THE CHURCHMAN

May, 1911.

The Month.

The Permissive Use of the Vestments.

THE first of our newly-started "Discussions"—that on "The Permissive Use of the Vestments"—is terminated this month by the reply from Canon Beeching, the writer of the original article. We have every reason to be grateful both to him and to his critics, not only for what they have said, but for the way in which they have said it. We do not intend here either to retraverse the ground or to attempt any summary of the conflicting arguments. They now stand printed in our pages; they are accessible for reference, and to abbreviate them might do less than justice to their worth. We only wish to say that Canon Beeching's article made more impression on us than anything that has yet been said in favour of toleration. And yet even his persuasive and eloquent words leave our fundamental convictions on the point unshaken. We still feel that the plea that the Eucharistic Vestments are non-significant of doctrine—with however much erudition that plea may be urged—is, at the present day and under the present circumstances, quite beside the point. They are, in the present crisis, charged with significance. It is for what they signify that their legalization is sought. It is because of their intended significance that they are at present illegally used by a considerable body of anarchical clergy in the Church of England.

The Counter-Reformation.

The unalterable conviction that Vestments are being sought and being used as intensely significant leads us to a further one as to the practical ends which they will, if legalized, be made to subserve. We readily grant that Canon Beeching and those who think with him would preserve them as links of historic continuity, with full loyalty to the Reformed and Protestant faith. But those who already do use them illegally, and who, if the Vestments are sanctioned, will point exultingly to the triumph of their own illegality, will use them in no such way. They will become the potent instruments of the Counter-Reformation. The first great Counter-Reformation movement arose within the Church of Rome. It is our lot in the present day to witness a second one, smaller perhaps in scale, but no less clear and determined in aim, within the Church of England. The coming issue is a clear one. It is between those who hold that the Church of England is at one with the Church of Rome as to the "Sacrifice of the Altar," and those who hold that at the Reformation the Church of England not only abjured Papal control, but discarded the medieval doctrine of the Mass. Those who wish to re-establish the doctrine of the Mass within the Church of England will have gone far towards their end when the Vestments which the Roman Church uses in the service of the Altar are permitted by law within the Church of England. As we repudiate the doctrine, we must oppose the Vestments with which it is vitally associated.

The Scottish Church and Prayer-Book Revision.

The Provincial Synod of the Episcopal Church in Scotland meets this month to consider, among other matters, the recommendations of the Consultation Council on the revision of the Prayer-Book. The Council has prescribed a long list of suggestions. All the changes are to be permissive, and none of them are doctrinal. Some few could be objected to, some few seem unnecessary, and often we could wish the revision had gone further. If the Synod accepts them, the Scottish Church will

have done much to make her Prayer-Book fit the needs of twentieth-century worship. We refer to the matter here because there is a widespread fear in England lest Prayer-Book revision should lead to a change of the doctrinal balance and to revolutionary alterations. Evangelicals are a negligible quantity in the Church of Scotland, and yet the changes are such that no Evangelical, *qua* Evangelical, can take objection to them. If such a happy solution be possible in Scotland—and we hope it may be—why should it not be equally possible in England, where Evangelical Churchmanship can make itself felt? We feel convinced that, as Evangelicals, we can welcome and take our part in securing a moderate and well-considered revision of our Book of Common Prayer.

Nonconformists and Holy Communion.

As the Churches draw closer together questions of importance demand discussion. Amongst them is the question as to the meaning of the rubric which demands Confirmation as a *sine qua non* for sons and daughters of the Church of England before admission to Holy Communion. By many that rubric is regarded as rigidly exclusive, and they are glad that it is so; many fear that it is exclusive, and wish it were not so. In the *Spectator* for April 1, Canon Hensley Henson examines the history of the rubric, and shows that it had nothing to do with Nonconformity. He quotes Bishop Creighton, who wrote that the rubric "was framed for normal cases, and did not contemplate the case of Nonconformists." He tells us that Archbishop Benson held the same view, and quotes Archbishop Tait's reply to a memorial signed by a large number of clergy in 1870, expressing "their grief and astonishment at the admission, in Westminster Abbey, to the Blessed Sacrament of teachers of various sects, openly separate from our Communion." The Archbishop wrote as follows:

"Some of the memorialists are indignant at the admission of any Dissenters, however orthodox, to the Holy Communion in our Church. I confess that I have no sympathy with such objections. I consider that the interpretation which these memorialists put upon the rubric to which they appeal, at the end of the Confirmation service, is quite untenable. As at

present advised, I believe this rubric to apply solely to our own people, and not to those members of foreign or dissenting bodies who occasionally conform. All who have studied the history of our Church, and especially of the reign of Queen Anne, when this question was earnestly debated, must know how it has been contended that the Church of England places no bar against occasional conformity" ("Life of A. C. Tait," by Davidson and Benham, third edition, vol. ii., p. 71).

The true position seems to be this: For our own children, and for those who wish to join our communion, the Church's rule is Confirmation. Of those who are occasionally our guests we need make no such demand. Canon Hensley Henson has done good service in again calling attention to the facts—facts the due observance of which will help the cause of Christian charity, and, sooner or later, of Ecclesiastical unity.

Party Politics and Social Reform.

The Shop Hours Bill has been passing through Parliament. Those who are inclined to despair of Parliament because of the rigour of our party system can take heart on occasions like this. Parliament was at its best. As in the case of the Children Act and the Coal Mines Bill, the Shops Bill was welcomed from all sides. Party spirit was absent and party ties forgotten. We know no politics in these pages; we dare to try and take each political question on its merits. But we welcome social reform; we are glad of such legislation as makes for the better and happier lives of our fellow-subjects; we are grateful, too, when a partisan newspaper like the *Daily News* can write as follows:

"The reception of the Bill has been really remarkable. There is undoubtedly on the Tory benches a spirit of co-operation with such social reforms which makes greatly for progress all round, and which could not have been more generously manifested than on the present most interesting occasion."

The Tory spirit of co-operation and the Radical recognition of it will alike make even greater progress possible.

Street Trading by Children.

We pointed out last month that Evangelical Churchmen, if they are true to their traditions, must take an active share in the attempt to grapple with the complexities of the social problem. We may go on

now to the further remark that the solution of any particular detail of this problem will require not only fervent good-will but a considerable quantity of very hard thinking. When we proceed to remedy one evil, there is always the risk of inflicting another and a greater one. This was made very apparent in the recent debate in the House of Lords on Lord Shaftesbury's Bill to amend the Employment of Children Act of 1903. With the general aim of the Bill there was the warmest sympathy on both sides of the House. But with regard to the clause forbidding boys under seventeen and girls under eighteen to trade in the streets, there was a disposition to plead for reconsideration. It was felt that the jump from the age of eleven to that of seventeen was a large one. It was pointed out by Lord Salisbury and others that to thousands of poor families living near the starvation margin the withdrawal of the 3s. or 4s. a week brought in by newspaper-selling would mean appalling disaster. It was hardly fair to forbid street trading to their children without the provision of some other more suitable employment. We sincerely trust that this Bill will be the basis of future legislation which will be not only prohibitory but remedial in character.

Anglo-American Arbitration.

We feel that we should be guilty of deep ingratitude if we did not take the earliest opportunity of expressing our heartfelt appreciation of the noble attempt now being made by President Taft and Sir Edward Grey to bring about a state of permanent peace between England and the United States. We cherish no illusory hopes of a corresponding alteration in the European situation. The recent speech of the German Chancellor is destructive of any such golden dreams. Nor do we wish to hurry matters by pleading for a defensive alliance. But that England and America should join hands firmly in a general arbitration treaty, in a pledge that, being brothers, however much they may differ, they will not fight, is a thing to be welcomed, to be worked for, and most earnestly prayed for. We can only trust

that the two statesmen who have taken the lead in this matter may be enabled to feel, by convincing and overwhelming manifestations, that they have behind them the whole force of the best public opinion in their respective countries. We can conceive of no grander memorial of the Coronation Year, no event more rich in augury for the happier welfare of the whole world, than that the two great nations, with their common heritage of religion, of birth, of literature and speech, should commit themselves in perpetuity to a league of friendship and good-will.

Welsh Disestablishment.

A Bill for the Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Church in Wales is promised by the Government for next year. English Churchmen, therefore, should not only inform themselves about the history and progress of the Church in Wales, but should do their best to spread the information to their fellow-electors. This is a question for English Churchmen as well as for those in Wales. The Archbishop of Canterbury struck the proper note of urgency in his letter to the Central Church Defence and Instruction Committee:

> "We must unhesitatingly support our Welsh brethren in the impending struggle, because we believe that the retention of the solemn trust and special responsibility which is theirs is a bounden duty, and because we also believe that the principles for which we contend are righteous, and are of incalculable and enduring benefit to the whole people of the land."

The Swansea School Case.

Contention is in itself an unpleasant thing. But when, as in the case of our opposition to Welsh Disestablishment and Disendowment, we believe that "the principles for which we contend are righteous," we have no right to shirk the conflict. And we are not so pessimistic as to suppose that causes championed by the Church of England are of necessity foredoomed to failure. The recent decision of the House of Lords in the Swansea School Case is sufficient to dissipate any such gloomy apprehensions. Because the local education authority of that city could not agree on various points with the managers of the Oxford Street School,

they hit on the paltry device of punishing these stubborn managers through the teachers. The unfortunate teachers were to be paid less than those of the same standing in undenominational schools, and, further, were to be deprived of the regular increase of salary enjoyed by other teachers. The Board of Education was appealed to, but would give no help. The managers, undaunted, stuck to their guns. The case was taken to a Divisional Court, to the Court of Appeal, and, finally, to the House of Lords. At every stage the judicial decision has been in favour of the managers, and the highest Court in the land has decided that the Board of Education must be impartial, and that no unfair discrimination must be made between the two classes of schools. This verdict is a trumpet-call to Churchmen. It bids them fight with confidence, for there is still the reasonable hope that right may win.

Bishop Ridley and Bishop Stuart.

Our readers will probably, for the most part, be familiar with the main outlines of the lives of the two missionary heroes who have recently passed to their rest—Bishop Stuart and Bishop Ridley. Their lives did not bulk largely in the eyes of Englishmen, for they were chiefly spent in strenuous, unobtrusive work abroad. Whether we think of Bishop Ridley's twenty-five years among the Indians in the wilds of New Caledonia or of Bishop Stuart's gallant entrance on new work in Persia, forty-four years after his ordination, we are constrained to wonder at the tireless energy, the dauntless determination, and, above all, the sublime faith in which these gallant heroes pursued their appointed task. Their example is an inspiration, and—may we say it?—something of a reproach to younger men on whom the mantle of these veterans must fall. We often hear to-day that the England of our generation is lacking in the sense of discipline, the power of sacrifice, the capacity for strenuous service, which enabled our forefathers to rear the fabric of the Empire. The lives of Bishop Stuart and Bishop Ridley are a call to us—a call to emulation in loyal and passionate devotion to our common Lord.

The Ministry of the Word and Sacraments.

By the Right Rev. J. W. DIGGLE, D.D.,
Lord Bishop of Carlisle.

(*Concluded from p.* 264.)

I HAVE limited myself thus far mainly to an examination of the Ordinal as an evidence of the loyalty of the Church of England to the guidance of Scripture in her assignment of the relative values and the true proportion of the ministry of the Word and Sacraments respectively. The Ordinal, however, is only a sample of the entire Book of Common Prayer in this respect. In every other part of the book a like proportion is maintained. No exception can be found to this rule. The rubrics require that Morning and Evening Prayer, with their appointed Psalms, shall be said daily throughout the year. The calendar appoints four portions of Holy Scripture to be read daily. But nowhere does the Prayer-Book require, or even suggest, that there shall be a daily administration of the Holy Communion. It requires, indeed—and this we may consider the minimum, not the ideal, of obligation—that every parishioner shall communicate at least three times a year, of which Easter shall be one. It forbids a Communion except four (or three at the least) communicate with the priest. It does not even command, though it by no means forbids, a celebration of the Lord's Supper every Sunday and holy day, as is manifest from the first rubric after the Order for Administration. It certainly never contemplates a celebration without a sermon, the rubric being very distinct that after the Nicene Creed shall (not may) follow the sermon. Even in the Collects the prayer for the right use of the Holy Scriptures goes before the prayer for the ministers and stewards of Christ's mysteries. And although I am far from thinking that these mysteries do not include the Sacraments, yet I remember that in the New Testament the word "mystery" is never applied to the Sacraments, but to such marvellous revelations, once hidden, but in Christ unfolded,

as the manifestations of God in the flesh, His justification in the Spirit,[1] the witness of angels, the Gospel for the Gentiles, the faith of the heathen, the Ascension into glory. And it is in this large sense of "mystery" that the Collect for the Third Sunday in Advent would seem to use the word, seeing that the drift of its petitions is that the hearts of the disobedient may be turned to the wisdom of the just. The Baptist, by his preaching, was ordained to prepare the way for the First Coming of the Lord; and Christian ministers, by their preaching, are ordained to prepare the way for His Second Coming. And as in the Collects, so everywhere in the Prayer-Book. The sufficiency of the Scriptures takes precedence of the sufficiency of the Sacraments. The reception of the Sacraments is of immense importance, but the knowledge and obedience of the Word have an importance still more immense. We dishonour not the Scriptures alone, but the Sacraments also, by preferring the latter above the former, seeing that all things are dishonoured if not given their rightful place; and neither Scripture nor the Prayer-Book seems to me to admit of any doubt as to the relative position Divinely assigned to the ministry of the Word and Sacraments in the Church of Christ.

How far some of the branches of that Church have discarded this Divinely-assigned proportion is a matter of common knowledge. In one branch an eikon is often more greatly treasured than a New Testament; in another the Scriptures are withheld in free and full measure from the private searchings of the people, while in the public services a mutilated Sacrament is adoringly worshipped; in another the Scriptures have much more than their rightful precedence, and the Sacraments much less than their rightful honour. Here and there the Sacraments, in contradiction to both Scripture and primitive Church history, are practically ignored. True Anglican Churchmen can regard none of these extremes as acceptable, or even tolerable, in their own Communion. Her way is the middle way, the Gospel way, the way of right pro-

[1] 1 Tim. ii. 16.

portion in both faith and worship, the way Divinely prepared in Holy Scripture and faithfully pursued in all her authentic offices and documents.

