove this cause, and the symptoms will gradually disappear.

To keep the body politic in health, a certain regimen, or course of self-treatment, is necessary. The laws of this

[1] "The Strength of the People: A Study in Social Economics." By Helen Bosanquet. London, 1902.

regimen are the laws of social and economic science. The discovery of these laws has been the task of many thoughtful men and women in the past, and it continues to be so in the present. There are those who think that the truth of many of these laws is now so far proved by the experiences of the past that it is at our peril we neglect them, or attempt to act in opposition to them.

In the course of her argument Mrs. Bosanquet cites: (1) The old Poor Law; (2) the Report of the Commission of 1834; and (3) the immensely improved conditions which ensued when the recommendations of that Commission were adopted.

Space will not permit me to enter into details. It must suffice to say that the appalling conditions previous to 1834 seem almost incredible to us. And let us remember that it was not simply the poverty of the poor or the cost of their maintenance to the community, it was the immorality actually generated by the old Poor Law that was so terrible. The following extract from the report of the Commissioners contains part of the evidence of a Mr. Cowell, who went from union to union to make investigations:

"At the time of my journey, the acquaintance I had with the practical operation of the Poor Laws led me to suppose that the pressure of the sum annually raised upon the rate-payers and its progressive increase constituted the main inconvenience of the Poor Law system. The experience of a very few weeks served to convince me that this evil, however great, sinks into insignificance when compared with the dreadful effects which the system produces on the morals and happiness of the lower orders. It is as difficult to convey to the mind of the reader a true and faithful impression of the intensity and malignancy of the evil from this point of view, as it is by any description, however vivid, to give an adequate idea of the horrors of a shipwreck or a pestilence."

As Mrs. Bosanquet shows, under the old Poor Law false principles and wrong methods of administration had brought the country almost to a state of ruin.

Then came the change under the new Poor Law, whose beneficial effects—that is where, and so long as the recommendations of the Commissioners were carefully and strictly carried out—seemed to grow year by year. "It may be doubted whether it has ever before happened that a nation so far on the way to decay has checked its downward course and recovered itself so completely. That we in England did recover ourselves, and started straightforward on a path of steady progress, was mainly due to the wisdom and determination of a few men, who devoted their whole energies to understanding the position, and then persistently carried

through their policy of reform in face of popular prejudice and misunderstanding" (p. 155).

Let me revert to the condition which I stated just now—viz., "Where and so long as the recommendations of the Commissioners were carefully and strictly carried out." But as everyone who has had any experience of its working knows, the new Poor Law is just one of those laws whose good or evil depends almost entirely on the way in which it is administered. It leaves wide latitude to those who administer it. How beneficial it may be the following case, cited by Mrs. Bosanquet, shows: "In January, 1871, there were in Bradfield Union 259 indoor paupers and 999 outdoor—total. 1,258, or 1 in 13 of the population. The Guardians that year determined to begin to administer the Poor Law strictly, and that policy has now been carried on for thirty years. At the end of those thirty years the number of outdoor paupers has fallen from 999 to 18 (all survivors of the original list); the indoor paupers have fallen from 259 to 107; now only 1 person in 145 is a pauper." How, then, do the people get on without parish relief? "The membership of medical clubs has increased 148 per cent., and of friendly societies 150 per cent. Children and relations have accepted the natural responsibility of helping the old and weakly, and where those resources have proved inadequate, private charity has come to the rescue." But the claims upon private charity are far less now than thirty years ago.

The lessons which Mrs. Bosanquet gathers from the change from the old to the new Poor Law, and from the failure—we fear the growing failure—to administer this latter strictly, are these:

1. "The English people is strong, but only when it is not tempted into weakness. It easily succumbs to the suggestion of dependence, but it nobly responds when called upon to assert its manhood.

2. "If the lesson" (taught by the old Poor Law) "had been thoroughly carried into effect, pauperism should by this time have disappeared."

Nations, like individuals, are only too apt to forget the lessons of the past, and the interest in social and economic questions is apt to be strangely intermittent. A nation, like an individual, may by a careful course of treatment recover from a severe attack of some social disease; but, as time passes, the conditions by which health has been regained, and by obedience to which it can alone be maintained, are all too easily forgotten.

Unfortunately, during the last few years we seem either to have forgotten, or practically to have denied, the principles

and conclusions which worked such changes for good in 1834 and succeeding years. Lately, whatever be its cause, there has undoubtedly been almost all over the country a rapid increase of pauperism—an increase which cannot fail to cause anxiety to all who have at heart the welfare of the poor. This increase is no doubt greatest and most palpable in London. How great it is there, witness the last annual report[1] of "the Legal Poor of London"; but it is by no means confined to London. As a single instance take Lancashire, where in 1851 the inmates of workhouses numbered 1 in every 195 of the population; these rose in 1891 to 1 in every 175, and in 1901 to 1 in every 147.

Various explanations of this recent increase of pauperism have been offered, the cessation of the war and the consequent return of a large number of reservists being a very favourite one. But on careful examination this explanation will not hold good. In fact, there is only one cause which does seem adequate to account for the increase, and it is this: that very many Guardians have either forgotten, or are ignorant of, those principles which produced such good results nearly sixty years ago. It will be found that the increase of pauperism is greatest in those unions where these principles are disregarded. Where out-relief is easily obtained, and where the condition of life within the workhouse is raised above the lowest standard of life outside, there pauperism, with all its attendant evils, is increasing.

Now, the value of Mrs. Bosanquet's book lies in this: that in it we have our attention drawn not merely to these facts and processes—the book does not simply say, "Where the conditions upon which relief is obtainable have been relaxed, and where the workhouse has been made more attractive, pauperism has increased"—but it shows why in the nature of things—or, rather, why, *human nature being as it is*—this result must *inevitably* follow.

It is Mrs. Bosanquet's method of approaching the problem which seems to give the book its special value, and that method consists in commencing with a most careful inquiry into the nature of human nature itself. Only where we have formed a correct impression of human nature can we hope to understand the temptations to which it is liable, and the right means to employ in order to overcome those temptations. In a more true and more scientific knowledge of human nature we shall find the key which will open to us the secret of how best to attack the social disease of poverty.

---

[1] *Times* of December 26, 1902.

The teaching and the method of its application is, of course, that indicated in the New Testament, where we are constantly shown that evil is the result of a false philosophy of human nature—of a false conception of man—and that the banishment of evil will follow upon (1) our obtaining, and (2) our acting up to, a true philosophy—that is, a true view of man's nature and of his possibilities.

Mrs. Bosanquet's first postulate is "The Mind is the Man," but she uses the word "mind" in a somewhat comprehensive sense, meaning by it "the higher powers of affection, thought, and reasonable action," and she believes that where our appeals to men or our dealings with men have failed, the cause of the failure has usually been because we have either forgotten that our fellow-man "is a mind, or because we have been ignorant of all which is involved in admitting this." As a rule it is the visible, tangible man alone which appeals to our sympathies. "We aim only at seeing him well fed, well housed, well clad, and we take it for granted that the shortest way to this is to put food in his hands, clothes on his back, and a roof over his head." In other words, we appeal to the *lower* rather than the *higher* faculties of human nature. Here Mrs. Bosanquet believes is the reason why: "Great religious teachers, who have put their faith in spiritual conviction and conversion, who have refused to accept anything short of the whole man, have achieved results which seem miraculous to those who are willing to compromise for a share in the souls they undertake to guide" (p. 3). Hence, she is led to the following conviction: "The first belief of a social reformer must always be that an appeal to the minds of men can never fail; his first and last study must be how to make that appeal."

Of course, this postulate, that "the Mind is the Man," demands others—*e.g.*, that the mind has principles of development, growth, and action—*i.e.*, that it is not a mere caprice. Granting, then, that there are principles of development, we must seek to discover these principles.

The aim of social work is social progress—that is, the whole community and every member of the same must be progressive on the rising scale. Now, when we come to consider this desideratum, and then carefully consider things as they actually are—viz., whole masses of men and women stagnant, uninterested, and brutalized, or, if not actually stagnant, yet their progress so slow as to be practically imperceptible—we ask, "Why do not these masses respond to the higher appeals which are so constantly being made to them?" They seem to be actually content to live an almost purely animal, if not a brutal, life.

This question leads to an extremely interesting discussion upon the reasons why, in some natures, we find what may be termed the characteristically *human* qualities, faculties, and interests—that is, in contrast to the merely animal faculties—much more fully developed. This contrast might be more briefly described as one between the progressive and unprogressive elements in human nature.

Mrs. Bosanquet turns for help to studies of animal and human psychology. Into these I must not enter, but her conclusion from them is that "animals have a definitely limited range of wants, and, consequently, of limitations . . . whereas the desires of the highest—that is, the true human nature—not the material wants, are as wide as the universe; they are practically infinite." The trend of this discussion, the truth to which it leads, may now be discerned; in short, we arrive at the paradox that we shall best assist in *supplying* the wants of human nature by studying how to *increase* them. It would hardly be going too far if we were to state that this is one of the chief pleas of Mrs. Bosanquet's whole book. Reflection will show that its truth is proved by both history and experience. And is it not directly in accordance with the teaching of Christ? Is not this the meaning of His words to the woman of Samaria about the unquenching power of the material water, and of His saying to the men who "eat of the loaves and were filled," and who still found no permanent satisfaction of their hunger?

Yet to-day, by increasing the ease with which out-door relief is obtained, by making the workhouses more attractive, by a thousand forms of material charities, gifts, and doles, what are we doing but sinning against this great principle, and putting various forms of temptation in the way of the poor, which all tend to weaken that self-effort and self-reliance upon which ultimately their welfare must depend? We are acting as if we were in entire ignorance of the teachings of History, Nature, and the Bible, which agree in condemning our action. There is a striking fact which Mrs. Bosanquet might have quoted in support of her argument. Is it not true that no strong and progressive nation has ever risen within the tropics—*i.e.*, in those regions where man's wants are few, and where those few wants are provided by Nature with the minimum of human ingenuity and exertion? On the contrary, the inhabitants of cold and barren and mountainous districts, where a sustenance has to be won by hard and continuous effort, have been renowned for their strength, their thrift, and progressiveness. Out of how many hardy Northern nations have not the rich plains of Italy seemed to suck the manhood?

Let us now consider who are the men and women who form what may be termed the *crux* of our social problem. As Mrs. Bosanquet says, "They are the men and women, rich or poor, who have never fairly broken through the most elementary cycle of the appetites which we share with the brute creation, or, if they have been forced into some small advance, have only widened their tether slightly, and are circling round again instead of progressing."

Here I would pause for a moment. Mrs. Bosanquet says these are the people, "rich or poor," etc. What philanthropist in the widest sense of the term, what minister of religion who knows his people, has not felt that the best which could be said of some of the richer, or even richest, among them was that they were "circling round" some extremely narrow, material interest—*e.g.*, sport, or outward show, or pleasure—and were certainly not "progressing"? May it not be said of many of those who have grown rapidly rich—is it not even more true of the sons and daughters of these?—that with their increase of wealth they have obtained no wider range of higher interests? They do not progress, but, alas! they too often, under the influence of the wealth they have inherited, rapidly deteriorate, and so bear out the truth of a North Country saying—that often not more than three generations separate those who have discarded the clogs and those who are compelled again to wear them.

To return to Mrs. Bosanquet's argument. The question we must seek to answer, and which she believes is the real social problem to be solved, is this: What are the causes which widen the lives of some, and which are absent or inoperative in the lives of others? That increase of wealth is not the cause, and that it is not poverty which confines a man's life to the lower levels and precludes all advance, seems to be proved abundantly from everyday experience. To quote Mrs. Bosanquet's own words: "The existence of people rich in material wealth, yet lacking the higher qualities, proves to us every day the insufficiency of material wealth alone to promote progress; while the speed with which wealth may be dissipated, when neither interests, affections, nor knowledge are there to maintain it, and the frequency of lives in which richness of character has been triumphant over material poverty, forbid us to admit for a moment that poverty is a sufficient cause to explain all the facts before us" (p. 10).

Mrs. Bosanquet sees that the real question at issue is the following: "How does a man's life widen beyond the lower range which he shares with the animals?" This question raises another—viz.: How are we to define the contents of this wider life? Mrs. Bosanquet defines these contents as

"interests," the word implying "affection, knowledge, and ideals." How, then, "does a man get his interests"?

Following this question come two sections, which are entitled: (1) "The Tyranny of Instincts," and (2) "Interests." These sections should be most carefully studied, for they may be said to contain the facts upon which Mrs. Bosanquet's philosophy of life, and, consequently, her treatment of the social problem, is based. In the first section it is shown, from observation of the behaviour of animals, how early and how strongly their instincts are developed. As far as we can judge, they are able almost at once to do all that is necessary to preserve their lives—*e.g.*, waterfowl can dive and swim the first time they touch the water. Mrs. Bosanquet's conclusions under this first section are summed up in the three following sentences:

1. "The more completely the life is under the sway of definite instinct, the less room there is for the development of intelligent behaviour. . . . Under normal conditions, man is obliged to think about what he is doing, to have an idea in his mind before he carries it out into action; while in instinctive behaviour the action comes first, and the idea, if it comes at all, only later."

2. "Doing for ourselves what their instincts do for animals means, among other things, this: that every step of what we do (before the formation of habit) must be present in our minds, not only after we do it, as a sort of reflection, but before we do it, as a guide to our action. And this means a gradual but vast accumulation of ideas." [And are not "ideas" and "interests" very closely related?]

3. "To deprive any individual human being of the necessity—the stern necessity, if need be—of planning out his life for himself is to deprive him of his natural power of "progressive development."

Mrs. Bosanquet's treatment of "Interests" we must defer until next month.

M. Edward Chadwick.

ART. IV.—ST. LUKE'S GOSPEL AND MODERN CRITICISM—II.

I AM now going to examine a quantity of other fresh detail which St. Luke has contributed to the Gospel story. My conviction is that his source is often shown to be oral. That he had opportunity of consulting first witnesses in Judæa in A.D. 58-60, and at Rome before Peter's death in A.D. 64, is quite probable. But the troubled state of Palestine, and the dispersal and deaths of first witnesses, rendered such historical research impracticable between the years A.D. 70-80, even if Luke himself still survived. For those who admit some connection with first witnesses, but think with Dr. Ramsay that Luke, having long ago accumulated his facts, yet delayed till A.D. 80 publishing them in a Gospel, I shall also point out that hopeless difficulties arise if we suppose Luke to have written at a time when Matthew's and Mark's Gospels were in general circulation.

To clear the way, let us see what dates the critics who postdate Luke's Gospel assign to the other two Synoptics. In the case of Matthew they find a *terminus ad quem* in his great judgment discourse (Matt. xxiv.). It is not my purpose to discuss the passage; but it appears that the critics agree that the writer could not have witnessed the fall of Jerusalem, because Matt. xxiv. 29, 31 apparently makes the fearful signs of the final consummation occur "immediately" after that event. Therefore this Gospel is not made later than A.D. 70.[1] Mark's Gospel is for various reasons set somewhat earlier, *circa* A.D. 69-70 (few admirers of German criticism following Weizsäcker's absurd inference from Mark iv. 29 that he wrote after the fall of Jerusalem). I am convinced that these dates for Matthew and Mark are some seven years too late, and that both Gospels fall within the period A.D. 60-65, but let us assume their accuracy for present purposes.

I proceed to the question, Who and what were the sources of the third Gospel? Let the book tell its own story. St. Luke, after a preface in which he claims both to have learnt from those who "from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word," and to have "traced all things in order from the first," introduces us forthwith to a number of Jewish persons otherwise quite unknown—Zacharias, Elizabeth, Simeon, Anna, the Shepherds of Bethlehem. He records their sayings and doings in two chapters marked by Hebrew idioms, and contrasting strikingly with the purer Greek of his own preface. Hymns are given which are obviously translations of Hebrew

[1] See Hastings' Dictionary, *s.v.* "Gospel": "Matthew."

originals. A genealogy follows in iii. 23-38 which must have come from written Palestinian sources. But more than this, in relation to the two births which are his subject, he gives details which only the Blessed Virgin could have communicated, and which we gather had not been freely published in writing. He relates not only the Divine Generation of Jesus, and such details of the most private character in regard to Elizabeth and Mary as we have in i. 34, 41, 44, but the growth of Jesus in wisdom and stature, and with the comment, "Mary kept all these things in her heart," the one authentic story of His boyhood. The obvious inference here is that he had access not only to Aramaic documents, but, as Dr. Ramsay sees, to the oral information of Mary herself.[1] There is no reason why such privileges should not have been attainable by Luke during those full two years in Palestine, A.D. 58-60. How either of them could have been attained after the effacement of Jerusalem and the dispersal of the Apostles, including John (who had provided a home for St. Mary as long as she lived), it is hard to imagine. There is no good tradition on the subject of the later life of Mary. What early legends there are certainly point to a general belief that she did not survive the destruction of Jerusalem.

But if we now pass *per saltum* from these opening chapters to the close of Luke's story it seems to me we are compelled to carry our inference yet further. Luke gives us such peculiar details in regard to the Cross and Passion as the Saviour's speech to the weeping daughters of Jerusalem, the story of the penitent malefactor, the words "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." Few besides St. Mary and St. John could have given testimony at all for these details of the Crucifixion story; and remembering that Luke in i. 2 professes to have information both from those who had been "eye-witnesses" and those who were "ministers of the word," we are at once reminded that if he ever met St. Mary he could hardly have failed to meet St. John too. Now, there is absolutely no reason why both should not have been accessible to Luke in A.D. 58-60. And it is an undeniable

[1] Dr. Ramsay ("Was Christ born at Bethlehem?") well says: "This account must have been either a part of a complete life of Christ . . . or an independent narrative, ranking with the authority of origin from Mary, and describing just so much as she was best able to tell. The existence of such an independent narrative, and the utter oblivion into which it fell, if it ever existed, seem alike most improbable" (p. 82). "It therefore seems unlikely that the first two chapters of Luke depend on an older written narrative. The quality in them is too simple and natural, they give too much of the nature of Mary expressed with the art of Luke, to have passed through the mind of an intermediate writer" (p. 85).

fact that often where Luke is independent of the "common source" he introduces John's name, or confirms some statement of the fourth Gospel. I will not press as instances Luke's knowledge of our Lord's repeated appeals to Jerusalem (xiii. 34; perhaps, too, iv. 4), or of the Resurrection appearance to the assembled Christians in xxiv. 36-43 (*cf.* John xx. 19-23). These may well have been matters generally known. But when we find Luke records the "running" of Peter to the Saviour's tomb, and his "stooping and looking in" and seeing the "linen cloths by themselves" (xxiv. 12; *cf.* also 24), we are at once reminded of a story told in similar phraseology, but in fuller detail, by St. John. When we find Luke recording, as John does, the petty detail that it was the "right" ear of the High-Priest's servant that was cut off on the occasion of Christ's apprehension, there is another indication of Luke's source. And when we find this Gospel alone relating a story to the disparagement of St. John—how the sons of Zebedee petitioned for the destruction by fire of the churlish Samaritan villagers, and sustained a rebuke—the evidence goes further still. Other instances could be given, but the crowning proof (if Luke xxii. 43, 44[1] be an integral part of the Gospel) is Luke's peculiar description of our Lord's night of agony before His Crucifixion. It is in some respects a defective story when compared with that of Matt.-Mk.[2] On the other hand, it contributes two new incidents—the appearance of the angel, and the sweat of blood. Now, only two persons could have been primary recorders of that scene after the beheadal of St. James. It can scarcely be doubted that the version of Matt.-Mk., with its special allusions to Peter, came primarily from that Apostle's lips. Nor can one suppose that Peter, whatever his contributions to this Gospel, supplied Luke with this very variant form of the story of the "Agony." There remain only two alternatives—either that Luke has embellished a most solemn scene with worthless romance, or that his authority was, primarily at least, St. John who, more wakeful than Peter, could attest the incidents Luke here supplies. I do not believe that even in A.D. 80 such embellishments were readily tolerated. That John gave his authority to a now lost document containing his version of

[1] This passage is omitted in several early MSS., but its absence is accounted for in the age of Arianism. Doubtless the explanation is that controversialists, more orthodox than scrupulous, expunged it as likely to weaken belief in our Lord's perfect Divinity and superiority to angels. Certainly no Arian or Nestorian would gain much by inventing such incidents.