But many declare, and not without some show of evidence, that the Church of England is to-day in great danger of forsaking this ancient, historic middle way, and of disturbing, if not denying, the Divine proportion of the Gospel. They are asking: What means the cry for the elevation of the Holy Communion to the throne of central honour in the English Church—a throne not to be approached after a meal, a throne gorgeously illumined, a throne before which no prostration is too low and no ceremonial too high? What means this splendid apparel for the celebrant, this rich and soul-subduing music, these clouds of incense, this awful keeping back from the Table of the Lord of the non-communicating worshippers, this daring re-introduction of Jewish and medieval terms and practices, these manuals for the altar, this Sacrifice of the Mass, in the English Church? What means this utter reversal and overthrow of the Divine proportion allotted in the New Testament, and accepted throughout the Prayer-Book, to the ministry of the Word and Sacraments respectively; this notable magnifying of one Gospel Sacrament so loftily above the other, and this glorifying of both Sacraments above the ministry of the Word? Doubtless part of the meaning may be found in the influences of reaction from the carelessness and irreverence of former days, when both Sacraments were often administered with slovenliness and in a beggarly fashion, when the font was hidden in a corner and the pulpit obscured the Table of the Lord. But is this the whole, or even the chief, meaning?

If the modern movement had gone no farther than the education of Churchmen in due reverence for the Sacraments, all men would have had good cause to be thankful. It is unquestionably meet and right that these blessed institutions of our Lord should be administered with impressive reverence and received with profound and grateful humility. No ceremonial

can be too solemn for their honour; no reverence too profound for their worthiness, so long as it is not destructive of the inspired proportion of Gospel faith and Gospel worship. But these modern innovations, these returns to the customs of unscriptural ages, are altogether destructive of that proportion. They put first what Christ and His Apostles put second, and second (if not lower) what they put first. And it is impossible to hope that anything but evil, either for Church or nation, can be the ultimate issue of such a reversal of the revealed proportion and Divine relation of the ministry of the Word to that of the Sacraments.

Sometimes it is pleaded as a justification of this ornate and æsthetic exaltation of the Holy Communion that the Sacred Supper was the only ordinance instituted by Christ Himself and of which He was a partaker. Assuming this to be the case, it yet by no means follows that the ministry of the Holy Communion takes precedence of the ministry of the Word, or has greater glory attached to it. Nowhere in the New Testament is such precedence allowed. Had that precedence been Christ-given, it is incredible that the Apostles and Evangelists in their writings and habits should have overlooked or neglected it. Yet we find the Apostles giving themselves up continually to prayer and the ministry of the Word.[1] In none of the inspired narratives are they recorded as giving themselves up to the ministry of the Sacraments. Far otherwise, as I have in this paper previously shown. The Pentecostal converts, indeed, were daily praising God in the Temple and breaking bread at home, or from house to house.[2] And we know from Pliny's rescript that this "breaking of bread together" was a recognized sign of membership in the Christian society. Would, indeed, that it were a more frequent—yea, universal—sign to-day! But there is no trace of this "breaking of bread," assuming it to be identical with the commemoration of the Supper, taking precedence of the ministry of the Word; otherwise Apostles would unquestionably have so taught and so practised.

[1] Acts vi. 4. [2] Acts ii. 46.

Moreover, if the presence of the Saviour be the ground on which precedence be accorded to the Communion, then what of fasting Communion and Communion in the evening? He instituted the Sacrament after supper.[1] It was "as they were eating" that Jesus took bread and said, "This is My body," and took the cup, saying, "This is My blood of the new testament." Neither the Saviour nor His Apostles at the first institution communicated fasting; nor did those of a later day, as the corruptions in the Corinthian Church testify.[2] Again, the original institution was at night, and if the breaking of bread at Emmaus be (as its illuminating results seem to warrant us in supposing it was) an administration of the Sacred Supper by our risen Lord Himself, then we know that that was in the evening also.[3]

Would it not be as reasonable to infer that because our Lord instituted His Supper in the evening and as His Apostles were eating, therefore all morning or fasting Communions are contrary to Scripture, as that because our Lord Himself instituted the Supper, therefore its administration takes precedence of the ministry of the Word? That He instituted the Supper makes the Supper Divinely sacred. It also justifies the Church in surrounding its administration with glory and honour, and in lifting it high above all materialistic considerations of food and time; but it is no justification for, according to that Sacrament, ascendancy over the Word. The Church has authority over rites and ceremonies, but it has no authority to make secondary that which the whole New Testament makes primary, or primary that which neither Christ nor His Apostles so exalted. In her Book of Common Prayer the Church of England loyally builds all her ministrations on the foundation-rock of the Apostles and Prophets, not on the shifting sands of Judaizing priests, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief Corner-Stone; and on no other foundation can either the Christian society or the Christian individual be safe and strong.

[1] St. Matt. xxvi. 26, 27. [2] 1 Cor. xi. 20 *et seq.*
[3] St. Luke xxiv. 29.

This sacerdotal inversion of the Divine order in these great matters seems to me the gravest peril of the Church of England at the present day. It is not a small and accidental peril, but a peril vast and fundamental. No Church can be truly catholic, as I believe the Church of England is, which is not patient of great diversities in subsidiary matters. A catholic Church must have a catholic mind and a catholic heart. It must be the patron of a large liberty, the friend of all truth, the example of the highest love. A Church cannot be catholic and narrow. Neither can it be catholic and stationary. The world moves because it is a living world. The Church must move also or it will die. An historic Church rightly appeals to the past; a living Church works in the present; a Christian Church has visions of the future. But past history is to be the guide of the Church, not her domineering despot. The Church is the Bride of the living Lord, not the bond-slave of obsolete traditions. And so the Church has full right—a right inherent in all vitality and health—to adapt herself to her environment. It is a small thing to us now that the early Christians broke bread from house to house, and that they had no music or liturgical forms at their administrations of the Holy Supper. We are not in their case. Their customs would not suit either our age or our circumstances; therefore we preserve them not. We prescribe our own, and we prescribe them with much diversity; for the absence of diversity in customs, as in gifts, suited to the varying needs of men, is a sign of the absence of the Holy Ghost. Dead things are uniform. Where there is life there is also variety. You may make machines all on one pattern, but not men. Skulls have more of a common likeness than souls. And so where life is, and especially Divine life, there of necessity is diversity. This diversity is part of the glory of the English Church, one sign and seal of the dwelling within her of the Holy Ghost, the Author and Giver of her life.

But this full and free diversity in customs, usages, forms of worship, and the like, does not reach to essentials. We cannot change the essentials of our Christian faith, or their respective

values as they have been revealed to us. One of these essentials is the supreme authority of the teachings of Christ and His Apostles; another is the necessity and benefit of the Holy Sacraments. These are unchangeable and never obsolete. And so also is their relation to each other, the Scriptures being primary, the Sacraments secondary. Neither our Lord nor His Apostles ever laid the same stress on the Sacraments as on the Scriptures; and the Christian Church has no power, no authority, to take the stress from where they laid it and lay it where they laid it not.

If the relative positions of the Word and Sacraments were mere matters of custom, they would be rightly regarded as changeable; but their true proportion is not merely customary; it is fundamental to the integrity and progress of the Christian faith. Experience confirms revelation in this matter. For there is no instance in any age of a Church remaining true or strong which has reversed this relative order. The Greek Church has reversed this order—at least, partially; and where is the renovating, converting influence of that Church to-day? The Roman Church has wholly reversed it, and by the reversion has opened the flood-gates of error and made plain the downward path of priestcraft. Almost every new day beholds a new diminution of the influence of the Papacy upon intelligent religion and religious intelligence, a new revolt against the usurpation by a superstitious sacramentalism of the supreme authority belonging to the Word of God—a revolt which, alas! though not unnaturally, finds not infrequent expression in hostility to religion of every kind. And signs are not wanting of the same kind of Nemesis dogging the heels of over-sacramentalism in the English Church to-day. I was in an Anglican church not long ago where one of these so-called Masses was being celebrated with all the pomp wherewith vestments and music and incense could magnify it. There must have been not fewer than four hundred persons in that church, and, excluding the clergy and choir, there were only six men besides myself. I am constantly hearing the same story. Earnest,

intelligent, spiritual men tell me they simply cannot go to church, because what they see and hear drags them down instead of lifting them up spiritually. It appeals to their senses, but leaves their reason numb and their spirits cold. Multitudes still go for the sake of their wives and families, for old sake's sake, for the sake of example to others, and, above all, because they desire to worship God in the public assembly. But the strain is growing very great, especially in country parishes where there is no choice of churches. Under the influence of this strain some are drifting to Nonconformity, some to private worship at home, and many more to week-end festivities and the non-observance of Sunday altogether. It is a deplorable state of things, but it is an inevitable result of over-sacramentalism. Man cannot invert the ways of God and not suffer for the inversion, however well-meant and sincere his object in the inversion may be. He cannot over-elevate the Sacraments without doing injury to the Word; he cannot under-estimate the Word without doing injury to the Sacraments; he cannot put either in the rightful place of the other without doing injury to both.

There, perhaps, never was an age which stood so sorely in need of the jealous maintenance of the Divine proportion between the ministry of the Word and Sacraments as the present. It is an age which, for the sake of the Sacraments themselves, needs better and truer and more constant instruction in the Word; for the Sacraments always revert to superstitions unless they are vitalized and their uses constantly unfolded by the teaching of the Word. Men need to feel their need of a Saviour before they can rightly value the blessings of the Sacraments. They who love the Saviour will generally love His Sacraments also. But the great office of the ministry of the Word is the conviction of sin and the setting forth of the Saviour. Let this, then, come first, according to the appointment of God. Let this be the central mission of the Church, and all the rest will, under God, duly follow. But make a Sacrament, apart from the Word, the central service, and both Saviour and

Sacrament will be losers thereby. Imminent danger lurks in the desire to have a costlier dress for the celebrant than the preacher; it is a visible sign of the disordering of the Divine order. It was a wise and true proposal made by the Royal Commission, and supported by Convocation, in 1870, that the same vestments should be worn in administering the Sacraments as in all the other services of the Church. What those vestments should be is a matter of secondary moment; the paramount requirement is that they should be the same for all services, or at least that the Holy Communion should not by any special dress or ornaments or other accompaniments be exalted above the Holy Word.

Half a century ago Dr. Pusey deprecated the introduction of Eucharistic vestments—"handsome dresses," he called them, tending "to make an idol of self while seeming to honour God and His Church." During that half-century many things have happened to make the caution far more imperative now than then. What the Church of England sorely needs to-day is not more "handsome dresses" for her clergy, but more clergy for whom the Word of God is a lamp to their feet and a light to their path—clergy who know their Bible, both in its text and its spirit, in whom its fires burn through to the very marrow of their ministry; not professional or seminarist clergy, but clergy human in feeling, enlightened in thought, spiritual in heart and will, enthusiastically devoted to the glory of God and the service of man. Such clergy can best discharge, in dependence on the Holy Ghost, the ministry of God's Holy Word and Sacraments for the redemption of mankind.

In conclusion, I would desire to strike the same note with which I began. Both the ministry of the Word and Sacraments is essential to the life and power of a Christian Church. No glory too great can be given to the Sacraments so long as their Divine relation to the Word is not disturbed, the Word taking precedence of the Sacraments, and the Sacraments, as in the ministry of Christ and His Apostles, upholding the Word. Neither can the priesthood of the Christian ministry be too

highly magnified so long as it is a true catholic, Apostolic Christian priesthood—not an obsolete Judaizing, sacerdotalizing priesthood. It is the high and glorious office of the Christian priest to be the ordained representative of God to man and of man to God; but, except in this sense of setting forth to men the Sacrifice of the Saviour, once for all offered and incapable of repetition, and of offering the prayers and praises and gifts of men to God, he is not a priest. Even in this limited sense his prophetic takes precedence of his priestly office. This was the Divine order in New Testament times; it is the order of the Church of England to-day; and any attempt to overthrow this order, however unconscious—yea, well-intentioned the action of the overthrowers may be, is nothing less than to unchristianize the Church and to Judaize the Gospel.

Historical Records and Inspiration.

By the Rev. C. F. RUSSELL, M.A.,
Fellow of Pembroke College, Cambridge.

IN a recent article[1] in the CHURCHMAN the opinion was asserted that the "essentials of Evangelicalism" do not involve any one particular attitude towards the modern criticism of the Bible. While this doctrine is as intelligible as it is acceptable to many persons, there are others who deny its soundness altogether. Quite recently circumstances have combined to force this divergence of opinion into prominence. At the Islington Clerical Meeting last January two papers were read in which the opposite position was maintained, and it was urged, in effect, that "Higher Critic" and "Evangelical" were contradictory terms. The representative character of the Islington meeting in relation to the Evangelical school of thought in the Church of England is generally recognized; and consequently

[1] "The Essentials of Evangelicalism," by the Rev. F. S. Guy Warman, in the CHURCHMAN for October, 1910, pp. 750-758. See especially p. 751.

it was felt by many persons that it would be a disaster if such statements were allowed to go forth unchallenged. A short letter of protest was therefore sent to the *Record* newspaper, and at once the flood-gates of controversy were opened. A voluminous correspondence ensued, which was read, probably, by many readers of this article. The present writer has no intention of repeating here what was said in the *Record* by various correspondents to show the reasonableness of Biblical criticism. But consideration of the matter, and conversations on more than one occasion, have convinced him that on one particular point of the dispute there is much confusion of thought — and that not on one side only; and he desires in this paper to dispel the misconception which is responsible for it. Even though the dispute will not thereby be terminated, it is at least possible that it may be conducted with a clearer understanding of the opposing views, and of that in which the opposition really consists.

One of the two Islington papers referred to was read by the Rev. W. T. Pilter, and the greater part of it consisted in an examination of certain points in the Graf-Wellhausen reconstruction of Old Testament history. The reader of the paper arrived at the conclusion that the reconstruction was false, and there is no need whatever to depreciate the importance of the evidence which he adduced to prove his case; indeed, for the sake of avoiding side-issues, we will assume throughout this paper that the proof was complete. But Mr. Pilter was not satisfied with doing this; he regarded his refutation of this particular critical theory as relevant to the assertion that the Higher Criticism was itself untrue in idea. The fact that he did so, combined with the fact that a large number in his audience evidently agreed with him, shows that no sufficient distinction is drawn between the method of criticism and its more or less widely accepted conclusions. As a matter of fact, it is an entire mistake to suppose that those who thankfully welcome, as from God, the fuller light which modern criticism has shed upon the Bible are thereby pledged to admit all those

results in which some would think Higher Criticism to consist. However widely a particular reconstruction of Scriptural history may be accepted by critics, they would all agree that it was not in that reconstruction that criticism consisted, nor by it that the true worth of their work should be judged; rather, they would say that what they valued most in the new learning was the attitude which it adopted towards the problem of the Bible, and the method of investigation it employed; and they would maintain that this attitude and this method must be clearly differentiated from the particular results reached by particular men.