[2] I use this abbreviation where the two first Gospels tell practically the same story.

the story seems most improbable. Therefore I claim the passage as a proof that Luke had here the oral testimony of the first witness, John. But, again, how are we to bring the Evangelist in contact with that Apostle, save on the assumption that he met him in those years, A.D. 58-60. It is easy, of course, to extend Luke's life and Luke's travels indefinitely, and imagine he visited Asia Minor, and encountered St. John in A.D. 70-80. But as a fact there is at least as much reason to believe that Luke himself did not survive the martyrdom of Paul in A.D. 68.[1] And no one unprejudiced with those theories about "post-dated prophecy," which I have already mentioned in my first paper, would doubt which is the more reasonable hypothesis for bringing Luke in contact with the evidence of St. John.

But Luke's claim to have learnt from first witnesses may have had yet fuller authorization. Besides the reasonable assumption that other Apostles were still at Jerusalem in A.D. 58-60, there is fair evidence, as Dr. Chase shows, that Peter was at Rome from the winter of A.D. 61 to his martyrdom in A.D. 64.[2] If so, the Christians at Rome were necessarily in constant intercourse, and it would be strange indeed if a man, designing to write a Gospel, did not avail himself of the presence at Rome of another eye-witness and minister. It may well be that Luke had not so much opportunity of learning from Peter as had Mark, for Peter's contributions to the second Gospel are, I think, undeniable, though, of course, not sufficient to justify us in calling that Gospel "Petrine Memoirs"[3] with Mr. A. Wright. But I think, in that "suspected" account of the Miraculous Draught of Fishes and a few other passages, possible indebtedness may be conjectured on Luke's part too to Peter.

Here, first, is another episode to which only Peter and John could give testimony. In the Transfiguration story Luke

[1] Appendix, Note A. [2] Hastings' Dictionary, *s.v.* "Peter."

[3] Papias, Clement, and Irenæus are mutually contradictory as to the character of Peter's connection with the second Gospel. But the most significant passages are those (Eusebius, "Hist. Eccles.," ii. 15, vi. 14) which indicate that Mark had already written before Peter was apprised of his design. It is most unlikely that this account of the matter should be a later conjecture. On the other hand a loose connection with Peter would naturally be exaggerated. Peter's ignorance of Greek and need of Mark as a Greek "interpreter" is so constantly assumed nowadays that I may remind the reader that we have an "undisputed" Epistle of Peter in almost classical Greek, not in the least suggestive of the second Gospel. Yet at the time of writing Mark was with Peter. Did Peter in his old age learn to write better Greek than his own dragoman? Papias mentions his own ἑρμηνείαι. And ἑρμηνευτής in Papias and Irenæus may after all mean no more than "interpres" in Jerome's "habebat ergo [Paulus] Titum interpretem."

strikingly qualifies the ideas we should have had we only the record of Matt.-Mk. I cannot pretend to say which Apostle is here Luke's informant, but his narrative here ought, in any case, to be a serious crux to the critics who make him write his Gospel in A.D. 80. Two Gospels had, on their assumption, given an identical account of a sublime vision vouchsafed to three favoured Apostles. Is it likely that, when Peter was a revered martyr and John the most venerated living Apostle, a man with no credentials but an ancient association with St. Paul, and the possession of some now lost document, should venture to introduce into the story the modifications we find in this third Gospel? For Luke gives us details which, if not discreditable to the Apostles, are certainly very far from enhancing the dignity of the scene, as presented in Matt.-Mk. He tells us that Jesus had ascended the mountain "to pray," and that the Apostles, on this occasion of high privilege, had simply fallen asleep. The whole scene is, in fact, elucidated for us by this presumedly late Gospel, for we usually gather from it that the Transfiguration took place at night. It suggests possibly the inference that Peter spoke, not as a man entranced with the glories he witnessed, but simply as one half awake, and therefore "not knowing what he said," when he proposed to make three tabernacles for Moses, Elias, and the Lord. Sceptics would obviously be tempted to go further still and say that the whole transaction was but a dream. Surely this is a strange sort of embellishment for the Gentile Christian to introduce into the "Petrine Memoirs." Indeed, I wonder that our "higher" critics do not make bold to "suspect" it as a replica of that other occasion of privilege just mentioned, when the Apostles were bidden to "watch and pray," and were found, as Luke tells us, "sleeping for sorrow."

The possibility of associating Luke with Peter is more distinctly suggested in that remarkable passage (xxii. 31-33), where the Apostle is specially warned that "Satan should sift him as wheat," told that his Master had "prayed for him," and urged "when he has turned again to strengthen his brethren." This passage seems to mark again the dividing-line between the two schools of criticism. If the words are authentic, the rational account of them is that Luke received them from an Apostle, and possibly from Peter himself. If they are merely a free embellishment of the familiar prediction of Peter's threefold denial (which prediction Luke also gives), then the Evangelist will, by most plain persons, be held disqualified to write a Gospel at all. It is interesting to note that it is only Luke who names Peter and John as the two disciples who were sent into Jerusalem to prepare the Paschal meal.

Probably, however, Luke's authority here is not Peter, but, as in the story of the Passion, John. On the other hand, in xii. 41, we may perhaps conjecture that Peter is the source of information. The case here is this: Matthew gives in a later context the charge to "watch as against a thief," and continues without break with the Parable of the Faithful and Unfaithful Stewards. Luke, besides giving the discourse a different occasion, interpolates between these two parables a somewhat obscure question on Peter's part, "Lord, speakest Thou this parable to us or to all?" Bearing in mind how frequently Matthew has ranged our Lord's discourses by subject, not occasion, we may perhaps claim that Luke's setting is the right one. But certainly that obscure question could not in any case have been invented by St. Luke. Where did he learn of it? How was he able to interpolate it so curiously between two sayings which Matthew is assumed to have recorded ten years earlier in a different context? The obvious answer is that Matthew and Luke are quite independent works, and that Luke records these matters with some help supplied by a first hearer, and perhaps by Peter himself.

I shall hereafter show how this minute interpolation of detail is observable all through Luke's Gospel. The impression it conveys is not that of an author who merely transcribes various documents now lost, but of one who has consulted living witnesses, and, as Luke states, tried to trace the course of all things accurately.

There appears, then, to be good reason for associating Luke's story with St. Mary and St. John, and some reason for thinking he had also the testimony of St. Peter. If we assume him to have also the written accounts of our Lord's Galilæan ministry, which are termed the "common Synoptic source," and which he may well have procured in Palestine in 58-60, we shall probably not find much more occasion to multiply "documents" in the case of a writer who has living testimony. St. Luke, is thus found in A.D. 62 completely equipped for the story he has given us. He has also a quantity of other precious material gathered in his travels with St. Paul, which is to be worked into the story of the Acts. What possible inducement could a man have in those dangerous days for delaying the publication of matter of such value in the form of a book, of which transcripts might be easily made? Horace, it is true, has given the advice in the matter of publication *nonumque prematur in annum.* But that was in the case of juvenile poetical effusions, not records of speeches, and accounts of historical events of supreme importance. Dr. Ramsay's assumption, however, is that Luke now makes a halt of not nine, but twice nine years, and that,

too with a third[1] volume in his mind—one on the doings of Peter and Paul till their deaths at Rome.

In view of this assumption, let us recall that admission of the critics that the Gospels of Matthew and Mark had been written as early as A.D. 70. It is certain that within half the time between the dates A.D. 70 and A.D. 80 both Gospels must have been widely circulated. The Churches were in constant intercommunication. It is inconceivable that a man proposing, in A.D. 80, to publish a complete life of Christ, should not have known that men of high authority had long ago anticipated his design. It is certain that any laborious student, even if he had not for many years been working in the same field, would have procured, as soon as possible, MSS. of these Gospels, if only to insure the success of his own book. Whether in such a case a man, known chiefly as a fellow-traveller of Paul many years back, would not have been held guilty of some presumption in traversing at all that ten-years-old Gospel with the Apostolic name Matthew, and what the critics call the "Petrine memoirs" of Mark, I will not stay to determine. But, at all events, any careful historian would have used these authoritative Gospels to supplement deficiencies in his own knowledge, and to correct his own inaccuracies in detail. That Luke did not do this is, I think, apparent; and therefore I am convinced that all this post-dating of Luke is a quite gratuitous hypothesis, which would never have been broached but for the modern view that Christ's predictions in Luke xix., xxi., must necessarily be prophecies after the event. Take, for instance, the different order of Christ's three Temptations in Matthew and in Luke. Few dispute that it is Matthew, the Apostle and hearer of Christ, who here presents to us the true sequence. Is it probable that Luke would boldly traverse a testimony of such sort, in so private a matter, without a note or comment? Take the markedly conflicting accounts of the death of Judas in Matt. xxvii. and in Acts i. Probably, as Dr. Ramsay suggests, Luke here has incorporated matter which is not strictly accurate. But, however we decide the point, it seems quite certain that even when the Evangelist came to edit the Acts, he had never read the account of Matthew. Take, again, the variations in Luke's account of the institution of the Eucharist, which I shall notice hereafter. However we account for them, it seems impossible that in such a matter Luke, in A.D. 80, could have thus modified the common language of two authoritative Gospels. Or take the familiar Parable of the Sower. We observe that in Luke our Lord's

[1] See Appendix, Note A.

application has lost the striking detail of varying degrees of fruitfulness: "Thirtyfold and sixtyfold and a hundredfold" (Mark iv. 8; *cf.* Matt. xiii. 8). Would not any perusal of Matthew or Mark have indicated the defect? Luke alone has recorded the story of the penitent on his cross; but he had not learnt what the offence of him and his colleague was. For him they are merely "malefactors." Acquaintance with Matt.-Mk. would have informed him that they were "robbers." Certain topographical peculiarities of Luke lead us to the same conclusion. In A.D. 80, when Matthew and Mark[1] were current Gospels of some standing, Luke, despite his large nautical experiences, would have deferred to the Christian nomenclature, "Sea of Galilee" or "Sea of Tiberias." Along with Josephus, but alone of the Evangelists, he calls this water "Lake of Gennesareth." The scene of our Lord's agony would probably, too, have been designated at least as a "garden," not loosely as "the Mount of Olives." Long before A.D. 80 he might have identified his "certain village" where Mary and Martha dwelt, with the Bethany which he himself elsewhere mentions. In all these cases Luke appears to have retained the facts which he gathered in Palestine, without very close attention to the names. These are just the defects which a long delay between compiling and publication should have enabled Luke to correct, in view of the constant intercourse between the Christians of Judæa and Rome. They are quite unintelligible in the case of a man who for many years might have had access not only to numerous Palestinian Christians, but also to accounts speaking with some degree of Apostolic authority. In this matter, indeed, Luke's very excellencies point to the same conclusion as his defects. There is much indefiniteness of arrangement in this Gospel. Yet both in his genealogy and in his setting of many discourses, Luke has recovered order and sequence where Matthew's arrangement is on an arbitrary plan. But the greater precision of our Evangelist would hardly assert itself in A.D. 80 against a Gospel familiarly associated for ten years with the name of Matthew without some mention of the writer's own authorities. That Luke never mentions these is a proof that, although many narrations of the *Gesta Christi* were afield, nothing had yet appeared which could be said to be full accounts, with Apostolic sanction.

While the subject of defects is on my pen I will notice one which seems to confirm my view of the date of publication

[1] On Luke's supposed knowledge of the second Gospel see Appendix, Note B.

both in Luke's case and that of the other two Synoptics. Many readers of these Gospels must have noticed a very singular omission in their story in the matter of Peter's assault on the High-Priest's servant, when our Lord was apprehended. All three are defective in one very important item, the name of the assailant. For all of them it is not "Peter" who draws the sword, but only "one of them that were with Jesus," or "a certain one of them." And this though Luke knows, as St. John does, that minute detail that it was the "right" ear of the man that was cut off. Now, can it be doubted that it was pretty well known in Christian circles who the one Apostle was who took up arms in the Master's cause? Can we suppose that the affair was really left in obscurity till John wrote down in his Gospel the names "Simon Peter" and "Malchus"? The obvious explanation is that this silence of the Synoptics is deliberate. As long as Peter lived, the acknowledgment of that action of his in a Christian publication might well be used by any enemies of the Church to bring him into trouble. After his death in A.D. 64, however, men's lips would be unsealed, and anyone writing the story might openly name Peter as the assailing Apostle and Malchus as his victim. This is just what John does, and from xxi. 19 we gather that this Evangelist certainly wrote after Peter's death. But by this reasoning we reach the conclusion that all three Synoptics wrote, not after, but before it, and therefore that Luke wrote, not in A.D. 80, but before A.D. 64.

ARTHUR C. JENNINGS.

APPENDIX.

NOTE A.—It is conjectured by many of the critics who assign a late date to this Gospel that Luke had also in hand a third volume on the careers of Peter and Paul after the date A.D. 63, with which Acts closes. Use is made in this connection of the obscure passage in the second century "Muratorian fragment" in reference to Luke. It runs thus: "Sicuti et semote passionem Petri evidenter declarat et profectionem Pauli in Spaniam profiscentis." It is possible that this passage does really point to an early tradition that Luke intended to add to the Acts the story of Peter's martyrdom and Paul's renewed journeys. But this would not necessitate a "third book." Further, if the reference really is to things that Luke might have told, it is surely significant that the *passio Pauli* is not among them, Paul's travels being for the writer the terminus of Luke's imaginary supplement. In fact, the passage (if worth anything) points to a belief that Luke was not able to tell of Paul's martyrdom, presumably because he did not live to witness it. There is not much improbability in this, despite Luke's presence with St. Paul at the time of his writing his last surviving letters (*cf.* 2 Tim. iv. 11; Col. iv. 14; Philem. 24). It is perhaps a fair conjecture, in view of the abrupt close of Acts and certain indications of incomplete editing, that Luke's intention was to carry on his story, that he had material for the

incidents mentioned above, and that his intention was intercepted by death. In that case Acts becomes (as far as the evidence of the fragment goes) a posthumous publication, dating A.D. 68. But that Luke should have *three* works on hand of such immense importance all through the twelve years A.D. 68-80, having, moreover, as Dr. Ramsay admits, got material for the first two as far back as A.D. 58, appears to me improbable in the extreme, and to make the Evangelist outdo Coleridge himself in dilatoriness. Were the times so smooth for the Church that the publication of priceless records could be thus confidently delayed? In connection with this imaginary "third" book of Luke, I notice that Dr. Ramsay insists on Luke's use of πρῶτον ("first") instead of πρότερον ("former") in Acts i. 1, as if it implies a latent knowledge on the part of "Theophilus" that a third book was in contemplation. Yet πρῶτος for the "first of two," or "former," not only occurs repeatedly in the Revelation, but also in Heb. viii. 7, ix. 1, 15, where the former "covenant," and "tabernacle" are contrasted with their successors. And if there is any book which should serve as a gauge for Luke's Greek, it is Hebrews. So closely does it resemble Luke's writings in diction that F. Delitzsch was led by the similarity to a belief that Luke, rather than Paul or Apollos, was its author. The adjective πρότερος only occurs once in New Testament Greek (Eph. iv. 22, in regard to "the former manner of life").

NOTE B.—It would really be sufficient for my argument to show that Luke could not have read the Gospel of Matthew. I notice here, however, that the old hypothesis as to Luke's knowledge of Mark's Gospel is almost as certainly untenable, though endorsed in Dean Armitage Robinson's useful little "Study of the Gospels." The more I study the Synoptic problem, the more convinced I am that it was not Mark, but the "common source," which Luke had in his hands. Let the student, with the help of a synopticon, compare, besides the passages cited in my paper, the parallels *in re* Peter's denials, the Crucifixion story, and the visits to the tomb. The first and last of these seem almost conclusively to prove that Luke had not read about these two subjects either in Mark or in the common source. If Luke has read Mark, we shall find him in the one case changing "a maid" into "a man," in the other "a young man sitting on the right side arrayed in a white robe" into "two men stood by them in dazzling apparel." That Luke's version of both incidents is broadly confirmed by the supplementary fourth Gospel (*cf.* John xviii. 25, xx. 11) of course attests Luke's connection with St. John, as advocated in my paper. But the question from the other point of view is, How could a man in Luke's position so boldly traverse Mark's ("Petrine") account without note or comment in the matter of Peter's own denials? Luke's variations in the Crucifixion story are the more striking when we compare Matthew with Mark, for in their presentation of the scene, however we account for it, "the relation is," as Dr. Salmon says, "constantly one of simple copying." It may be worth noticing that the section Luke xx.-xxiv. is unusually full of Lucan phraseology; I find 110 instances. This fact perhaps indicates oral testimony here as Luke's source, rather than the "non-Marcan documents" which Dean Armitage Robinson postulates.

ART. V.—BUTLER'S "ANALOGY."

THERE is hardly any book in the English language which, if thoughtfully studied, would be so wholesome and remedial of the ills of the present generation in respect to belief as Bishop Butler's "Analogy." That is the name by which the Bishop's great work generally goes, but it is only an abbreviation of the title given to it by its author, which indicates its purpose much more clearly, "The Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed, to the Constitution and Course of Nature," and by "the Constitution and Course of Nature" the Bishop means that which we experience in daily life under the providential government of God. Therefore the treatise is addressed, not to atheists, but to deists, and its typical argument is this: You say that you will not accept the religious system proposed to you because it contains something which, being unreasonable or unjust, could not have come from God; but, if you look closely, you will find that same thing in the ordinary course of the world's government, which you allow comes from God, and therefore you are illogical in rejecting in religion as unreasonable, unjust, and unbecoming to God, that which you accept as coming from His hand in daily life. For example, you will have nothing to do with Christianity because it teaches the value of vicarious suffering, but look at our daily life: do not you see instances on instances of the value to one man of the sufferings undergone in his behalf by another? Be consistent; either say with the Epicurean that there is no God who providentially governs the world, which goes on by haphazard or by mechanical laws, or do not object to Christianity because it has a characteristic which it shares with the course of Nature, directed, as you acknowledge, by God.