Perhaps the answer will be made that this may very well be true, and if so, all that is necessary is to change the Islington notation. It is all a question of words. Let us understand Mr. Pilter as condemning certain conclusions of the Higher Critics, and not the Higher Criticism itself, and then we shall at last be agreed.

But if this reply is given, it is an unreflecting one. The dispute is not, in fact, one about words merely. If it were so, it would have been discovered long ago, and this article would not have been written. The instinctive conviction of both sides in the controversy that something more than words is involved is not a mistaken one; and we shall find, if we look a little deeper, that the disagreement is still as profound as before. Those who would seek to win agreement by a concession of this kind would thereby unwittingly betray the cause of many of their conservative friends.

If we would trace the divergence to its source, we must go right back to a fundamental difference of belief as to the meaning of inspiration. But before we consider even this difference, let us acknowledge the common element in the belief which we all alike share. All Christians are agreed that we have in the Bible the writings of men who were "moved by the Holy Ghost"; and that in consequence it teaches us, with Divine authority, the truth about God and man, about salvation and sin. But they differ among themselves in this—that while some believe the effect of inspiration to be manifested by moral and

spiritual insight into the deep things of God, others believe that the effect extended to the details of the utterance in such a way that statements of physical and spiritual matters are equally attested by the Holy Spirit.

In opposition to this latter view, the Christian critic sees the inspiration of the sacred writers in the fact that, taught by God, they perceived the true meaning of man's life in relation to the unseen. To them the material world revealed, not concealed, the spiritual; they saw God Himself active in history and in the ordinary life of men, where other people saw no more than chance and natural force and human action; they read the verdict of His approval or disapproval in earthly success or disaster, whether individual or national. They knew that His righteousness must ultimately triumph over all its foes, and so they could denounce sin with magnificent courage, and foretell its punishment with absolute confidence. Thus they delivered the message of God to their time, and to all time; and, whether they were speaking words of exhortation or reproof, or were interpreting the significance of historical events, they were taught, moved, inspired by the Divine Spirit of Truth.

It should be added that the Christian critic does not expect to find all these marks of inspiration present in every Biblical writing in the same degree, and hence it offers no difficulty to him to find that there are places from which some are absent. He believes that man's knowledge of God has been gradually increased under the guidance of His Spirit, and has passed through stages of greater or less imperfection. Indeed, who will say that our knowledge is perfect even now? Do we not still "see in a mirror, darkly"? When, therefore, to take an example, he reads in the song of the children of Israel, after the destruction of the Egyptians in the Red Sea, such words as "Who is like unto Thee, O Lord, among the gods?" and finds the Israelites ascribing a real existence to heathen deities, and only a national authority to Jehovah, he is at no pains to explain away the obvious meaning of the passage, or discover for it some non-natural interpretation.

Now, it is plain that such a view as this, which sees the evidence of the Holy Spirit's influence in profound religious and moral insight, will regard the historical details of the narrative as vouched for only by the ordinary care and intelligence of the writer. But—and here we come to a point which is seldom grasped by the opponents of Biblical criticism—this is not to say that the narrative is necessarily unhistorical! Apparently Mr. Pilter regards the Higher Critics as bound, by their first principles, to assert that Biblical history is untrue; otherwise he could scarcely have thought it worth while to prove its truthfulness *as a means of demonstrating that their first principles are wrong*. What he said would have been both relevant and convincing if there were no such thing as historical accuracy apart from inspiration; as the case stands, it was neither. We do not necessarily call in question the truthfulness of Bede or Professor Gwatkin when we deny that their statements of fact have Divine authority. This is, indeed, a distinction of the greatest importance. The principle of criticism is not that the Scriptural history is untrue, but only that its truth must be considered apart, and is not to be regarded as guaranteed by the fact that it was employed to convey teaching from the mind of God. We may gladly admit that the initial presumption is entirely in favour of the trustworthiness in detail of all godly and sensible men, whether now or in the past, and no light considerations will induce us to give up our belief in it; and yet we shall maintain that inspiration and historical infallibility are unconnected.

May we not illustrate this view by the case of a Christian preacher in our own day? Let us suppose that he emphasizes a spiritual lesson by an incident from past or present history. To fix ideas, let us imagine that he is urging the duty of living in constant watchfulness for the coming of Christ, and that he illustrates his message by considering the case of a railway accident. Shall we not believe that he is guided by the Holy Ghost? And shall we cease to think so the next day, because we read in the morning paper that the number of persons killed

was one less than he had said? Will reverence compel us to say that "the Holy Spirit could not have taught through lies"? And even if lapse of memory, and not insufficient knowledge, was the cause of our friend's mistake, shall we be the less indulgent? Is there not a danger lest we should be "guilty of an eternal sin"?

Moreover, if it be claimed that the cases are different, in that this man is not inspired in the way that the Biblical writers were, we cannot admit the evasion. For we might assume, for argument's sake, that the action of the Holy Ghost was of an altogether different kind in the two cases, and yet it would remain true that both these "worketh the one and the same Spirit, dividing to each one severally even as He will." If we cannot believe that He could teach men of old apart from infallible statements of fact, then neither must we believe it of the present. Now, as much as then, we should be compelled to ask, "Can the Spirit of Truth use an untruthful man to convey His message?"

Another more brief illustration will apply to the modern view of the early chapters of Genesis, which sees in them the sanctification of early myths which gave an account of the origin of the world, and man, and sin. It is said by certain people that the religious value of the narrative would be lost to them if they came to think that not everything had actually happened in the way described. Yet has no one, for example, ever enforced the need of purity of heart in those who would attain to the vision of God by the story of Sir Galahad and the Holy Grail? And is that illustration of no value except to those who imagine that it is true?

To sum up what has been said so far, the critics do not start from the assumption that the Bible is necessarily unhistorical. They only maintain that the opposite theory is false which would have us believe that it is necessarily correct in every detail, simply because it is inspired. It may be thus correct, or it may not; and whichever it is, its inspiration is not thereby affected. They claim that the value of the historical record

should be examined and appraised by the methods of ordinary historical research.

As soon as this is understood, it will be perceived what a strange waste of time, from the point of view of Mr. Pilter's main purpose, was his proof that the Biblical history was correct. Of course, from another point of view, when regarded by itself, it was both interesting and valuable; for to test the ancient records by the light of archæological discovery is one part, and a very important part, of the historical method. But how is it possible that an inquiry into the matter, just because its result is to establish the historicity of the narrative, should be thought to refute the Higher Criticism, of which, as we have seen, the fundamental principle is that such inquiry is necessary?

It may be said, moreover, that from the conservative point of view such a method of procedure is an extraordinary tactical blunder. So long as it was maintained that the complete trustworthiness of the Scriptures was involved in their inspiration, so that no further test was required, the position was at least secure, for it had ruled science and history out of court. But when Mr. Pilter continues to maintain that trustworthiness, while yet he regards the evidence of archæology as admissible, he has departed from that impregnable position, and taken up a new one which is fraught with extreme danger. Henceforth it is needful that he should always be able to prove that modern research substantiates the Biblical story; and as soon as a single discrepancy is proved, his position is untenable. To put the matter otherwise, Mr. Pilter has made his case depend on his ability to prove a universal negative by means of an examination of particular instances, and any such attempt is foredoomed to failure; in the opinion of those people who cannot shut their eyes to the existence of contradictions—not merely of difficulties—in the Bible, even the time for making the attempt is past.[1]

[1] It may be worth while to point out the futility of attempting to get rid of all such contradictions by assuming that they are due to textual errors, so that if only the true text could in all cases be reached, no contradictions would remain. It is, of course, obvious that some contradictions are to be accounted for in this way; *but when this is put forward as a means of defending*

If, however, we need not concern ourselves further with this tactical error in the conservative defence, we are bound to emphasize what has been said above—that in his attack on the Higher Criticism Mr. Pilter completely fails. For the Higher Criticism does not consist in certain results, but in certain principles and methods; it does not affirm that the Bible is untrue, but only that its historical value is a legitimate subject for investigation. We may even turn the tables on Mr. Pilter, and tell him that the valuable part of his paper is that in which he is himself a Higher Critic. It is true that his conclusions differ widely from those of the Graf-Wellhausen school; and with this school he has a just quarrel, but it is not because they are critics. He agrees with them in the reasonableness of investigation; he agrees with them, for the most part, even in the evidence which he admits; he differs from them only in his estimate of the worth of the several parts of the evidence.

Now, there is really an immense difference between the position of a man who, after applying such a critical examination to the Scriptures, arrives at the conclusion that they are accurate historically, and that of one who adheres to the older view. For that older view was not simply that the Bible *is* true, but—what is quite different—that the Bible *must be* true; while the principles of criticism deny, not the former assertion, but only the latter; they contradict, not "*is*," but "*must be*." And hence it is a most foolish misstatement that is often made by the opponents of critical methods when they tell us that the tendency of the latest research is to establish again the old con-

---

the entire inerrancy of Scripture, it proves too much. For what is the value to us of an inerrant text which we no longer possess? How can we be sure that we have such a text, even where there is no contradiction to rouse our suspicions? It is plain that such a position is logically open to precisely the same attack as that which Mr. Pilter brought against the Higher Criticism: "It needs an expert to tell us how much of the Old Testament is authentic and reliable!"

For desperateness, such a position is a serious rival to that to which many modern defenders of papal infallibility have been driven. As it is undeniable that Popes have differed in the past, we are asked to believe that the Pope is infallible only when he speaks *ex cathedrâ;* but further inquiry elicits the information that it is quite impossible to tell in any given instance whether he is speaking *ex cathedrâ* or not!

servative position, and that a complete return to it is, indeed, only a question of time. Such a statement is utterly untrue. It fails absolutely to comprehend the facts. For, assuming it to be the case that modern scholars are more inclined than they once were to pronounce judgment in favour of the historical veracity of the Bible, it is still a "judgment" which they pronounce, and is based upon the examination of evidence. The old belief, that such an examination is unnecessary because the Bible "must be" true in detail, has disappeared for ever from the presuppositions of scholars. So that, even if we admit that the most extreme critical conclusions are being given up, yet this only allows us to say that the results of modern criticism are tending to coincide with beliefs which were formerly held on quite other grounds. This is as unlike a simple re-establishment of the old theory of inspiration as it can well be; for we have already pointed out more than once that it is in the method of working, and not in the conclusions reached, that the essence of the new learning consists. If only we would attend to principles, and not rely upon a mere superficial scrutiny of the conclusions to which they occasionally lead, we should perceive that the position of Dr. Orr or Mr. Harold Wiener is much less widely separated from that of Wellhausen or Professor Driver than it is from that of the Evangelicals of the early nineteenth century. Is not Mr. Pilter himself a witness to prove that this is so? For he disposes of the late date of the Priestly Code—how? By asserting that his view of inspiration compels him to ascribe its authorship to Moses? No; by seeking to show that an impartial investigation of the evidence does not lead to the conclusion of a late date after all.

We must return, finally, to what has been said at the beginning of this paper, and justify our assertion that all this is not mere verbal quibbling. Perhaps we shall still be told: "Very well; in the way that you understand the matter, we are all Higher Critics; and our quarrel is not with the Higher Criticism itself, but with the conclusions of particular exponents of it. We still regard these as inconsistent with Christian belief. And so what practical difference does it all make?"

We answer that the practical difference is enormous. It necessitates, indeed, a thorough reconsideration of their attitude by those who have been hitherto opposing the Higher Criticism; for their opposition has been dictated ultimately by their conviction that faith in the Gospel of Jesus Christ is jeopardized by the acceptance of critical results which do not consist with the absolute trustworthiness of the Old Testament records. But the truth is—and to prove it has been the one object of this paper—that in so far as any man's belief in Christ has anything at all to say on this question, it is with the principle of criticism that it is concerned. That is to say, such faith is inconsistent with the criticism of Cheyne and Driver precisely to the same degree as, and no more than, it is inconsistent with the criticism which is called conservative. If a truly Christian faith requires such a belief in inspiration as insures the infallibility of the Old Testament in every detail, then it cannot find room even for the criticism which establishes the historicity of the narrative; for such criticism, equally with the most extreme kind, starts from the principle that historical investigation may be legitimately applied to the Scriptures. And, on the other hand, if the Christian faith is compatible with such investigation at all, it cannot be less so when the results are "liberal." It is not the conclusion, but the method, which is crucial. Mr. Pilter is quite within his rights when he denounces the Graf-Wellhausen theory as unsound, or unscientific, or biassed in its admission and treatment of evidence. But the one thing which he may not do is this: he may not call it un-Christian. It can no more be un-Christian than can any other mistaken result of lawful scientific inquiry, as, for example, the early belief in the material nature of heat, or as to the real character of the teaching of Nestorius.

A whole-hearted faith in Christ can have nothing to say in regard to the results of the Higher Criticism as such; and, rightly viewed, it is not, after all, opposed to the historical method. Those to whom the meaning of inspiration is similar to that outlined above cannot but think that it is not only more reason-

able, but also more reverent, than the mechanical theory which is opposed to it; and it has the further advantage of being in harmony with all that we know of the action of the Holy Spirit in our own time and in our own experience. The faith of such persons is no whit less real and true than that of the older Evangelicals in the holiness and love of the Father, in the Incarnation of the Divine Son and the Atonement wrought by Him, in the personality and the power of the Holy Ghost, the Life-Giver. They perceive in the Bible—and all the more clearly because they are friendly to modern criticism—the supreme message from God to mankind; and they learn—and what comfort the lesson brings to them in these later days!—that He has sanctified the ordinary life of men and of nations to be the means of leading them ever onwards in the knowledge of His purposes, and of His love, and of Himself.

The Religious Philosophy of William James.

By the Rev. ALBERT WAY, M.A.,
Pusey House, Oxford.

I.

THE first of these two articles will be an attempt to give an account to the readers of the Churchman of the well-known American thinker who died some months ago—Professor William James, of Harvard. In the second we shall ask ourselves how far his method and conclusions are compatible with the religion which we believe.

He was a popular philosopher in the best sense of the word, a man who felt keenly the interest and importance of the deeper problems of life, and did his best to kindle the same interest in ordinary educated people by writing about philosophic subjects in a breezy, untechnical style. As he wrote he would have in his mind's eye before him an audience of typical American students of both sexes—keenly alert citizens of the modern

world, and fully alive to its religious questionings. For the most part, they would know very little indeed about either philosophy or religion, and would not be wedded to any particular religious organization; but religion is a subject about which they would be very anxious to learn to think intelligently, and they would be almost entirely free from the frigid scepticism of Continental Universities.

American students are not as a rule out-and-out unbelievers in religion, however vague their minds may be on such subjects. Religious observances and beliefs still figure largely in their social background, and practical religious activities—such as the student movement or the St. Andrew's Brotherhood—play so vigorous a part among them that religious convictions would never be waived aside with the airy incredulity of many a German lecture-room. And so, as he sat down to dash off his telling metaphors, and to remint the ideas of dryasdust academic thinkers into the crisp, direct language of the modern commercial world, Professor James saw before him the future leaders of American industry and social reform, to whom religious belief is still—to use his own phrase—"a living and momentous option" ("Will to Believe," p. 3), and who are quite ready to listen to anyone who will prove to them that it is not irrational.

It was his temperament, perhaps we may say, rather than any definite choice or training, which led him to this rôle of the popular philosopher. His intellectual training was first as a doctor and then as a psychologist, or expert student of human nature. He turned to philosophy proper more or less late in life, and his knowledge of the technicalities of philosophic systems was probably not very extensive. He was always more interested in people than in books, and many are the stories told of his often Quixotic kindness to individuals who came to him for help and advice. He had the keenest sympathy for human experience of every kind, and was tenderly sensitive to the tragic side of things. I once had the privilege of meeting him at his house, and in the course of conversation the very

distressing illness of some friend was mentioned. I shall always remember, as characteristic of the man, the way in which he turned to me with the comment, "What awful burdens many of our fellow-creatures do have to bear!" Thus he was the last man in the world to be blind to the strongest objective test of religious convictions—the power they can give to men of rising superior to pain.

His earlier works dealt with his own proper subject of psychology, and in this field he made several distinctly important contributions to science. But his powers lay always rather in popular exposition than in technical research, and possibly, as time goes on, he may come to be known only as the author of the famous "Textbook of Psychology," which is an abridgment of his larger work. This book ought to be read by anyone who wants to know how to think about and describe his own faculties and feelings. He had quite a marvellous power of putting inner states of consciousness into words. Take, for instance, this description, on p. 218, of a state of mind well known to everybody, which he calls "dispersed attention":

"Most of us probably fall several times a day into a fit like this: The eyes are fixed on vacancy, the sounds of the world melt away into confused unity, the attention is dispersed so that the whole body is felt, as it were, at once, and the foreground of consciousness is filled, if by anything, by a sort of solemn sense of surrender to the empty passing of time. In the dim background of our mind we know meantime what we ought to be doing: getting up, dressing ourselves, answering the person who has spoken to us, trying to make the next step in our reasoning. But somehow we cannot start: every moment we expect the spell to break, for we know no reason why it should continue. But it does continue, pulse after pulse, and we float with it, until —also without reason that we can discover—an energy is given, something—we know not what—enables us to gather ourselves together, we wink our eyes, we shake our heads. The background ideas become effective, and the wheels of life go round again."

Every trait in human nature was interesting to him, and he had a masterly power of showing the connection of any facts which he had observed in himself or other people with the theory or principle that was under discussion. Take this passage, for instance, from his chapter on "Will" (p. 447). He is remarking on the falsity of saying that pleasure is always

the motive of action. Our real motive very often, he says, is a kind of perverse attraction towards what is painful:

"In my University days a student threw himself down from an upper entry window of the college buildings, and was nearly killed. Another student, a friend of my own, had to pass the window daily in coming and going from his room, and experienced a dreadful temptation to imitate the deed. Being a Catholic, he told his director, who said: 'All right; if you must, you must!' and added, 'Go ahead and do it,' thereby instantly quenching his desire. This director knew how to minister to a mind diseased. But we need not go to minds diseased for examples of the occasional tempting-power of simple badness and unpleasantness as such. Everyone who has a wound or hurt anywhere—a sore tooth, *e.g.*—will ever and anon press it just to bring out the pain. If we are near a new kind of stink, we must sniff it again, just to verify once more how bad it is. This very day I have been repeating over and over to myself a verbal jingle, whose mawkish silliness was the secret of its haunting power. I loathed yet could not banish it."

The "Textbook of Psychology" was published in 1892, and since then he has come to be best known to ordinary readers by his excursions into the definitely religious sides of philosophy; the stimulating volume of lectures and essays called "The Will to Believe," 1896; his Gifford lectures on "The Varieties of Religious Experience," 1902; and "Pragmatism," 1907. In the last of these one can see the definite expression of a view of life which is just suggested in the first, and implied all through the second. During the later years of his life he was in very bad health, and he would probably have been the first to admit that he had not been able to do justice to the thoughts which he was struggling to express.

If he had lived longer, it is conceivable that his views on religion might have undergone very considerable change, and he certainly always writes as one whose mind is still open to convictions which he recognizes as real forces in other people, and which he would like to see able to justify themselves to philosophic thought. I have often wondered what the result on him would have been if he could ever have come into effective contact with such theologians as Westcott, Illingworth, Scott Holland, or Du Bose.

He frankly admitted that of mystical experiences he knew

nothing "from the inside." "My constitution shuts me out from their enjoyment almost entirely, and I can speak of them only at second-hand" ("Religious Experience," p. 379). And for himself he confessed his "inability to accept either popular Christianity or scholastic theism" (p. 521), and yet he always insisted that the possibility of the religious view of life being true could never be ruled out as inconceivable. He looked on it as not proven, and was inclined to say we must wait for fresh evidence. The following passage from the lecture on "Pragmatism and Religion" exposes his attitude with characteristic downrightness and vivacity. He is anxious to remove the impression that he has not done justice to religious conviction:

"On pragmatistic principles, if the hypothesis of God works satisfactorily in the widest sense of the word, it is true. Now, whatever its residual difficulties may be, experience shows that it certainly does work, and that the problem is to build it out and determine it so that it will combine satisfactorily with all the other working truths. I cannot start upon a whole theology at the end of this last lecture; but when I tell you that I have written a book on men's religious experience, which on the whole has been regarded as making for the reality of God, you will perhaps exempt my pragmatism from the charge of being an atheistic system. I firmly disbelieve myself that our human experience is the highest form of experience extant in the universe. I believe rather that we stand in much the same relation to the whole of the universe as our canine and feline pets do to the whole of human life. They inhabit our drawing-rooms and libraries; they take part in scenes of whose significance they have no inkling. They are merely tangents to curves of history, the beginnings and ends and forms of which pass wholly beyond their ken. So we are tangent to the wider life of things. . . . Pragmatism has to postpone dogmatic answer, for we do not know certainly which type of religion is going to work best in the long run. The various over-beliefs of men, their several faith ventures, are in fact what is needed to bring the evidence in" ("Pragmatism," p. 299).

This quotation leads me on naturally to an attempt to give a sketch of William James's general attitude towards all philosophical and theological questions, without going at all into the technicalities of the philosophical system called pragmatism with which his name is connected.

He never pretended to be putting forward a complete system of thought of any kind. He looked on himself rather as the leader of a revolt against methods in philosophy which

he felt have led professional thinkers only into blind alleys, and have made the ordinary educated man turn away from philosophy with disappointment and disgust. Pragmatism, he was always insisting, is primarily nothing but a method ("Pragmatism," p. 166); what we want, before we can do anything, is a new method, a shifting of the emphasis, a change in philosophy's centre of gravity. To put it shortly, we want to make people look forwards instead of backwards, and give up relying on ready-made systems of thought, concocted nobody knows how, in the past. Don't let us go on imagining, he says in effect, that we know how to deal with our experience, and judging every new fact simply by the measure of some old formula. We shall never make any progress that way. And we shall fail to do justice to our mental faculties, which are meant to grow and advance, just like everything else.

"In our cognitive, as well as in our active, life we are creative. We *add*, both to the subject and to the predicate part of reality. The world stands really malleable, waiting to receive its final touches at our hands. Like the kingdom of heaven, it suffers human violence willingly. Man *engenders* truths upon it. No one can deny that such a rôle would add both to our dignity and to our responsibility as thinkers. To some of us it proves a most inspiring notion. Signor Papini, the leader of Italian pragmatism, grows fairly dithyrambic over the view that it opens of man's divinely-creative functions" ("Pragmatism," p. 256).

Thus, in spite of the best intentions, he is inevitably led on from demanding a new method to the formulation of a new system, and by it he must of course be judged.

William James is climbing the mountain of life, as it were, in the company of a friend who prides himself upon his map-reading. When they come to a difficult place, the friend pulls out his map, buries his face in it, and pronounces that the correct path will be to the right. William James, meantime, has been looking about him.

"Oh, bother your beastly map!" he exclaims. "It's perfectly clear that the left-hand path leads up the mountain. Anyhow, let's go and try. After all, experiment is the only way to find the truth."

"Well, but the map says just the opposite," protests his friend.

"Then chuck the map away!" retorts the buoyant American. "I don't believe the fellow who made it had ever been up this mountain himself at all."

"The absolutely true," he says, "meaning what no further experience will ever alter, is that ideal vanishing-point towards which we imagine that all our temporary truths will some day converge. It runs on all-fours with the perfectly wise man, and with the absolutely complete experience: and, if these ideals are ever realized, they will all be realized together. Meanwhile we have to live to-day by what truth we can get to-day, and be ready to-morrow to call it falsehood" ("Pragmatism," p. 222).

The only test we have for deciding whether our views about things are "true" or not is whether they "work" satisfactorily in the long run.

Here, of course, we come upon the philosophical and epistemological controversy between the Pragmatists and the people whom James calls the Rationalists, and into that it is not the purpose of this article to enter. We have seen his general attitude of mind, however, clearly enough to be able now to understand the way in which he looked at religion.

Let us imagine him facing an audience such as we described above:

"You are not out-and-out materialists—I am quite sure of that. You are prepared to deal respectfully with the religious attitude towards life. You see through the folly of trying to dispose of religious melancholy and enthusiasm by a simple flourish of the word 'insanity,' and you intend to allow religious experiences to rank as real facts" (see "Varieties of Religious Experience," p. 10 *et seq.*). "But you probably are no more prepared than I am to accept any religious system as true in such a way as to argue deductively from it, and mould your own opinions and practice upon it. The truth is, we do not know about God in the way those old scholastics imagined we did, with their clear-cut definitions of His nature and their pompous descriptions of His attributes" (see "Varieties of Religious Experience," p. 430 *et seq.*).

"These attempts to draw up systems of religious knowledge have been the death of real religion. They have petrified men's minds, and made it almost impossible for them to enjoy real, spontaneous religious experience. What we want here, as in the theory of knowledge generally, is a new method that will unstiffen our theories and give us a more flexible way of thinking altogether" ("Pragmatism," p. 79).

"I want to start, then, by disarming your very natural prejudice against religious institutions and theological systems by frankly throwing them both overboard. Historically religion has invariably tended to ally itself with two wicked partners—the spirit of corporate dominion and the spirit of dogmatic dominion. The first has produced ecclesiastical, the second theological, bigotry, and these have alienated men's minds from religion altogether" ("Varieties of Religious Experience," p. 337).

"But these undesirable alliances do not invalidate the original individual experience of Divine help, and it is with this alone that we are concerned. Conversion and saintliness are facts from which we cannot and do not want to get away, however little we may understand them for ourselves. There are unfathomable potentialities of development in human souls, smouldering fires in the subconscious regions of our natures, which may at any moment break out into life. And when this happens, as times without number it has happened, a new type of human activity is produced, infinitely more attractive and powerful than the ordinary humdrum reasonable 'moral' person can ever show. No one who is not willing to try charity, to try non-resistance, as the saint is always willing, can tell whether these methods will or will not succeed. When they do succeed, they are far more powerfully successful than force or worldly prudence. These saintly methods of handling experience are nothing less than creative energies, and the practical proof which the saints give, that worldly methods can successfully be neglected and transcended, is the magic gift of religious experience to mankind" ("Varieties of Religious Experience," p. 357).

"Such men show us that they have a superior way of hand-

ling life to ours, and therefore it is simply absurd for us to tell them they are mistaken when they say that their power comes from belief in God. But we are not, on that account, obliged to believe that there can be only one right form of belief, any more than there is only one right kind of physical diet. Different men's constitutions require different kinds of stimulants, and all we can do is to observe what beliefs do affect different men in a satisfactory way, and draw a few provisional conclusions. After all, we are all of us only creatures of a day. We live from hand to mouth, from morning till evening, in our spiritual life, no less than in our physical life, and all our insights can be only provisional" ("Pragmatism," p. 223; "Varieties of Religious Experience," p. 333).

That would be a fair account, I think, of the way Professor James thought and spoke about religion; and we ought to be interested in it, because he has put into words just what multitudes of educated people are thinking all round us. His mind has been, as it were, the draw-net which has pulled up into view a great multitude of those fishes which our Lord has sent us Christians out to catch. To a very great extent, it is from people who have been interested in religious subjects by books like these that the Christian Church of the next generation has to be built.

What, then, are we going to say about it all? We shall certainly have to criticize it pretty severely, but first of all let us be clear about what is good in it. It is a new method of handling religious facts by a man who does not profess to be religious, and has no particular theological axe to grind. He is not wanting to "convert" people to faith or to atheism. He is a man of science, who wishes simply to observe, analyze, and appreciate the significance of the facts before him. And the facts he places before him are the fruits of religious faith in individual lives. He asks himself two questions about them: What value has all this religion for human life? and, What does it tell us about the unseen powers of the universe?

So long as he is dealing simply with the first question, I

think we feel that he is justified in his method, and that we have much to be grateful for in his work. The tree of faith, we have been taught, is to be known and judged by its fruits. We are bidden to commend ourselves to the consciences of those who are without, and it is a great help for once to meet an outsider who is so intelligent, and unbiassed, and sympathetic. The religious man, when he meets Professor James, feels he is going to have a fair hearing, and he is not disappointed. He is not asked, as so often happens when the outside world condescends to take an interest in Christianity, how many soup-kitchens he has started, and whether he has written a satisfactory textbook on metaphysics. "Religious institutions and theologies may be important," says this keen-eyed American doctor, "in their proper place, but they are not fundamental. What I want to know about is your own soul, and what difference your religion has made in your innermost personal life." We find ourselves challenged, that is, to give an account of our religion in regard to the things which we know to be really important: Has conversion been a reality to you? Does fresh light really stream in upon you through prayer? Has your new life produced the fruits of loving service?

And then, having listened to our story and looked us full in the face, this kindly specialist does not leave us to plead our own cause all by ourselves any more. He goes out to the world, and says: "No, these people are not mad, most noble Festus, but speak forth the words of truth and soberness. The products of religious faith are scientific facts in the fullest sense of the word."