There are two classes of objections brought against religion: one, *a posteriori*—this *did* not happen, and I *do* not believe it; the other, *a priori*—this *could* not happen, and I *cannot* believe it. The best argument that we have to meet the *a posteriori* difficulties is that of Archdeacon Paley in his "Evidences of Christianity." The best argument against the *a priori* difficulties is to be found in the present treatise of Bishop Butler.

The treatise consists of two parts, the first dealing with natural religion, the second with revealed religion. At the beginning stands a preliminary chapter, the purpose of which is to prove the likelihood of a future life, in which the Bishop argues that neither the reason of the thing nor the analogy of Nature should lead us to believe that we ourselves perish

with the dissolution of the bodies with which we are connected. In this chapter there are passages here and there which have to be corrected, owing to the extension of our knowledge of natural science since the days of the author; but whether this be done or no, the argument as a whole stands firm, and leaves us, not with the certainty, but yet with the probability, of our future existence. The credibility of a future life is a foundation-stone both of natural and revealed religion.

Natural and revealed religion differ in this: Natural religion is that which we can attain to by the exercise of our reason, intuition, and our other faculties, and consists of religious regards to God the Father. Revealed religion is a republication of natural religion, and in addition it teaches us our relation to God the Son and God the Holy Ghost (of which natural religion knows nothing certain), and it gives an account of a dispensation of things, not discoverable by reason, in consequence of which several distinct precepts are enjoined us.

The objection first proposed is that both natural and revealed religion represent God as dealing out punishment to men for the transgression of His precepts, a thing supposed to be unworthy of the greatness of God, considering the weakness and littleness of man. The answer from analogy is: God deals with us in a similar manner in daily life. Walk along a path bordering a precipice, transgress the law of gravitation by stepping off the path, and you are punished for your transgression by death. Why take that as a fatal objection in religion which you experience in every-day life without shrinking?

But, continues the opponent, you require that God should dispense His rewards and punishments according as men are righteous or wicked, and their action good or evil. You do not find that He does that in daily life. Do you not? answers the disciple of Butler. Do you not find that virtue is rewarded both by the temper of mind that it begets in the virtuous man—calmness, serenity, peacefulness, and by the affection and respect that it generates in others? And is not vice punished by pains of body and remorse of mind, and by the consciousness of the disapprobation of those most worthy of respect? God is not only the Governor, but the moral Governor, of the world, and though, for reasons partially hidden from us, there are hindrances which prevent virtue being always rewarded and vice punished, yet no one can doubt that the *tendency* of virtue is to produce happiness, and of vice to bring about unhappiness, and "these things are to be considered as a declaration of the Author of Nature for virtue,

and against vice; they give a credibility to the supposition of their being rewarded and punished hereafter, and also ground to hope and to fear that they may be rewarded and punished in higher degrees than they are here" (chap. iii.).

Another point in both natural and revealed religion which the sceptic refuses to believe is that in this life we are in a state of probation for another, that our future estate will depend on our conduct here, and that we are intended to discipline ourselves so as to be more fitted for a higher life hereafter. The answer, as supplied by analogy, is that we find some parts of our present life to be times of preparation for other parts; *e.g.*, our childhood and youth serve as a preparation for the higher estate to which we arrive on maturity, and the happiness or misery of our later life is made to depend on the way in which we have used our earlier years: if we have used the events which have happened to us in a way to improve our characters, we find serenity and peace in our later years; if we have given way to the temptations which have assailed us, we bring upon ourselves misery arising both from our internal tempers and from our external relations.

"The former part of life, then, is to be considered as an important opportunity which Nature puts into our hands, and which, when lost, is not to be recovered. And our being placed in a state of discipline throughout this life for another world is a Providential disposition of things, exactly of the same kind as our being placed in a state of discipline during childhood for mature age. Our condition in both respects is uniform and of a piece, and comprehended under one and the same general law of Nature" (chap. v.).

"And the alternative is left to our choice, either to improve ourselves and better our condition, or, in default of such improvement, to remain deficient and wretched. It is, therefore, perfectly credible, from the analogy of Nature, that the same may be our case with respect to the happiness of a future state, and the qualifications necessary for it" (*ibid.*).

The opponent may now be supposed to burst in with a very far-reaching objection. There can be no rewards and punishments of men hereafter for their actions here, because all their doings and failures are the result of the law of necessity. They could not have done otherwise, and therefore there was no merit or demerit in what they did or did not, and consequently no man deserves to be either rewarded or punished. For himself, Butler repudiates the doctrine of necessity (Part II., chap. viii.). But he is not satisfied with that. He proceeds to argue that, if it is reconcilable with the constitution of Nature (which is the position of his adversary), it is equally reconcilable with religion. Whatever theoretical

perplexities may surround the question, the law of necessity, if it exists, must hold throughout. Now, in daily life we know that we are treated *as though* we were free; we can lift up our hand and drop it; we can bring suffering upon ourselves by some acts, and enjoyment by others. Why should not the same principle hold good in the religious sphere as that which we experience day by day?

"From the whole, therefore, it must follow that a necessity, supposed possible, and reconcilable with the constitution of things, does in no sort prove that the Author of Nature will not, nor destroy the proof that He will, finally, and upon the whole, in His eternal government, render His creatures happy or miserable, by some means or other, as they behave well or ill. Or, to express this conclusion in words conformable to the title of the chapter [chap. vi.], the analogy of Nature shows us that the opinion of necessity, considered as practical, is false."

The final chapter of the first part of the treatise deals with a difficulty felt by many, and regarded by some as an objection both to natural and revealed religion. This is that they contain a number of things which we cannot understand, and the reason of the existence of which we are unable to comprehend. For example, why should evil exist at all, or why should it be so powerful and dominant? The explanation of such difficulties is that God's government is a vast scheme, with some few parts of which alone we are acquainted; if we knew more we should understand more. But, besides this, analogous difficulties exist in the natural world. We cannot understand the use of deserts, mountains, and arctic seas, nor can we explain many of the ways of God in His natural government, any more than in His spiritual government, although we can go some little way towards doing so by recognising things which in themselves appear merely evil as means, possibly necessary means, to good ends, and by realizing that the general laws which God imposes on the works of His hands, if they seem on occasion to produce harm, are yet on the whole more conducive to good than incessant interpositions.

From the first part, then, of Butler's treatise we learn: (1) That the dissolution of our bodies is no proof of the annihilation of ourselves, nor does it make such a result probable; (2) that the representation that hereafter God will reward virtue and punish vice is justified by the analogy of Nature, in which we see that He acts in a similar manner; (3) that the representation that the present life is a state of probation for a future life, and that it is intended by its trials and discipline to lead to our improvement, is similarly justi-

fied; (4) that if there are things that we cannot comprehend in religion, so there are in the world and its Providential government—and all this whether the doctrine of necessity be theoretically accepted or not. If, therefore, a man believes that the constitution of Nature comes from God—that is, if he be a deist—he is bound not to object to natural and revealed religion on any of the above grounds.

Passing on from the considerations which belong to natural and revealed religion in common to those confined specifically to revealed religion, the Bishop prefixes a chapter on the importance of Christianity. He was living in an age which was frankly irreligious and contemptuous of Christianity, and he therefore takes frequent occasion to remind his readers that they could not safely disregard revelation, even though they were but half, or less than half, convinced of the probability of its being true. Christianity is, Butler says, (1) an authoritative republication of natural religion; (2) an account of a new religious dispensation. Regarded as an inward principle, natural religion consists in religious regards to God the Father Almighty, and revealed religion in religious regards to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost in addition to God the Father. As soon as these relations are known (however they may be known), duties at once arise on our parts towards Christ and the Holy Spirit, such as reverence, honour, love, trust, gratitude, fear, hope and obedience, as well as those which we owe to God the Father. Revealed religion contains more than natural religion, but cannot be contradictory to it.

"Indeed, if in revelation there be found any passages the seeming meaning of which is contrary to natural religion, we may most certainly conclude such seeming meaning not to be the real one. But it is not any degree of a presumption against an interpretation of Scripture, that such interpretation contains a doctrine which the light of nature cannot discover, or a precept which the law of nature does not oblige to" (Part II., chap. i.).

Having set aside the *a priori* presumptions against revelation in general as being not discoverable by reason, and being miraculous, the Bishop proceeds to deal with the objections brought against the Christian revelation in particular. In every revelation, the Christian included, there must be things appearing liable to objections, for, speaking broadly, we are not judges of what a revelation is likely to be, or ought to be, but only of its evidence—that is, whether it comes from God or no. Reason can and ought to judge (1) of the meaning of revelation, (2) of its morality, (3) of its evidences. If reason goes beyond this and pretends to declare what is

or what is not to be expected in revelation, it passes out of its proper sphere, and is not to be listened to. Very often its objections can be met by the argument from analogy. For example, if it be maintained that it is incredible that Christianity, professing to be an expedient to recover the world from ruin, should have made its appearance so late, it may be answered from analogy that though men have from the beginning been liable to diseases, yet the remedies for those maladies remained unknown to mankind for many ages, and to a great extent are unknown still. Christianity being a scheme quite beyond our comprehension, it is to be expected that there would be many things in it that would be contrary to our expectations.