So far he has invited the religious people to speak for themselves, and has allowed his mind to be impressed by their testimony; but when he passes on to his second question, he adopts a much less teachable attitude, and allows all kinds of unconscious prejudices to bias his judgment. "What can we learn from these facts about the unseen forces of the universe?" he asks, and to all intents and purposes his answer is, "Nothing." At the end of all this lifelong study of the work of God's Spirit

in the hearts of men, he seems to have come no nearer himself to a living faith in God, and he certainly has no creed to preach to his students. Religious people differ so widely, he concludes, in their ideas of God, and such different creeds all produce such excellent results, that we cannot say of any one set of beliefs, "This is the way: walk ye in it." They are all interesting, and, for those who accept them, all are valuable, but none are conclusive. And the consequence is that his books, in spite of his arguments for the reasonableness of the believing attitude of mind, are turning out a generation of young people interested in all creeds, but adherents of none, patronizing everybody else's ideas of God, but quite content to get along without any of their own. Professor James's new theological method has cut at the roots of all the old idea that there is such a thing as the revealed truth about God, and that belief in it is a duty. The consequence is, however far it may be from what he desired to do for his generation, that his works will prove, unless some writer of equal attractiveness and power is raised up to expose their deficiencies, the most terribly efficient ally of scepticism. We shall try to consider this more in detail in our second article.

(*To be continued*).

The Reflex Influence at Home of Missions Abroad.

By Mrs. ASHLEY CARUS-WILSON, B.A.

WE have long regarded Foreign Missions as having to do with the saving of the world; we are at last beginning to learn that they have to do with the saving of the Church also. This lesson is set forth clearly and frequently in Holy Scripture, though missed by many who read their Bibles regularly. It is writ large in the pages of church history, though it has often been obscured by the dust of controversy that envelopes ecclesiastical records. Why, for instance, did Greek Christianity become so weak in the seventh century,

when Latin Christianity was so strong? Why did Latin Christianity need Reformation in the sixteenth century? Why did Reformed Christianity fall so low in the eighteenth century? Because each looked only at its own things, not at the things of others, and each failed, therefore, to be an evangelizing force in the world. Indisputable is the conclusion of Professor Gustav Warneck, the historian of Missions, that "Missions are from the beginning a law of life in the Christian Church; a necessity for its own preservation, and therefore a self-evident duty."

We are told that the members of the Chaldean Church were amazed when they learned through the Archbishop of Canterbury's mission to them that they were not the only Christians in the world. Without their excuse of seclusion in mountain recesses, where all goes on to-day as it did in the days of the patriarchs, communities nearer home too often think and act as if there were no Christians outside their own parish or diocese or mother church, and no non-Christian fellow creatures in the world beyond. They suffer accordingly from an excessive solicitude for their own spiritual welfare, much as do certain friends of ours who devote themselves so constantly to the care of their health that they have little health left to take care of.

No Church is more vitally and intimately concerned with this matter than the Church of England, which, as a national church, is inevitably responsible for vast territories outside Christendom, and under the rule of our Sovereign. It is faced, not in one but in many parts of the globe, by the crucial question: Are we going to exploit and enslave, or to enlighten and uplift, the barbarians? Are we going to permeate and transform the ancient civilizations of the East for their welfare or for their undoing? The very phrase "*Foreign* Missions" is out of date, since six-sevenths of our fellow subjects are not yet Christian.

And when we turn from the familiar thought of Missions benefiting the heathen abroad to the less familiar thought of Missions benefiting the Christian at home, we find in them the largest and finest exemplification of the words of the Lord Jesus,

which we ought to remember: "It is more blessed to give than to receive."

More than thirty years ago, Bishop Baring of Durham, preaching the annual sermon for the Church Missionary Society, flung back the trite argument that it will be time enough to think about the far-away heathen when all our own people are Christian, thus: "Seek to evangelize the world, and in so doing you will evangelize your own country."

All the experience of the past generation goes to confirm this view, to justify such an expression as that used by one of the earliest nineteenth-century Christians in Japan, Kanzo Uchimura, "You converted the heathen, and now the heathen convert you."

We might refer to isolated spiritual gifts imparted to those whose Christianity is a long-established tradition, by those newly-won to the faith; we might recall that Bishop Parker, who, after valuable work among the Gonds in India, became Bishop Hannington's successor in Equatorial Africa, had been inspired with missionary zeal at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, by Jani Alli, an Indian convert from Islam; that Pilkington of Uganda and his comrades were fired with new spiritual power through a tract written by the Tamil evangelist. David; we might point out how the gold coin lately brought by a Kaffir woman to St. Cuthbert's Mission, Tsolo, on the Feast of the Epiphany, "because she thought of the Wise Men," contrasts with much niggardly giving at home; how the universal practice of family worship by Polynesian converts shames us from letting that wholesome old custom fall into abeyance. But we would rather emphasize here the general influence upon the Home Church of sustained missionary zeal.

How do we commonly estimate its actual result? We turn over the contribution pages of a missionary society's Report; we light on the name of some obscure village, some wholly poor East End parish; we note the paltry sum that represents coppers accumulated during a twelvemonth by countless petty self-denials; we think of some individual, who, with a little

prompting from his vicar, could write a cheque for thrice that amount without curtailing one of his expensive amusements; we say to ourselves: "All those sermons, all those reiterated appeals have enriched the society so very little. Were they worth while in such a place?" But we fail to remember that the gain to the society in cash is as nothing compared with the gain in spiritual education to those sleepy rustics, those self-absorbed toilers in the great city. When the missionary came to tell his story, his audience consisted mostly of elderly women and shabby little boys. Yet it was well worth his while to give of his best to enlarge their hearts and to inform their minds, for ever since these good women have been interceding for his field, and their intercession, unrecorded on earth, has brought it a rich blessing. "I often wish," wrote Elmslie of Kashmir, "that I had half a dozen old, faithful, loving, lonely women praying for me and for my work." Moreover, their own lives have been enriched by the sympathy called out, and in a few years one at least of those eager, touzled boys will be in direct contact with heathen, as soldier, sailor, mechanic, or trader; and more than one heathen will be the worse or the better for that contact, since every Englishman who leaves these shores is bound to be a missionary of one sort or another. The tales of the "deputation" concerning "coloured" folk have awakened an intellectual interest in them which forestalls insolent indiscriminate prejudice against "natives," and stirs kindly feeling for them, leading to some humble gift towards the supply of their spiritual need, for which the giver is morally stronger henceforth. Again, the deputation did something to arouse that best sort of patriotism, which recognizes our nation's mission and imperial responsibilities for subject races; he did something also towards demonstrating, not theoretically, but practically that "the Church is the human instrument through which the love of God embraces mankind."

Such a conception of the Church brings to it not only fresh light but fresh love. And here we reach what is probably the highest kind of reflex influence from Missions abroad.

Nearly half a century ago Bishop Selwyn asked tentatively, "Is it a hope too unreasonable to be entertained that the power which will heal the divisions of the Church at home may come from the distant Mission-field?" To-day we are seeing that hope fulfilled to an extent that could hardly have been imagined then. Just as in the Middle Ages the Moslem menace compelled the Christians of Europe to stand shoulder to shoulder on the defensive, so our present offensive war constrains us to close our ranks if we would not fail conspicuously in our most obvious duty. Individuals widely sundered at home by ecclesiastical differences are drawn close together by their common faith when they are face to face with heathendom. We read how the "advanced Anglican" Albert Maclaren took the Communion with Congregationalist fellow missionaries in New Guinea; how in the New Hebrides the stanch Presbyterian John Paton was helped and comforted not a little at the open grave of his young wife by the episcopal benediction of John Coleridge Patteson.

When we see our religion as it presents itself to those who are detached from the historic origins of our differences, we gaze out on a more distant horizon than heretofore. We have climbed up; barriers whose height once baffled us have suddenly dwindled, and some of our controversies promise to appear as obsolete and meaningless to the Christians of the future as some of the controversies that vexed the Early Church persistently appear to most Christians now. Many purely controversial questions settle themselves, in fact, as we perceive greater and more vital questions pressing for immediate solution.

Mere argument over conflicting conceptions of truth will accomplish little. We all remember that the first Œcumenical Council of the Church at Nicæa was summoned by the Emperor Constantine to induce those who were quarrelling with each other within the Church "to abandon their futile and interminable disputes, and to return to the harmony which became their common faith," that its debates were marked by fierce recriminations, and that afterwards Christendom remained divided. We

remember also that, 1,200 years later, the Conference to establish union between the German and Swiss Reformers at Marburg was not more successful, and that Luther's response to the outstretched hand of Zwingli was only: "We acknowledge you as friends, but we do not consider you as brothers or members of Christ's Church."

For, indeed, "Our Lord's great disappointment of a divided Church" (as Bishop Brent terms it) can only be dealt with as concern for the sad fact that many of our fellow Christians hold views that we reckon unsound, or at least defective, is swallowed up in concern for the sadder fact that two-thirds of our fellow men are not in any sense Christians. Zeal for doing good abroad is still discouraged in some quarters as likely to stand in the way of doing good at home. In reality it can become the one effectual remedy for the conditions at home that we have most cause to deplore.

Of this there have been three notable examples. In 1908 the Pan-Anglican Congress demonstrated that Churchmen of different schools, animated by a common missionary zeal, could work together towards a common aim in absolute unanimity.

The Student Christian Movement has for some years been taking us gradually a step farther in bringing not only Evangelical but advanced High Churchmen into friendly relation with Nonconformists over missionary effort. A dozen years ago, when the late Douglas Thornton of Cairo was organizing it on lines which should make this possible, Bishop Creighton penned a vigorous expression of his own "warm sympathy" with its aim, saying that "such union for the general purpose of promoting missionary work does not involve any surrender of individual convictions about the best form in which the Christian truth can be expressed." Those of us who have taken any personal share in the wonderful gatherings of college men and women which it brings about have been in turns amazed and cheered by seeing how the younger generation of missionary-hearted Christians, not committed to the same extent

as their elders to party ideals and party watchwords, easily scale barriers that were formerly reckoned insuperable.

Lastly, the World Missionary Conference at Edinburgh, in June, 1910, more than fulfilled the anticipation of the Archbishop of Canterbury in his exhortation to special Whitsuntide intercession for reunion, that it would "offer to Christendom an object-lesson of the most striking kind as to the unity of Christian purpose, devotion, and endeavour, underlying the differences which sunder us."

Looking back now with profound thankfulness on that inspiring and unique assembly, which could not have been held even ten years ago, one recognizes that the cause of the world's evangelization is the only cause grand enough and urgent enough to bring together with one accord in one place, to discuss a purpose and a work common to all, such a representative body of Christians, and that probably no event in the long history of Christendom has done so much towards healing its "unhappy divisions." There delegates from every part of Great Britain, and Greater Britain, met delegates from every part of the United States, from nine European lands, and some twenty Asiatics, first fruits of the Christian China, Japan, Korea and India, that are to be. Reformed Christendom was represented in all its manifold variety, and although the Greek and Roman Churches sent no delegates, distinguished prelates of both despatched brotherly greetings, and more than one speaker dared to anticipate that next time Greek and Roman Christians would be there.

Differences were neither discussed nor ignored, and in view of apparently insurmountable obstacles to organic union, many were content to limit their aspirations to possible co-operation, or even federation among missionary workers of separate communions. But we were all compelled to acknowledge that the points upon which Christians agree are more numerous and more important than the points upon which they disagree, that there may be common action without surrender of conscientious principle, and also much honest and fruitful co-operation without coincidence

of opinion. If, for example, the Anglican and Baptist Missionaries at Delhi find it possible to organize a joint enterprise of weekly bazaar preaching, if the Baptists send their boys to the Cambridge Mission schools for advanced instruction, if the Anglicans baptize always by immersion, that divided testimony and divergent ceremonial may not perplex the heathen, if they can meet at each other's houses month by month for united intercession, why should not the example thus set by such large-hearted and clear-headed men as the Bishop of Lahore and Dr. Stephen Thomas be followed in many other stations abroad?

And why should not such action become possible at home also? One can only pray that the great results of Edinburgh abroad in quickening and guiding aright missionary enterprise everywhere may in the end be accompanied by results equally great at home as its spirit percolates, through the reports of its proceedings and the witness of those who were there, into every congregation, and that so the cause for which it was convened may touch the conscience and fire the imagination of all who confess the Name of Christ.

As Mr. J. H. Oldham has lately pointed out in the *C.M.S. Review*, "The habit of constantly viewing as a whole the impact of Christianity upon the non-Christian world would in the long run profoundly influence our policy and methods, and infuse a new spirit into our work." It is good for Anglicans to know how much Nonconformists are doing; it is good for Protestants to know how much Roman Catholics are doing; it is good for Britons to know how much Americans are doing; and at Edinburgh four great facts were indelibly imprinted on the memory. First, that in view of the growing audacity of the forces arrayed against the Faith, it is not only criminal but suicidal for those who hold the Faith to stand aloof, in distrust if not actual antagonism, from each other. Second, that a divided Christendom can never win the world for Christ. By working together as colleagues, not rivals, the missionary force in the field might be doubled without adding one man. Third, that "Denominationalism does not interest the Chinese," as one

able delegate from the Far East told us. The Chinese and the Japanese will each probably form one Christian Church for themselves, taking little account of much that we hold to be of the *bene esse*, if not of the *esse* of the Church, if we do not lay to heart in time the teaching of that loyal Anglican and illustrious scholar, Bishop Westcott, that "the Christian Society is not in essence an external organization, but a manifestation of the powers of the new life" ("Christus Consummator," p. 55).

Lastly, as a Vision of Unity greater than one had dared to dream of opened out, one felt that the future belongs to a higher type of Christianity than any as yet evolved, a type towards which we are slowly labouring, which will gather up all that is best in primitive, medieval, and modern Christianity; which, while walking in the narrow way of faithful adherence to the great verities of the Catholic Faith, will get out of many ruts worn by ignorance and prejudice.

We rejoiced that our own Church was adequately represented at Edinburgh in all its comprehensiveness, because it ought to become, and may become, the great reconciling, unifying force in an ever-expanding Christendom. Loud applause greeted Bishop Montgomery's statement as to "undenominationalism," that "we have no use for the least common denominator of Christianity," and he says elsewhere, "I can only give my own conviction, formed chiefly in regions outside the Motherland, that the stability of Christianity depends upon the Catholic Church, and its order and temper. The only anchor that can hold to the end in spite of any storm from whatever direction, is the Catholic anchor, with its long unbroken chain" ("Mankind and the Church," Introduction).

For this reason we gladly see the eldest daughter of the Church of England taking the lead in a new American Reunion Scheme. The American Episcopal Church has resolved to appoint a Joint Commission to consider questions of faith and order, and is asking all Christian communions throughout the world who confess our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour to unite in conference. A well-known millionaire is giving £20,000 to carry this resolution into effect.

As we look back on the greatest century of Missions as yet known, and forward into a century that promises to be yet greater, the conviction should deepen in every Christian heart that a living Church must be a missionary Church, and that a missionary Church cannot fail to become an united Church.

The Attack from Within.

By T. H. S. ESCOTT.

THE second volume of Lord Beaconsfield's official biography, to be looked for during the present year's first half, should incidentally contain an as yet entirely unwritten chapter in the ecclesiastical and religious history of his time. In and after 1837, at the most impressionable period of his early life, the illustrious subject of Mr. Monypenny's adequately executed memoir lived much at his father's country home at Bradenham, near Wycombe. The second Pitt's personal connection with his rival and successor, Addington, originated in the accident of the latter statesman's father having been the Pitt family's medical attendant. Scarcely less eventful proved the circumstance that Dr. Rose, of Wycombe, became the social counsellor as well as medical adviser of the Disraelis. That was the most impecunious of the younger Disraeli's earliest years, and private intelligence that the sheriff's officers were on his track for debt produced from Dr. Rose a warning message to his Bradenham friends, winding up with the words, "Hide Ben in the well." Dr. Rose, whose son became one of Lord Beaconsfield's executors, was highly thought of in private life by the chief families living under the shadow of the Chiltern Hills. Amongst these none surpassed in consideration the ancient Berkshire stock immemorially settled at Pusey House, near Farringdon. Long before there seemed much chance of "Ben's" political ambitions being realized, Dr. Rose had secured for him the *entrée* of Pusey House, then about to become one of the rallying

centres for the Protectionist organization. In the early thirties, however, the hospitalities of Philip Pusey's roof were not exclusively, for a year or two not even chiefly, political. At the very beginning of the thirties E. B. Pusey's influence with his relatives who owned the family seat had made Pusey House the cradle of the Oxford Movement. For that, preparations were still in progress when Isaac Disraeli's son, about the age of five-and-twenty, first rubbed shoulders with Philip Pusey's clerical guests, among them E. B. Pusey himself, occasionally Keble, and, much more infrequently, Newman.

It would be difficult, were the words in which afterwards Disraeli recalled the gloomy anticipation of the alarmed Churchmen, to exaggerate the blackness of the ecclesiastical outlook in 1833, when the Oxford Movement began. Since 1828-29, Dissenters and Papists had been eligible for seats in Parliament. The two Houses, therefore, hitherto outposts of the Established Church, had been transformed into secular or, as the Churchmen called them, heathen assemblies. At the same time, the 1832 Reform Act had given a new political power to the classes credited with most animosity to the national faith. The Tory Bishops had always resisted and thwarted reform. They and their colleagues generally were now punished for their contumacy by a warning from the Whig chiefs to "put their houses in order." For close on a century and a half—that is, ever since the change of dynasty in 1688—the omnipotent Whigs had depressed the national clergy because of their Tory traditions and principles.

Between 1830 and 1840, the suppression of ten Irish bishoprics, and the newspaper rallying of Nonconformists, Secularists, Latitudinarians, and Agnostics against a religious establishment, filled the whole Anglican body, clerical and lay alike, with mingled terror and disgust. If, said the champions of Orthodoxy—among whom young Disraeli found himself at Pusey House—the Church of England escape destruction, it will only be by conversion into a department of the Civil Service. These were not the only alarms in the air when the

young visitor from Bradenham began to be at home with the Church and State celebrities who assembled at Pusey House, with whose ideas he has sprinkled his novels, but his authentic and personal reminiscences of whom his biographer may now, perhaps for the first time, see his way to give.

The Lord Beaconsfield that was to be had scarcely leaped into notoriety with "Vivian Grey" when his visits to the Berkshire country house, already mentioned, told him of more than one clerical protest, first in writing, then in action, designed by his Berkshire friends as a counterblast to the prevailing Erastianism. At Pusey House was planned and drafted the address to Archbishop Howley, signed by 7,000 clergymen, and assuring the Primate of their attachment to the Apostolical doctrine and polity of the National Communion, and of their desire to promote whatever, by reviving ancient discipline, might strengthen an alliance between laity and clergy in defence of the Church against her enemies, not only without, but within; for at this epoch the old Evangelicals had lost much of their energy and fervour, while the old High Churchmen, with some notable exceptions, such as H. H. Norris and Joshua Watson—comfortable and prosperous in the enjoyment of pluralities—passively acquiesced in whatever the Government of the day might propose. The ecclesiastical awakening, begun under the social conditions now described, completed itself in 1833 by the appearance of the first of the "Tracts," and by Keble's assize sermon on national apostasy.

The Anglicanism thus fairly brought into operation four years before the Victorian age, in its first beginnings and environments, was not only Conservative, but eminently exclusive and aristocratic. That character it maintained till at least the year 1846, when Keble's curate at Hursley wept because the introduction of Free Trade had compelled his squire, Sir William Heathcote, to put down one of his carriage horses. The men who promoted the address to Archbishop Howley and the Oxford "Tracts" prided themselves on their direct ecclesiastical descent from the sober and learned seven-

teenth-century Fathers on the Isis—from Andrewes, Bishop of Winchester, from Jeremy Taylor, and from Hooker of the "Ecclesiastical Polity." To remove abuses and to secure efficiency in the National Church were their chief and, indeed, sole-declared purpose. When, in 1828, J. H. Newman became Vicar of St. Mary's, Oxford, he would not allow candles on the Communion table. Oakeley's church, Margaret Chapel, soon afterwards famous for its advanced ritual, knew nothing at first of incense, vestments, and all other decorative symbolism in millinery and furniture. In "Coningsby" Disraeli made himself the novelist of that Anglicanism whose chiefs he had begun to know in his boyhood, and has rescued from oblivion at least one of their most picturesque disciples. Eustace Lyle is the name which he wears in the story. In real life he was known as Ambrose de Lisle, of Garendon and Grace Dieu. Nine years before the "Tracts" began he had gone over to Rome, so that he could look with calm indifference on the tempests which convulsed the Church of his birth and nurture before, in 1846, she received from Newman's secession the blow that, as Disraeli put it, caused her so long to reel.

The great feature during the earlier stages of Anglicanism's Romeward tendency was the future Cardinal Newman's complete self-effacement. He had become a Fellow of Oriel in 1822, and shortly afterwards a tutor, with, for his best-known colleague, Dornford,[1] who had settled at Oxford after having served in the Peninsular War. Provost Coplestone called him to account for the mutilation, by his bad carving, of a venison haunch at the high table, and the undergraduates who were in his lecture played upon him pranks, which he ignored with stoical indifference. It is entirely a mistake to speak of him as having drifted from advanced Anglicanism to Popery. Newman began with Evangelicalism closely resembling that of John Wesley. He held meetings for prayer and Bible-reading in his rooms. After some dalliance with Liberalism, he eagerly threw himself into a project which he hoped might restore to the spiritual

[1] Lord Malmesbury's "Memoirs of an Ex-Minister," vol. i., p. 17.

power some of its lost temporal prerogatives. But of Anglo-Catholicism, as it had shaped itself to Pusey, and had been expounded by the *Christian Remembrancer*—writers whom J. B. Mozley had trained—he never had any real apprehension. Newman's most important service to Tractarianism was that he made Pusey its recruit. As regards Disraeli's "reeling" effects of Newman's submission to Rome, Anglicanism would have been in a much more perilous plight if that had never taken place. Between 1845 and 1850 the old High Church organization was completely broken up. The "Tracts" had come to an end even before 1845. The High Churchmen were quarrelling among themselves about the proper attitude to the Roman and Greek Communions respectively. The Gorham Decision had placed the Privy Council's authority above any ecclesiastical court. Manning and others at once went over to Rome. Even Pusey and Keble seemed to qualify their Anglican loyalty by discountenancing declared hostility to the Pope. William Palmer laboured for union with the Eastern Church rather than with the Latin. Archdeacon Denison insisted on the impossibility of friendly dealing with a Pontiff who, like him of the Vatican, heaped scorn upon Anglican Orders. Meanwhile, the two Wordsworths, Christopher, afterwards Bishop of Lincoln, and Charles, who died Bishop of St. Andrews, were the active champions of pre-Tractarian Anglicanism. Together with Professor Blount of Cambridge, they showed, in a circumstantially convincing manner, that the Book of Common Prayer, the whole Liturgy, and the Thirty-Nine Articles gave the Church of England a better claim than any other Communion to be considered the true successor of the primitive Church.

Profoundly dissatisfied with the Privy Council's trespass on the ecclesiastical province, Pusey had now offended and alienated many of his old-fashioned and steady-going adherents by adapting to the English popular use some of French Popery's most sentimental and sickly manuals. Even thus, no innovations had been made very extensively in public worship. Without excep-

tion the early Tractarians were as indifferent to ritual as, it has been seen, was Newman himself. Intonation of the service and improvement of Church music were the two chief, if not only changes, up to the year 1850. At the same time, what is now called Ritualism had asserted itself at least a decade in advance of the date usually given for its appearance—1866. Ten years before that the parish of St. George's-in-the-East had been thrown into uproar and confusion by the Eucharistic rites and vestments with which Mr. Bryan King had signalized his rectorship. This episode brought to the front the remarkable man who now took, and throughout his life retained, the Ritualistic leadership. The most devoted and enterprising of Bryan King's curates, A. H. Mackonochie, had met with rough treatment from the mob in its assaults on the church where he ministered, and had not, it was said, been properly defended by the police. He speedily became at once the hero, martyr, and chief of the Anglican anti-Protestants, no longer in the capacity of East End curate, but as Vicar of St. Albans, Holborn. Many social classes were represented among his devotees. The best brains and least self-seeking energies of the High Church party, however, held aloof. Butler of Wantage had recently formulated, and by his beneficent exertions illustrated, the maxim that "prayer and grind can do most things." He now exercised his justly great influence and authority to discourage the devotional extravagances arranged by Mackonochie at St. Albans.

Meanwhile, Ritualism was securing for itself unexpected alliances in high quarters. Smart and popular pens, interpreting the artistic and theological minds of Beresford Hope and Welby Pugin, in the *Saturday Review*, poured contempt upon Protestantism by showing that it was a synonym for Philistinism. But for one churchgoer whom the cleverest section of the High Church Press converted into an Anglican æsthete, a dozen partisans were gained to the new decorative ecclesiasticism by its popularity, real or supposed, with English royalty and its hangers-on. Disraeli's phrase, "Mass in masquerade," was first used in 1874. Six or eight years earlier the thing itself had

been welcomed as a sign that the long-expected reaction from rationalism in faith and Puritanism in ceremonial had begun, if not at the Palace, at the residence of the Heir-apparent. Whatever their doctrinal relations, the visible differences, social and ceremonial, between English and Continental Protestantism are much greater than is at all generally realized. The present Queen Alexandra, as Princess of Wales, brought, in 1863, from her Northern home, a natural liking for the most decorative features in the Lutheran ritual—for lights, music, and quick changes of many coloured robes. High Church doctrines receded to the background. The old Tractarianism had quite gone out; the new Ritualism took its place, and came into fashion and favour with the numbers always waiting to adopt Court modes in matters of taste or faith. The surplice, it was now pointed out, could not be distinguished from the white robe traditionally assigned to the Apostles and early Fathers, and admittedly of a sacrificial significance. Between the Lutheran consubstantiation and the Roman transubstantiation little practical difference could be discerned. Each really and almost equally involves that sacrifice of the Mass on which Pusey had always insisted, which formed the central doctrine of his school, and which, in 1871, the Privy Council, when adjudicating on W. J. E. Bennett, of Frome, had declared consistent with the Anglican formularies.

Since then all Church prosecutions have not ended equally well for the Romanizers. All censures of Ritualism, however, subsequent to Disraeli's Public Worship Act, have proved mere waste of breath. Before the Victorian era's close the Lincoln Judgment, in 1892, constituted a kind of guarantee against future litigation about ceremonies and rites. Stormy controversies once centred round Edward VI.'s Prayer-Book and the continued validity of its Ornaments Rubric. On that head no definite decision has been given or maintained; nor is there likely to be forthcoming any which the anti-Protestants will accept. One cannot, however, force an open door, and none of the so-called attacks from within can be delivered upon a surrendered position. The aggrieved parishioner, if he ever

did so, has long ceased to protest against any external displays, whether allowed by the Ornaments Rubric or not. Episcopal rebukes of generally prohibited and notoriously illegal usages are not, and never again will be, followed by imprisonment of the offenders. The successors of the Tractarians, Faber and Oakeley, weak men and fond of show, first introduced Roman practices in the forties, and are the real founders of Ritualism as it is in evidence to-day. Their twentieth-century successors parade their uncompromising resolve never to acknowledge the usurpation of the judicial committee, but are really in little danger of finding themselves in conflict with it. Their methods are less those of assault upon an institution than of a demonstration, intended to show the demonstrators' superiority to law, order, and old-fashioned prejudices of appearance. There may, of course, be in words much discontent with the connection between Church and State, and loud talk of readiness to join Radicalism in any disestablishment scheme. But, taken altogether, it scarcely constitutes one of those attacks from within sufficiently organized to threaten a crumbling of the foundations as well as a disturbance of the superstructure. It is rather a passing ebullition of calculated priestly petulance, unsupported by the deep conviction and the learning of High Churchmanship in the thirties.

Disestablishment, a free Church in a free State, anything rather than subjection to the judicial committee, is the Church Union Brigade's watchword. Those who have caught it up now talk of deliverance from the Thirty-Nine Articles, objected to as being Articles, not of faith, but of religion, and of secular origin. What are the facts here? Let the Bishops give us our orders, and we will take them, say the objectors to the Privy Council, in the same breath that, if instituted in a benefice, they try to evade the reading of those Articles. But these formularies are of purely Episcopal origin. Reduced from forty-two to their present number, they were drawn up by a committee of Bishops in 1571, without any of the political interference, royal or parliamentary revision, so often alleged. Queen Elizabeth,

indeed, made one addition with her own hand. That was entirely in the interest, not of State, but of Church; for the twentieth Article, the royal handiwork, insists on the Church's authority to decree rites or ceremonies in controversies of faith. Consequently, the practical acceptance of these definitions of conduct and belief, promulgated in 1571, is really a touchstone of sincerity on the part of those who, while persisting in mutiny against the judicial committee, profess all loyalty to the Bishops, whenever and whatever they may have spoken. The truth is that the commotions now referred to, dignified occasionally by the description of "attacks from within," are really so many surface skirmishes and bids for notoriety, having absolutely nothing in common with the work undertaken by the able, erudite, and earnest men who worked with and under Pusey.