The chiefest objection brought against Christianity is that it teaches the appointment of a Mediator and the redemption of the world by Him. But the analogy of Nature removes all presumption against the use by God of the mediation of others. Our infancy is preserved by the instrumentality of others, and when we put ourselves in a position of danger, it is often only by another's coming to our relief, and our laying hold on that relief, that we can be saved. In some cases of misdoing fatal results must follow were it not for the assistance of others; and this, therefore, may be our case in respect to our future interests. Further, we often see that repentance alone is not sufficient to prevent evils that we have incurred falling upon us in this world, which may suggest to us that the same principle is likely to hold in respect to the future, and makes us ready to welcome the doctrine that God has given His Son to make interposition in such a manner as to prevent the punishment from actually falling, which would otherwise have followed on the transgression of the Divine laws. There are three ways in which Christ is our Mediator: (1) As Prophet, inasmuch as He introduced a new dispensation; (2) as King, inasmuch as He instituted and rules His Church; (3) as Priest, inasmuch as He offered Himself as a propitiatory sacrifice, and made atonement for the sins of the world. In what particular way His sacrifice had this efficacy is not made perfectly evident, but the fact is clearly revealed. It has been objected to the doctrine that it represents God as punishing the innocent for the guilty. The analogy of Nature helps us to answer the difficulty. When in the daily course of natural providence innocent people are made to suffer for the faults of the guilty, this is liable to the same objection as that brought against the satisfaction of Christ. In ordinary life one person's sufferings often contribute to the relief of another, so that vicarious punishment is a providential appointment of every

day's experience. The objection, therefore, does not lie against Christianity any more than against the constitution of Nature, however mysterious to us, with our limited faculties, the Divine law may be. We must not expect fully to understand all God's laws, for "the constitution of the world and God's natural government over it is all mystery, as much as the Christian dispensation." We are not to expect as full information concerning the Divine conduct as concerning our own duty.

Another objection to revelation is that it was not universal, or made to all alike. "But we should observe that the Author of Nature in numberless instances bestows that upon some which He does not upon others who seem equally to stand in need of it; indeed, He appears to bestow all His gifts with the most promiscuous variety among creatures of the same species—health and strength, capacities of prudence and of knowledge, means of improvement, riches, and all external advantages. Yet, notwithstanding these uncertainties and varieties, God does exercise a natural government over the world," so that "the disadvantages of some in comparison of others respecting religion may be paralleled by manifest analogies in the natural dispensations of Providence at present, and considering ourselves merely in our temporal capacity" (chap. vi.).

A further objection to revelation is the supposed deficiency in the proof of it. The reason of this may be that we may be placed in a state of probation in respect to our intellects as well as to our moral practice. Speculative difficulties in respect to religion may make the principal part of some persons' trial, as temptations to ill-life do to others. Analogously, we have great difficulty often in deciding wherein our temporal interests really consist, and whether we have sufficient proof to justify us in pursuing one or another line in order to attain to them; yet in spite of this doubtfulness we do pursue it. In either case the doubt what we ought to do or believe is often the result of a man's own fault, but not always. After we have passed the best judgment that we can, the evidence upon which we must act often appears to us still doubtful.

Passing from the *a priori* objections to the Christian revelation, and the answers supplied to them by analogy, the Bishop comes to the particular evidence for it. This evidence is either direct or indirect. Its direct evidence consists in the attestation to its truth supplied by miracles wrought by those who were instrumental in propagating it, and in the fulfilment by it of prophecies already in existence. And besides these two which are "its direct and fundamental

proofs," there are also "collateral proofs," which, "however considerable they are, yet ought never to be urged apart from the direct proofs, but always to be joined with them" (chap. vii.).

With respect to miracles, the Bishop notes that there is equal historical evidence for them as for other facts in the Scripture narrative; that St. Paul bears independent testimony to their existence, declaring himself to be endued with the power of working them (Rom. xv. 19; 1 Cor. xiv. 18), and recounting the many miraculous gifts which subsisted in the Church of Corinth; and that as an historical fact, Christianity demanded to be received, and was actually received, upon the allegation of miracles publicly wrought to attest the truth of it. The historical testimony to the Christian miracles is not to be done away with by the pleas that men are liable to be misled by enthusiasm; that cases may be found of men who were half deceived and half deceivers; and that false claims have been made to the miraculous in other instances. Testimony must as a rule be accepted, unless we find a want either of the *posse* or of the *velle* in those who give it.

On prophecy Butler remarks that "if a long series of prophecy delivered before the coming of Christ is applicable to Him, that is in itself a proof that the prophetic history was intended of Him," though each several prophecy be also applicable to events of the age in which it was written. Collateral evidence may be derived from the history and character of the revelation.

As the first part of the "Analogy" proved to the deist that objections to the doctrines of future rewards and punishments for good and bad conduct, and of this world being a state of probation for the next and for individual improvement, was untenable, because analogous to God's dealings under His Providential dispensation, so the second part proves to him that for the same reason objections to Christ's mediation and to redemption by Him, and cavils at the Christian revelation on the ground of its want of universality and an alleged deficiency in its proof, are untenable, and consequently that he is left free, without presumption to the contrary, to consider the particular evidence for Christianity.

There is not space to apply Butler's principles to the religious state of the present day and its needs in any detail; the following observations will be sufficient:

1. We must not give up our beliefs because we find that we have not demonstrative proof for them, but only probable evidence, which admits of higher and lower degrees, nor because objections lie against them, for everything is open to objections brought by us, owing to our imperfect knowledge.

2. We must confine reason to its proper work in matters of alleged revelation. That is, to discovering its meaning, judging of its morality, and examining its evidence. If reason usurps the right of criticising and approving or condemning the several doctrines of the revelation acknowledged to come from God, it is not to be listened to.

3. Miracles are not to be regarded as vexatious excrescences which have to be thrust into corners, explained away, or apologized for, but as attestations by God to the teaching of those who are enabled by Him to perform them. Testimony as to their having been wrought is to be accepted on the same conditions as other testimony by those who believe in a divine governor of the world.

4. Prophecies of Christ are not to be evacuated of their Messianic meaning.[1]

A perusal of much of our modern theological literature will show that each of these warnings is greatly needed at the present time. We may derive them from a study of Butler's works.

F. MEYRICK.

ART. VI.—A PLEA FOR AN EFFECTIVE DIACONATE.

"THE extension of the Diaconate as a permanent vocation, to be exercised by those who do not forsake their worldly calling, is advocated by many as one great remedy for the dearth of clergy. It is supposed that the aid rendered by such men on one day in the week would be a great relief to the overburdened incumbents of our large parishes, whose Sundays are a ceaseless round of services in church and mission-room, and who require a larger staff of helpers than they can afford to employ."

The words here quoted occurred in an article in the CHURCHMAN of January, 1903 (p. 178). That article, having reference to the existing dearth of clergy, only dealt in a passing way with the proposal for the extension of the Diaconate, which is quite seriously advocated at the present time by some Churchmen. There is so much to be said in favour of that proposal that it is fitting to deal with the matter separately in a special article.

The remarks which have to be made will naturally fall

[1] According to Professor Cheyne, Messianic passages "simply mean that the people of Israel is to work out the Divine purposes on the earth, and to do them with such utter self-forgetfulness that each of its own successes shall but add a fresh jewel to Jehovah's crown" ("On the Psalms"). "That," he says, "is the fundamental idea of the Messianic Psalms," which are therefore neither typical nor predictive of the Messiah.

into three divisions: I. The present position of the Church without an effective Diaconate. II. The way in which an effective Diaconate may be developed. III. The results which may be expected to follow.

I. The Present Position of the Church without an Effective Diaconate.

The Church of England recognises in theory the office and work of Deacons, as well as of Priests and Bishops. In practice, however, there is no organized use for the Diaconate. By the plan now in vogue, we only use the Diaconate as a kind of probationership for the Priesthood. Most English people, if asked to say something about the Diaconate, would be unable to describe the duties actually done in each important parish by the Deacons of that parish. They would simply be able to say that a Deacon is a young clergyman who is hoping some day to be a Priest, but who for the present is unable to take certain parts of the service. We not only make our Deacons mere probationer Priests, but we require them to dress in Priest's clothes; we call them "Reverend," as we do in the case of Priests, and we require their separation from secular occupation to come at the time of admission to the Diaconate, whereas it might very well be delayed until the admission to the priesthood, when it would come with a greater degree of suitability, having regard to the special features of the Service of Ordination to the Priesthood.

Another point of importance is that through the practical disuse of the Diaconate we fail to utilize, in any very thorough-going way, a large body of devout and capable men who might easily be brought into close association with our ministerial arrangements. In every large town there are a considerable number of Churchmen engaged in secular business whose religious convictions and whose devotion to the work of the Church are such as to make them quite worthy of being compared as Christians and Churchmen with those who are in the ministry. Many of them are men whose education has been nearly equal to, perhaps better than, that of some who are admitted to the ministry. They are quite qualified by education for reading in public, in church, without offence to educated people, the various parts of Morning and Evening Prayer, the Litany, etc., and the standard of their Christian living would make it quite certain that their private lives would not render any public ministry of theirs an offence to any of the congregation. Many of these men are already devoting the whole of their Sundays, and much of their leisure hours during the week, to helping

Church work; they are doing so without one penny of remuneration, and are thereby showing that they have the cause of the Church at heart. It seems a great pity that for such men there should not be a position of closest association with the ministry if they are willing to occupy it.

II. The Way in which an Effective Diaconate may be Developed.

1. By procuring an alteration of the statute (1 and 2 Vict., c. 106, §§ 29, 30) to make it apply to Priests only, and not to Deacons, and by altering the practice of the Church accordingly, so that those who are admitted to the Diaconate need not be obliged to surrender secular occupations.

2. By withdrawing the custom for Deacons to use clerical clothing and the title "Reverend."

3. By allotting to these Deacons such minor ministerial duties as the reading of Morning and Evening Prayer, the Litany, and the Lessons on Sundays as well as on week-days, the reading of the Gospel, and the ministering of the Chalice at the time of Holy Communion. The admission to the Diaconate should not *ipso facto* carry with it any authority to preach. The Deacon should only have the privilege if he "be thereto licensed by the Bishop himself," and he would not have any claim to be advanced to the priesthood unless he could show himself well qualified for the higher office, and be ready to withdraw himself entirely from secular work.