A hostile movement, especially if of the nature of a forlorn hope, requires not only a rank and file to fight, but picked men to lead. Whence are these to come? Not from Anglo-Catholicism's recognized chiefs. For it was not so long since, at a meeting of the English Church Union, that Canon Newbolt protested against the rising taste for Roman innovations on the part of the younger clergy. On the occasion now referred to Mr. Newbolt was surrounded by speakers who, declaring their personal devotion to him, echoed his resolution against assimilating the Anglo-Saxon to the Latin Communion. All were prepared to maintain the National Church, "as by law established."

Disraeli, while yet influenced by his youthful impressions of the man, intelligibly overrated the consequences of Newman's secession. The more masculine of his disciples never followed their master. The representatives of the old High Church school like Pusey furnished, as Pusey himself boasted, no recruits to Rome. Such of them as may now survive have only found themselves in the same clerical camp as the Ritualists under the pressure of a common persecution, which is now a thing of the past. The original High Anglicanism was, as has been seen, largely a patrician affair. The

Ritualism which poses for its successor is as democratic as the Primrose League, many of whose tactics it imitates. The cause now banding callow curates against the judicial committee is one of externalism alone. An analogous controversy agitates other Protestant Churches, notably the Congregationalists. The domestic differences of these about the æsthetics of devotion are to some extent shared by Presbyterians and Wesleyans as well. As for the true significance and the probable results of the superficial restlessness and discontent which malignant extremists might wish used as a leverage for rending Church and State asunder, the English Church Union will perhaps not disregard Canon Newbolt's already quoted warning, and seriously ask itself whether its energies cannot find more dignified, if not useful exercise, than in trying to do for the Established Church in the twentieth century what was vainly attempted against it in the nineteenth.

The central novelty in the situation is that while in the Victorian age the Established Church had only to fear its declared or thinly-disguised enemies, to-day it must reckon with a combination of secularists and sacerdotalists, both animated by different aims, but both agreeing that the preservation of Church discipline is a greater evil than disestablishment, and the uncurbed excesses of an irresponsible priesthood which would necessarily follow. Not, indeed, that the ecclesiastical anarchy would be of long continuance. The Anglo-Catholics of to-day may make common cause with the survivors from the Liberationists of former years. With the learning, tradition, discipline, and organization of the Church of Rome, the Church of England, as Disraeli once said, has alone proved able to cope, and that only when supported by the courage of a determined and devoted people. In the ecclesiastical polity of the present day there may be, unfortunately, less to inspire and sustain such a national temper. If that be so, events themselves now confirm and repeat the warning given by the Conservative leader in 1868. The present is, above all things, as Dr. Bright has shown in the last volume of his English history, the age of reaction. The most

sanguine of Ritualistic law-breakers now despair of "union with Rome" as absolutely as the Oxford remnant in the forties abandoned all hope of an alliance between the English primate and the Greek patriarch after William Palmer's abortive pilgrimage to the Russian holy places. In 1704, for the first time, by refusing to accept the orders of John Gordon, a Scottish Bishop and Jacobite refugee, the Vatican first recorded its decision to treat Anglican Orders as null. To that precedent the Pope still adheres. None the less, the Roman opportunity would be looked for in the chaos which would follow the organic and ruinous changes in the position of the English Establishment that those enemies who belong to its own household talk so lightly of preferring to a reasonable obedience.

"In Earthen Vessels."

By Miss A. E. WOODCOCK,
Langholm, Bishop's Lydiard, Taunton.

"THE Vicar mentions the difficulty of securing enough Sunday-school teachers, and comments on the indisposition evinced by many to taking up work which demands regularity and self-denial. . . . The parish has a population of over 20,000."

These words, from a London daily paper, caught my eye, and arrested my attention at once. The paper fell unheeded, for my thoughts had flown to a little parish in Wiltshire under the shadow of the Great Downs. I could recall the pungent scent of the box-hedges along the chalky white roads and the song of the larks "rising and falling as on angels' wings." I could see the cloud-shadows passing softly over the downs that were now green, now gold with dandelions, while the village lay dusty-white at their foot. I could see, too, the shy, inexperienced teacher who, for many successive Sundays, trembled

outside the old school-door before she took her courage in both hands and walked in. The faces of the boys rose up before me, during the five years in which they had grown from a senior lad's class into a regular well-organized Bible-class. I could see them, too, kneeling at the Holy Communion month by month. It seemed but yesterday since those delightful winter practices were held, when they would bring cinders and wood themselves, and coax up the ashes of the defunct school fire, and one boy played, and the rest sang glees (at first, it is true, in "unison" voices); later on, in real part-singing.

Or there were long, hot summer days, when each week brought its gardening evening in the Church garden, and pinks and roses scented the air, and the cut grass and the cypress-trees gave forth of their sweetness.

In after days of stress and sorrow such scenes remained clear and vivid.

And this class was built up on the foundation of forty years' work in the parish, patiently and hopefully, by one who was schoolmaster and choirmaster too. The outward and visible memorial of his work may be found in the Church now, but who shall tell of the unseen results of such a life!

Then, when the hand of God touched him, and he slept, his work was completed, and all that remained was for others to carry it on. The details of teaching pass away, but the character of the teacher remains, and his unconscious—perhaps unknown—influence too.

There is a story told of one who went to hear a very celebrated preacher. The sermon was inspiring, yet, years afterwards, she said: "Curiously enough, I cannot remember anything that was said by that preacher, but I shall never forget the faces of some Sisters coming out of the church; they made me realize what it might be to live in the Presence of God."

And yet there is this need in most parishes for more Sunday-school teachers!

Surely the clergy themselves are partly responsible for this.

Over and over again we hear the cry, "The classes are too big, I know; but we have so few teachers"; or, "No, we have not got a Sunday-school; we have to have children's services, as we cannot get new teachers." If the clergy really believe as they say, that there will come a day when the religious teaching of the children will only be given on Sunday, the importance of the Sunday-school teacher's work can hardly be over-estimated. Yet in how many parishes is there any attempt to help the teachers to teach well? Or, again, in how many churches is there any definite service admitting new teachers into this important work, giving them authority not only to teach their children on Sunday, but also to visit and know them in the week?

I confess that out of the eight parishes in which I have taught, I have known only *one* in which such a service was held. It is when we realize our utter powerlessness to do anything well, wishing, perhaps, that we had never undertaken so difficult a task, that this service, solemn as it is, reminds us that "our help is in *the Name of the Lord*," and though the sense of responsibility may be deepened, the knowledge of the helpful Presence of God is deepened also. It is impossible after this to give up a class because it is tedious or troublesome, for the solemn sense of re-dedication is borne in upon us. We have offered and presented to God the few miserable little barley-loaves and fishes we have to give, and lo! He can spread a table in the wilderness and feed His five thousand people at our hands.

Again, do the clergy take sufficient pains with their instructions for teachers? In many parishes there is no class for them at all, and even if teachers' meetings are held, it is often "only that, and nothing more." Expositions on the Prophet Ezekiel were given every week in one parish I know, while the Sunday-school lesson was on the Gospel for the day! Yet this was called The Teachers' Class. Or, again, the Vicar will probably content himself with going through the lessons in a book each month, just as they are, except for a little word-painting on

Cana of Galilee or Bethany (mostly culled from "The Land and the Book"), the whole four lessons occupying an hour, and including "a bit for yourselves" stuck in at the end like an unbruised clove in an apple-pie!

Sunday-school lesson-books are most useful as *helps;* they are invaluable when there is not time or power to make a lesson for oneself, but they were, of course, never intended to take the place of preparation, or to be used (as I have seen them used) merely to read the lesson through to a class ripe and ready for misbehaviour. Yet in one school I know they made their weekly appearance unchecked, and the Vicar would even change a lesson on the spot—say Lesson xli. to xliv. I remember once hearing, to my amazement, from the next class, "Illust., burning house. Children asleep. Father's anxiety. So with us," and the lesson went on! "Oftentimes," says a great worker, "we have to work against the whole trend of Sunday-school teaching. In most places the children will expect a 'stock question,' and be ready with a 'stock answer.' For a time they will offer 'stock answers,' even to real questions. But at last the 'stock answer' will fall out of fashion from lack of demand, and your children will begin to *think!*"

Surely this is the most important result of all teaching; it is considered to be so in every subject taught in the day schools, but it will never be achieved by teachers who will not learn and by clergy who do not teach.

Again, the clergy, or those whom they appoint to be superintendents, have mostly little wisdom in their choice of teachers. They do not differentiate. One may have a special gift for teaching infants, but it is quite as likely as not that she will be pressed to accept a boys' class, or one of elder girls, merely because it is vacant; she meekly yields, and then probably before long gets sick of it, and gives it up. And of all the classes surely the infants are most important. "Give me a child till he is seven," said a great head-master; "I don't care what happens to him after that." Yet "We will give you the infants till we can find you something better!" How many

teachers are not familiar with these words? And how few of us have the power to teach infants well! Perhaps that is why a really good children's service is such a treat; but, alas! such a rare treat. It is connected in most minds with children who fidget and with teachers who try in vain to keep them quiet. Being as often as not conducted on the plan of the "Missing Word Competition," the attention of the children is not gained, and answers fall very wide of the mark usually.

Some few years ago I was attending just such a service, taking charge of a class of boys aged from eight to ten. The subject for the day was that most inspiring story of the Raising of the Widow's Son at Nain, but if it could have been rendered commonplace and uninteresting it would have been so then. The preacher, in a heavy monotonous voice, inquired: "Children, why were not even the priests allowed to touch the bier?" One of my most brilliant and restless little boys raised his head, and in a loud, excited whisper, exclaimed: "Teacher, *my* mother do touch tha beer—she *do*, teacher; she do like un, an' zyder, too, teacher!"

I merely quote this story to show how entirely the ordinary preacher or teacher will talk over the children's heads without in the least realizing he has done so.

The Church Sunday-school, we must admit, is the great link between the child and the Church; and the Sunday-school cannot be kept going without Sunday-school teachers. They are often ineffective (for they are but earthen vessels!) from want of knowledge, though seldom from want of will. If, after careful selection, the clergy would help them by teaching them, and then, having faith enough in them *to back them up*, it would make the work vastly more interesting as well as more efficient.

I know a case of a teacher of twenty years' experience, who turned a really bad boy of sixteen out of her class after much earnest thought and prayer. She had tried everything, and it was impossible to teach as things were. She told the superintendent she had done so. The next Sunday he was brought back as a suffering martyr to the class, and this was done

three times! Most unprejudiced teachers could supply similar cases.

"Heaven knows," says a thoughtful writer, "our Sunday-schools need reform. . . . The Church of England's extremity is apt to be the Dissenter's opportunity; but if that Church will really rouse herself, she may yet keep a large majority of the young within her fold. The Sunday-school will be the key of the Church's position in the near future. What is imperative to-day is better methods, better teachers, better standards of efficiency." And the Church of England "expects every man to do his duty"!

The Missionary World.

TRUTH alone is eternal, but certainly error dies hard. The man who objects to Christian Missions because he disbelieves in Christianity has logic at least on his side. But the challenge of which the last few weeks has seen a recrudescence in the daily press is only remotely connected either with logic or with facts. Sir Hiram Maxim — whom the *C.M. Review* terms, with some justice, "an impenitent critic," seeing that it answered his strictures on Chinese Missions only last December—has been writing again. His letters in the *Morning Post* either generalize from individual instances, unidentified, and therefore unanswerable, or else make sweeping statements which prove either nothing or else absurdly much. If it be true, for instance, as Sir Hiram Maxim asserts, that for every Chinaman who becomes a Christian a thousand Chinamen lose their lives, then it is also true, as Sir Ernest Satow said at a missionary meeting immediately after, that the whole Chinese race would have been exterminated ere now. The challenge has been ably met by letters from missionary experts, citing testimonies from many men of knowledge and weight. But the most striking product of the controversy has been the

leader in the *Morning Post* of March 20, a powerful and closely-reasoned argument for Chinese Missions of permanent value. We hope it may be reproduced in some more lasting form. It goes far to fulfil its sure prediction that "the final result of the criticism will be a strengthening rather than a weakening of the cause."

* * * * *

A recent issue of the *Daily Mail* gave nearly half a column to quotations from a book published in England by an educated Chinese, who is strongly adverse to the presence of Christianity in China, and scathing in his criticism of the mental equipment of missionaries. Those who can distinguish truth from error may gain a needed warning from his words, but the pity of it is that so many readers are absolutely at the mercy of such crude statements and wholesale condemnations. Are we doing what in us lies to bring the true facts about foreign missions effectively before the man who reads the daily paper and little else? Are we even using what has been tersely called "potted apologetic" to meet the "potted objections" in vogue? A twopenny pamphlet by Dr. Stock—"Don't Support Foreign Missions! Why not?"—issued by the C.M.S., deserves to be widely known. Welsh's "Challenge to Christian Missions"—to be had for sixpence—is excellent in parts. But the real need is deeper far. We want a Christianity which manifests the power of the Invisible to lift men everywhere above the material plane. The "plain man in the street" can estimate home results, even if he cannot readily realize foreign conditions. A vitalized Church at home is the one missionary apologetic that will appeal and move.

* * * * *

Meantime, we turn from the challenge to the work of Missions and trace the news from China through the April magazines. The Baptist *Missionary Herald* gives us a sketch of a Chinese fair, a study of Chinese building methods and implements, a Chinese melody, a record of early work in a new station, and the doings of Chinese Christians in conference.

The Bible in the World (British and Foreign Bible Society), deals with "Tribes and Tongues of Western China," and tells a wonderful story of Mrs. Sie's Chinese New Testament. *China's Millions* gives columns of latest news from the wide fields of the China Inland Mission, able editorial notes, a striking article on "The Chinese Church and Independence," a private letter about the plague at Chefoo, and a record of baptisms in fourteen different provinces. The *C.M. Review* has an article by Bishop Molony, of Mid-China, on the work of the twenty Chinese clergy in his diocese, and an obituary notice of the senior among them who has just gone to his rest. The *C.M. Gleaner* gives the story of a Chinese Archdeacon. Both papers, and also *Mercy and Truth*, contain numerous incidents from China. *India's Women* (C.E.Z.M.S.), has an "In Memoriam" notice by a devoted missionary in China, and reports the opening of a women's hospital. The *L.M.S. Chronicle*, besides various incidents, has a vivid record of the fight for Chi-meng's soul, and a descriptive paper on checking Chinese demons. The *S.P.G. Mission Field* has a note on the plague in North China, written by one of their missionaries "from a third-class railway carriage at Harbin, where he has been living." The *U.F. Missionary Record*, besides a reference to the heroic death of Dr. Jackson, gives "A Visit to a Doomed City"—Harbin—written by a doctor, in which the following statement is made:

> "In our recent Council meetings the medical missionaries felt bound to advise the withdrawal of all who were not likely to be actively engaged in the work of battling with the epidemic. . . . Man after man, and—what was finer—woman after woman, declared they would not leave their native brethren and sisters in this the time of their visitation . . . in our common manhood we quietly gave thanks in our hearts for such a spirit."