4. By inviting educated and cultured men employed in secular work to apply for admission to the Diaconate thus extended. The men thus invited might be expected from among those engaged in Government offices and in the offices of large banks, insurance companies, etc.

III. The Results which may be Expected to Follow.

The outcome of a step of this kind would speedily appear in many different ways. I will endeavour to suggest some of the advantages which may with reasonable certainty be looked for.

1. In country places there would be a greater prospect of fuller remuneration and fuller occupation for the incumbents of small parishes. Many such parishes have but a very small number of inhabitants, and an income of under £150; two of these lying close together might be united under one incumbent, who might receive the income from both parishes, and in return be responsible for all the celebrations and sermons, while the duty of reading Morning and Evening Prayer might be provided for by the voluntary service of one of the suggested Deacons. The improvement of the position of the country clergy could thus be attained without any large

financial scheme, and, on the other hand, without any diminution of the opportunities of worship at present provided.

2. Many town parishes which now have three priests on the staff could manage with only two priests if these were aided by one, two, or three Deacons appointed in the way suggested. As a result, one of the priests would be released for the charge of some newly-created conventional district, while the remaining assistant-priest could have a more satisfactory stipend paid to him without any burden falling on the incumbent.

3. The Easter Day Communion difficulty would, to a large extent, disappear. The parish which has two Communions on Easter Day could have them taken by the parish priest, who, with some two or three Deacons, could manage the administration to a large number of communicants.

4. The existence of a large body of intelligent and vigorous Deacons would necessarily tend very quickly to raise the standard of general capability in their superior officers—*i.e.*, those admitted to the priesthood.

5. A very important link would be supplied between the ministry of the Church and those men who are connected with commercial life, to the very great advantage of both Christianity and commerce. The gap which at present appears to exist between commercial men and the clergy would necessarily become much lessened.

6. The plan would be the means of leading many young men to desire a more intimate connection with the Church's ministry, and to be willing to leave commercial life and prepare for the priesthood. This result would work itself out in two ways. Firstly, some of those admitted to this Diaconate, if still young men in years, might desire to save up their money for a college course, and then, after obtaining a University degree, ask the Bishop to exchange their Deacon's Orders for the Priesthood. Secondly, the sons of middle-aged men, who had continued for many years to serve the Church as Deacons, might very reasonably feel a desire not merely to minister as Deacons, as their fathers have done, but to go on to desire the Priesthood.

Conclusion.—I have endeavoured to set forth fully the proposal for an extended and effective Diaconate. It is difficult for the Church to deny that a large amount of good material exists at this moment near to its hand which is not being utilized in the fullest and most effective way. It is quite certain that the Church, by making more effective use of the most earnest-minded and energetic of her sons now in secular business, must, by using enthusiasm, increase its quantity and its power, to the immense gain of the Church's health and life and work.

PAUL PETIT.

Art. VII.—THE MONTH.

THE election, confirmation, and enthronement of the new Archbishop of Canterbury have followed his designation with commendable promptitude—a promptitude which is in conspicuous contrast with the unwonted and strange delay in filling up the other important posts in the Church which are vacant. The Archbishop is thus able to meet the opening of Parliament and of Convocation in full possession of his prerogatives, and his best powers will at once be called upon to deal with the problems that are awaiting him. At Canterbury he made two considerable speeches: one at his reception by the Mayor and the civil authorities, the other at the luncheon after his enthronement. Of the former, it is not necessary to say anything; but the latter was worthy of the occasion and of himself, and will confirm the hopes with which his appointment has been received. Its most important passage was a clear indication of the position he holds in relation to the two main parties in the Church. He said that "the Church has at present to steer her course between those—and there are not a few, apparently—who look back to the sixteenth century, and, with strange ignorance of history, strive to make out that everything in the Church of England depends upon that, and those on the other side who, with equal deficiency of historical insight, try to make out that what happened in the sixteenth century was a melancholy interlude, a lamentable blunder in Church life. To neither of those contradictory voices are those present likely to give ready ear, but it is vital to the true life of the Church that her leaders should endeavour to steer her course upon the line which her Master would have her follow." This has no doubt been correctly understood as an intimation that the Archbishop's sympathies are with the *via media*, and that his support will be given to the control party in the Church. This is satisfactory in itself, and is what would have been expected in Dr. Davidson. But it may be well to observe that, in his reference to what may be called the Protestant wing of the Church, the Archbishop fails to do justice to one important motive by which its members are inspired. We doubt, indeed, if there are any persons so ignorant as to suppose that "everything in the Church of England depends upon" the sixteenth century. But we are quite sure that a large number of those to whom the Archbishop seems to refer, while they cherish the principles asserted in the sixteenth century, value them chiefly as the reassertion of a venerable and a more ancient ideal. They have historical

knowledge enough to look behind the sixteenth century to the primitive Church, and it is to the truths and the practices of that Church that their deepest allegiance is given. The Protestant party in the English Church are not ignorant of Bishop Jewel's "Apology," and of his bold appeal from the medieval Church to the Church of the first six centuries. To them the true and only test of Catholicity is to be found in the beliefs and practices of the early centuries; and their complaint of the self-styled Catholic party in our Church at the present day is that its tests and symbols of Catholicity are taken from the most uncatholic period of the Church, the period of Roman exclusiveness and obscurantism. The Archbishop will mistake the strength of the Protestant school in the Church unless he recognises that an earnest desire to maintain the principles and practices of the purest ages is what chiefly and ultimately animates them. It was always the pride of English divines, until the last forty years or so, to believe that the sober order of the Church of England, which till then prevailed, was the nearest approach to the simplicity and truth of the primitive Church which had anywhere been seen since those ages themselves. If by steering a middle course the Archbishop's intention is to bring both extremes to unite around that standard, he will find that the great mass of the laity and a large majority of the clergy will heartily and gratefully support him. But a middle course which would mean a compromise between primitive truth and medieval error, would satisfy no one, and would leave the Church as much distracted as it is at the present moment.

It is much to be feared, however, that the most difficult problem with which the Archbishop may have to deal will not be the differences between the High and the Low Church parties, but the growth of a school of opinion which claims a position within the Church of England, and even in the ranks of the clergy, while openly withholding assent from beliefs which are not only plainly asserted in our formularies, but have been regarded by the Church from the earliest ages as essential parts of the Christian Creed. The correspondence columns of even the *Guardian*, in the number which reaches us as we go to press, contain letters from able and earnest men who claim to treat the Virgin birth of our Lord as not a necessary article of belief, either to an English clergyman or to a Christian. It seems a small matter to these writers that, as one of them expresses it, the evidence for the Virgin birth is "slight"—that is, that the explicit narratives in St. Matthew's and St. Luke's Gospels are of "slight" value, and that the authority of the Gospels as inspired writings is thus

destroyed. When a Bishop of our Church writes a volume like the Bishop of Ripon's "Introduction to the Temple Bible," and admits to the citadel of the faith, hardly concealed in a cloud of words, critical views which are completely subversive of the authority and historic truth of the Old Testament; when another Bishop, at Rochester, tolerates without public protest the continuance in one of the canonries of his cathedral of a writer like Professor Cheyne, who disseminates, in the encyclopædia he edits, articles by Dutch Rationalists which deny the Divinity of our Lord—when *pudet hæc opprobria nobis et dici potuisse et non potuisse refelli*, it is not, perhaps, surprising that a mere denial of the credibility of an Evangelist, in one of the most sacred and mysterious parts of his narrative, should be admitted without scruple. But it does seem surprising that men should deliberately claim a place in the Church and its ministry who deny a belief like that of the Virgin birth, which is explicitly asserted in the Apostles' Creed, which is expressly reaffirmed in our Articles, and which no one can deny to have been the belief of the Church from the earliest time of which we have any record. Sooner or later—and we must hope soon—the Archbishop will have to make it plain to all whom it may concern whether, in his view, a direct denial of prominent doctrines of this kind is compatible with ministerial office in the Church of England, or even with lay loyalty to her teaching. We are approaching a division in our Church which threatens to be more momentous and more dangerous than any other—a division between those who accept the Scriptures and the Creeds in the sense in which, generally speaking, the Church has always received them, and those who treat the Scriptures as only partially trustworthy, and who think themselves justified in rejecting—or at least treating with agnosticism—any Article which does not harmonize with their views of modern science and criticism. The extent to which the authority of the Scriptures has been weakened among us, and in which vital doctrines of the Creed are held to be mere matters of opinion, is, perhaps, not generally appreciated; but, unless a reaction sets in, the day cannot be far off when the Christian Church in England will be regarded by the mass of the people as built upon sand; and when that time arrives it will fall, and great will be the fall of it. This, we are persuaded, is the greatest of all the dangers the new Archbishop has to face, and we can only pray that he may be given the spiritual wisdom and strength and charity to deal with it effectually.

Notices of Books.

THE BIBLE AND EVOLUTION.

Redemption According to the Eternal Purpose. By the REV. W. SHIRLEY. London : Elliot Stock, 1902.

TO many minds the ideas of science and theology which they have conceived seem to imply a hopeless contradiction. Despair as to any hopes of reconciliation between the two grieves and saddens a multitude of minds. So many of the attempts that have been made to bring about that reconciliation have been ill-judged in conception, intemperate in the language used, or illogical in reasoning, and this on both sides of the conflict, that to many anxious minds it has seemed best to let things drift for a time, with a confidence that all must come right at last, and that truth must prevail under the providential guidance of Him who is the God of truth. With this aim the disturbed soul has been encouraged to believe that "in quietness and confidence" is its strength, and that though "God moves in a mysterious way, His wonders to perform," yet at the last He will make all things plain.

But notwithstanding this, it is well always to give a welcome to any investigator after truth who tries to lay down the bases for such a reconciliation. Great gifts are required if the work is to be done satisfactorily. A knowledge of both theology and science, a careful definition of terms, patience, a good temper—all these are indispensable, combined with a power to realize the positions which an opponent takes up.

The author of the volume we are at present considering possesses a good measure of most of these qualities. The ideas which he formulates are not all new—notably, those about "man before Adam" found a place in McCausland's works between thirty and forty years ago—but they are treated with fresh vigour, and even where we do not follow him Mr. Shirley sets us thinking.

A very large proportion of the book deals with the period covered by the narrative of the early chapters of Genesis. It is only when we reach the last sixty-five pages (out of 363) that we pass beyond the Flood. To anyone, therefore, who is interested in the study of the *origines* of the world and all that therein is, and the laws governing that world, the volume will, we think, be full of interest.

We may sum up the line taken by the author if we say that it contains a doctrine of "evolution by compartments," if we may venture to use the expression, combined with an attempt to arrive at a divinely appointed law which is put into force at the points where the law of evolution fails us and gaps in continuity exist. This law involves a

mortification of some baser part and therefore its disappearance, with an accretion of something higher, which cannot be the result of direct evolution. Darwin, the apostle of evolution, if we may call him so, recognised the difficulties in his way caused by these gaps or chasms much more openly than some of his disciples, or those who have accepted his theory with less knowledge than he had, have done. Perhaps the clearest idea of what Mr. Shirley tries to do in his attempt to state a law governing these transitional points is to be found in his account of the passage of the chasm between the vegetable and the animal kingdoms. Here, as elsewhere, he would say: "The newness of the new creature has risen out of the mortification of the old" (p. 69). We piece together a few of his sentences to show how he works out his idea: "There are the same phenomena surrounding a similar appearance of a new power, of which the origin is equally obscure. There is a question, if not unanswerable, yet similarly unanswered. Could the sun-worship and faith of the plants (anthropomorphic words have to be used) have led any living members of that family up to the higher animal life? It may be impossible to say" (pp. 56, 57), but "who can prove impossible such an occurrence? . . . All things are possible with God, even the Immaculate Conception, even so strange a birth of animal from plant. . . . It is no easy task the atheistic evolutionist has set himself. No mere reference to chance, the struggle for existence, survival of the fittest, or other partly indefinite phrases, will suffice. . . . Ere a plant will move, it must have sacrificed its greedy roots, surrendered the security of its earthly anchorage, laid low the pride and refinements of its flowers; more yet, its whole nature, built up for the storage, must have altered itself for the expenditure of sun-force . . ." (p. 59). This surely it could not do by itself. Rather with the mortification of the old comes a newness of life which cannot be other than a gift of a higher power—that is, God.

It is with reference to this particular chasm that Mr. Shirley makes his argument clearest. In others, notably that of the coming in of the soul, his mode of thought is not by any means so manifest. But it is easy to see how such a train of reasoning might apply to the higher spiritual life of the Christian on earth, and still more to the difference between the natural body and the spiritual body of the life beyond the grave, just as he would claim for it that it would account for a pre-Adamite carnal man and the newness of life in Adam. There may have been animism or fetichism in that pre-Adamite race, but that will not account for "the God of Eden" who "became Jahveh when there was a first man with whom He could enter into a covenant," who was "the God of the tree of life," and therefore "a Saviour." In this way in Adam we see a carnal nature mortified; "his freedom was new, being the service of his God; Eden was his new world, and the new law over him was Love" (p. 91).

One great advantage claimed by the author for his theories is that it

enables us to accept the literal meaning of the narrative of the early chapters of Genesis. There is a great deal of direct, though perhaps somewhat discursive, statement on the relation of the sexes in the chapter entitled "Adam and Eve," which ends up thus: "There can be no rivalry between the sexes, for woman is not without the man, nor did God create Adam without Eve. These twain are one flesh" (p. 175).

Throughout the volume Mr. Shirley is plain-spoken, though sometimes we can scarcely approve his choice of expressions. Which is it to be—"nidering" (p. 192) or "niddering" (p. 193)? Sometimes, too, the very form in which he puts his opponent's argument runs the danger of making it appear more attractive than it really is.

The last chapters of the book deal in a more hurried manner with the following subjects: "Redemption by the Law," "Redemption by Christ," and "Certain Objections 'Ambushed.'" At the present, when much is being said and written on the subject, it may be interesting to read what Mr. Shirley has to say on the Doctrine of the Incarnation:

"If that wonder be a tradition of men, then the world's course, which seems to have been diverted by Christianity, was diverted humanly, which means not at all, seeing that in such a case the direction taken must have been natural, however novel. Christ, stripped of the supernatural, is left the self-deceived, somewhat vainglorious Teacher, who voiced an aspiration of mankind. On the other hand, if the Incarnation be a fact, so great a wonder must have portended and introduced a work otherwise impossible in the world, whatever may be pretended after the rescue. The nature of redemption must rest upon the truth of the Creed, 'Conceived of (*sic*) the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary'" (p. 324).

The Coming Unity. By Rev. A. J. HARVEY, M.A. London: Elliot Stock.

This is one of the many expressions of that yearning for the realization of the brotherhood of all Christian believers, which is a hopeful feature of the present age. If we compare the general feeling in that direction with the mutual animosity which prevailed after the Caroline Restoration Parliament, we cannot but be struck by the immense alteration in sentiment. Have we really become more kindly and tolerant? or is this change in feeling merely an outgrowth of that genial laxity which very often appears in the religious thought of to-day? Perhaps, as usual, each cause contributes somewhat, and some souls wish for union because they hold their own principles so dearly that they can love others who are equally staunch according to their lights; while the "honorary members of all religions" are actuated by a benevolent indifference. We are glad that Mr. Harvey is not inclined to make nothing of the differences that do exist between the various Protestant Churches, and we think that his little book aptly indicates the lines on which alone a

rapprochement is possible. That it is probable is more than any man, we fear, can maintain.

We have received two stories for children from the S.P.C.K. *The Farm of Aptonga* is a reprint of one of the late Dr. Neale's tales. The scene is laid in Africa, in the times of St. Cyprian. We are introduced to his martyrdom and that of others. The narrative moves briskly and with interest, and is characterized by the religious fervour that is to be expected from the author; also, we must add, by his highly sacramental views. The same tendency is noticeable in *A Scholar of Lindisfarne*, by GERTRUDE HOLLIS. This records the mission of the Celtic Church to Northumbria under Aidan and his monks, conveys a great deal of historical teaching in a brightly written narrative, and is well illustrated. From Seeley and Co. we have received a reprint of BISHOP SAMUEL WILBERFORCE'S *Agathos*. The stories which make up this collection were once widely read; we fancy that they would still be most useful if told by parents or others from memory. In such a way, they would carry much information to children of between five and ten years old. The Bishop's questions at the end of each allegory might also be used as a basis of discussion.

Two volumes of the "Quiet Moments Series" (R.T.S.), clearly printed and well bound, are *The Teaching of Jesus Christ in His Own Words*, compiled by the EARL OF NORTHBROOK, and *The Gates of Life*, by the Rev. H. E. LEWIS. Lord Northbrook says in his preface that he originally compiled his book for the use of Indians. With this purpose, he includes the teaching of Christ in His own words, but leaves out those parts of the teaching which were addressed specially to the Jews. It will occur to all that our Lord taught not only by His words, but by His acts, and by the whole tenor of His life. While, therefore, such compilations can be in no sense a substitute for the Gospel story, they are yet convenient and useful, as showing the substance of Christ's teaching on different topics. It is in this manner that Lord Northbrook has arranged his quotations. The idea has been carried out before; we recollect especially one charming book, called "The Great Discourse," compiled some years back by an anonymous author. In one sense, he was more consistent than Lord Northbrook, for he included only Christ's actual sayings, while the ex-Viceroy of India inserts in italicized passages quotations from the Old and New Testaments bearing upon whatever subject he is treating of. This little book will be useful for both study and meditation, and cannot fail to clarify and so to strengthen the faith of the believer. *The Gates of Life* is a series of studies on different doctrines, such as Repentance, Forgiveness, Justification, and Sanctification. They are thoroughly sound, if, perhaps, somewhat trite and conventional.

True Religion. By the Very Rev. F. W. FARRAR. London: Brown, Langham and Co.

These sermons exhibit all the well-known traits of the great preacher. There is the same glow of language, perfectly boundless wealth of illustration, impassioned appeals after righteousness, and scathing denunciation of formalism that we have known and loved before. Criticism is silent before so much honesty and sincerity of purpose. The admirers of the gifted Dean—and are they not found all the world over?—will rejoice in this collection of trumpet-like calls to a single-minded and moral life.

NOTES.

WE understand that Messrs. Eyre and Spottiswoode, His Majesty's printers, will shortly transfer their Bible and Prayer-Book Department to 33, Paternoster Row and 13, Paternoster Square. We are also informed that arrangements have been made for the transfer of Messrs. Thomas Nelson and Son's Bible Department to the same premises, and that both businesses will thereafter be conducted under the name of Eyre and Spottiswoode (Bible House), Limited. The new premises, which will probably be opened in April, will contain a reading-room, a show-room, and a collecting department, with ample warehouse and office accommodation.

ERRATA IN "LIGHT FROM THE ALMANACK," IN THE "CHURCHMAN" FOR DECEMBER, 1892.

Page 121, line 27, *for* "went" (ἀπῆλθε) *read* "came" (ἦλθεν).
„ „ lines 30 and 31, *delete* "The Revisers . . . little difference."
„ 122, line 1, *for* "south-west" *read* "south-east."