Last, but not least, among our April papers, comes the Wesleyan *Foreign Field*, with a sketch of work at a station in Hunan—11,995 miles by waterways from headquarters—and of a "happy Christmas" at Wusueh. We should like Sir Hiram Maxim to read all these. At least we would commend to his

notice the following summary of the progress of Missions in China, which we take from *China's Millions*:

"The first issue (1910) of 'The China Mission Year-Book,' edited by the Rev. Donald MacGillivray, D.D., contains an interesting table of statistics of the work of Protestant Missions in China for 1908-1909, which we summarize as follows:

Missionary Societies	91
Foreign missionaries (including medical missionaries —217 men and 66 women)	4,299
Chinese workers (including 487 ordained pastors) ...	11,661
Stations (670 with resident missionary)	3,485
Primary schools	2,029
Scholars	45,730
Intermediate, high schools, and colleges	1,116
Students	34,064
Number of congregations	2,341
Baptized Christian community	195,905
Catechumens	49,172
Total Christian community	278,628
Chinese contributions to Church	Mex. $298,687·56
Hospitals	170
Dispensaries	133
In-patients	45,188
Out-patients	197,011

"These figures indicate that since the Martyr Year (1900) there has been a quite remarkable progress in the work of Protestant Missions in China. During the past ten years, as will be seen by a comparison of the statistics given by Professor Harlan Beach in 'The Hills of T'ang' and the Year-Book mentioned above, the number of communicants has increased from 80,682 to 195,905; day schools have grown from 1,766 to 2,029, and pupils from 30,046 to 45,730; higher institutions of learning from 105 with 4,285 pupils, to 1,116 with 34,064 students. Foreign mission workers have increased from 2,461 to 4,299, and Chinese mission-workers from 5,071 to 11,661. Truly 'the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church.'"

* * * * *

Dr. Weitbrecht's article in the *C.M. Review* on the Lucknow Conference on Missions to Moslems should be carefully read. The whole situation is full of significance—so great that a realization of it would stir the Church to action forthwith. The changes in the Moslem world since the Cairo Conference was held five years ago are startling in their extent. There has been no parallel change in the attitude of the Christian Church towards Islam.

How many persons—even ardent Scotsmen—have read through eight numbers of the *Missionary Record* of the United Free Church of Scotland in one afternoon, and felt some impatience at having to wait for the issue of a ninth? To ensure efficient survey of missionary progress, it is well now and then to take a selected topic and trace it through several numbers of one magazine. This is a somewhat severe test of the editor's sequence of thought and of the purpose and policy of the organization concerned. In the special case before us the test has been met. The reticent and closely-printed official organ of the United Free Church of Scotland is not attractive to the outward eye; but it offers itself as a good basis for an investigation of the influence of the Edinburgh Conference upon existing missionary work. Is that influence waning or deepening ten months after date?

* * * * *

The August number of the *Missionary Record* contains a varied account of the lessons and impressions of the Conference —many a great Scotsman felt, with Professor Cairns, "the widening of the whole horizon before him and the clearing of the heavens overhead." We find a sub-committee appointed by the Foreign Mission Committee to "see what could be done to diffuse the influence and stimulus of the Conference through the Church." In September, together with further reports of the Conference, we read that "the Foreign Mission Committee is addressing itself very seriously" to the whole question, with "a full realization of the critical importance of a wise and strenuous and adequate campaign." In the October number, the Moderator, Professor Denney, and Professor Cairns add fuel to the kindling fire. The conviction of shortcoming and inadequacy is strongly expressed. In November we find record of a significant conference of from 200 to 300 delegates, representing the various United Free Church agencies and presbyteries — a gathering full of purpose and humility. In this number begins a series of able summaries of the Edinburgh Reports. In December we find another summary of a report,

and another conference, summoned this time by the Women's Foreign Mission Committee. A big project begins now to emerge—based partly on a survey of the needs of the United Free Church Mission-Fields undertaken before the Edinburgh Conference—for a series of conferences "in all the presbyteries of the Church." "The Scottish mind," said a leading speaker, "works slowly, but it holds what it gets." This is the record to the close of 1910.

* * * * *

In the January number, it is clear the movement is gathering force. We find a summary of a third report; a vigorous article on the Layman's Missionary Movement, now well-rooted in Scotland, and a lively outbreak of suggestion and response. "The whole Church is facing the Forward Movement with expectation and hope." An editorial note is headed "The Awakening of Interest." Under the title "Our Forward Movement," we find a well-ordered enterprise set forth. The missionaries, after careful survey of actual needs, appeal for ninety-nine new missionaries "as an irreducible minimum." The Foreign Mission Committee, admitting the justice of the claim, set before themselves and the Church "as a policy, the immediate sending forth of twenty-five men and fifteen women," involving "an increase in our congregational Foreign Mission contributions of £10,000 per annum—*as an urgent first instalment*," both of missionaries and of means. The possibility—or impossibility—of this is faced, and results in a solemn call to prayer. Then follows a stirring record of what individuals, sessions, groups of congregations, and presbyteries are already being stirred to do, and of what is actually happening as the *Record* goes to press. In February "Our Extension Movement" carries on the inspiring tale. Of the "Call to Prayer," 250,000 copies have been issued; the Foreign Mission Committees (men's and women's) have invited *all* presbyteries to organize conferences. "As we go to press many are devising ways." Glasgow has already held a great gathering, to which 158 congregations sent official delegates. In another presbytery,

the resolutions passed have been printed, and a copy *sent to every family*. The closing paragraph is fine:

"What does it all mean? All this demands just so much as is required for the fulfilment of our task. Nothing more, nothing less. It demands that our dear Church shall awake at last to a due sense of her responsibility to Christ her Head and to the wide world for which He gave His life; boldly because believingly, heroically because self-sacrificingly, taking up her great task and doing it. That is what it means. If the Church, having been brought to face this great task, takes it up and performs it, not turning away, then it will be done, and there will come down blessing unspeakable to the Church and to the world. But if, having been brought face to face with the task, she shirks it, *that* will spell loss, and leanness of soul, and spiritual defeat; and from such a calamity the Church may well pray, 'Good Lord, deliver us.'"

* * * * *

In the March number we find still other conferences in other presbyteries, still endorsing a forward movement, still pledging themselves to support it, still sending copies of their resolutions through the kirk-sessions, "to every family." Under "Our Responsibility," it is urged that "the United Free Church is responsible for the evangelization of thirty millions of the heathen world." Then comes this pregnant sentence: "We have told all the Churches of Christendom that this is our work, and the truth is that we are *not* doing it." There is not much trace of waning interest yet!

* * * * *

Now—at last—the April number is to hand. There is neither lessening of purpose nor of aim. The report on "The Preparation of Missionaries" is summarized by Miss A. H. Small (Principal of the United Free Church Women's Missionary College), whose influence and whose ideals work widely amongst Anglicans of all schools of thought. Under "Our Extension Movement" there is an able paper on "The Call, and How to Answer It," full of well-considered suggestion. It is evident that when the next General Assembly meets the United Free Church will have gathered force for a decision to go forward. It is this quiet, cumulative work which tells.

* * * * *

The London Missionary Society are issuing a series of penny pamphlets on "The Lessons of Edinburgh." Two of the

five now ready are so cogent that we cordially commend them for wider use: "The Need for a World Campaign," by Dr. Wardlaw Thompson, and "Our Sufficiency in God," by the Rev. Godfrey Phillips. The style is attractive, the arguments are impressive, the appeal is deep. We have seen nothing so likely to be of use amongst educated men. Except for the L.M.S. imprint, the two pamphlets are applicable to the needs of all Societies alike.

* * * * *

The *Times* of April 1 records the formation of a Board of Study in Great Britain for the Preparation of Missionaries, as an outcome of the work of the Continuation Committee of the Edinburgh Conference. This is at once the goal of a long period of investigation and collaboration and the starting-point of a great endeavour. The members of the Commission dealing with Preparation came to the conclusion that no Society acting alone could adequately provide for the specialized training of its missionaries without overlapping and waste of expenditure and of force. Negotiations, now happily consummated, have been on foot to devise some means by which common action might be secured. The newly-formed Board is widely representative, and is receiving almost unanimous support from the Societies. Two of the C.M.S. delegates have seats on the Executive Committee. Its work should serve to increase knowledge of existing facilities, to advance schemes for specialized training at home and in the Mission-field, and to stimulate the production of necessary literature. Theological and ecclesiastical questions are expressly excluded from its sphere. We hail such wisely-directed joint action as one of the most hopeful results of the Edinburgh Conference. Though some expenditure is inevitable if the work is to be efficiently done, it will prove an economy in the end. The Board of Study should elicit our sympathy and support.

* * * * *

Three days later—on April 4—the *Times* again had a note of interest—

"The International Continuation Committee of the World Missionary Conference will hold its first meeting from May 16 to 20 at Auckland Castle. The Committee, which consists of ten members each from America, the Continent, and Great Britain, will be the guests of the Bishop of Durham."

The Conference met at Edinburgh in a Presbyterian Assembly Hall. It is fitting that the first meeting of its Continuation Committee should receive hospitality in one of the historic centres of the National Church. The great men who have served their generation at Auckland would rejoice to see this day. The Committee has great and far-reaching projects before it. Let us pray.

G.

Discussions.

"THE PERMISSIVE USE OF THE VESTMENTS."

(*The Churchman, March*, 1911, *p.* 169.)

I UNDERSTAND that I am at liberty to make some reply to the courteous critics of my paper on "The Permissive Use of the Vestments." Mr. C. F. Russell goes with me a long way, but he pulls up in the usual place. He assumes that the Vestments in the minds of those who wear them imply disloyalty to Reformation principles, and so he has no difficulty in condemning them. But this assumption is the very thing against which I protested. It is no doubt true that those who use, or wish to use, Vestments take a somewhat different view of Eucharistic doctrine from those who resolutely oppose them. But the differences, whenever they have been examined, have been found to be less and less important than had been thought. They cannot be expressed by saying that the one party regards the Eucharist as a "sacrifice," while the other does not, for almost every view claims that the Eucharist is a sacrifice in some sense. The sense repudiated at the Reformation was that of a "propitiatory" sacrifice, and if Cranmer had held that the Vestments had this signification, as the Roman party asserted, and the counter-Reformation party still asserts, he would not have tolerated them for a moment, for he removed every suggestion of such a power in the English priesthood from his revised Ordinal. It is disappointing, then, to find Mr. Sydney Carter speaking of a "sacrificial" view of the Eucharist as though that expression conveyed an unambiguous and an untenable meaning. The Evangelical party would not, I am sure, wish to maintain that their view, what-

ever it is, is the only view honestly tenable in the Church of England. But this is in effect the plea that Mr. Russell puts forward:

"Let it once appear that the opposition to them [the vestments] is due, not to a dislike for their witnessing to the continuity of the English Church, but only to a determination to adhere to our *reformed doctrine*, and it must be perceived that this opposition is made in obedience to a higher law than that which authorizes the desire for their revival."

In other words, the "reformed doctrine" is the exact shade of doctrine at present held by those who oppose the use of Vestments.

The appeal to High Churchmen in Mr. Russell's last paragraph "to give up their demand for a mere external symbol" does not strike me as fair. I am reminded of a demand I once heard made by a child to his brother: "Mother says it is more blessed to give than to receive, so give me your ball." Obviously the High Churchman might with equal justice appeal to Mr. Russell to surrender his opposition. But when both parties make a conscience of their desires, and neither can see its way to make a concession, it remains for the Church as a whole, after the matter has been fully debated, either to call upon one or other party to make a sacrifice in the cause of peace, or else to allow both uses. I have no doubt that the latter is the more reasonable, and I think it is the more Christian course; but it is new and untried, and I am not surprised that both extremes unite against it.

2. The points raised by my second critic, Mr. Guy Johnson, concern the Ornaments Rubric and its interpretation. I cannot agree with him that there is any distinction in meaning between "the minister shall use . . . such ornaments" (1559) and "such ornaments . . . shall be retained and be in use" (1662), especially as the latter words are taken directly from the Act of Uniformity of 1559. Nor again can I recognize any distinction in meaning between "at the time of the Communion and at all other times in their ministration" (1559) and the more compressed form of words "at all times of their ministration" (1662). It is not disputed that the Caroline rubric was meant at least to legalize the practice enjoined by the Canons, which recognized a difference of vesture in cathedral and collegiate churches between the Holy Communion and other services. Further, I must repeat my conviction that the Revisers went most ambiguously to work, if, when they used the words "such ornaments as *were* in this Church of England by the authority of Parliament in 2 Edward VI.," they meant "such ornaments as came into general use in accordance with the authority which a later Parliament conferred upon Queen Elizabeth." It is perfectly true, as Mr. Johnson insists, that the Bishops who were responsible for the revision of 1662 inquired in their Visitation Articles about the surplice, and the surplice only. But their question takes the form "Doth [your minister] never omit it?" It was no time to advocate the revival of Vestments when even the surplice had to be inquired about. It is not so absurd, as Mr. Johnson seems to think, to suppose that the Bishops deliberately refused to

stereotype the current usage by altering the Ornaments Rubric, which they clearly ought to have done if the rubric was to be any guide at all to the officiating minister. Nor does it seem irrelevant to point out, that when the Puritans excepted against the rubric that "it seemeth to bring back the cope, alb, etc., and other Vestments forbidden by the Common Prayer Book, 5 and 6 Edward VI.," the Bishops returned no direct re-assurance, but referred them to their general remarks upon Ceremonies, in which there was nothing to the point (Cardwell's "Conferences," pp. 314, 345-351). Why did they not say in plain terms "You are mistaken; by our rubric the Vestments you mention are not brought back"?

I quoted several passages from Cosin, chiefly as evidence that he did not regard the Vestments as implying Roman doctrine, and that at the time when his notes were made "in Charles I.'s reign," he considered them to be obligatory in the Church of England, although neglected. That many of his notes are "collections" and not "original annotations" is not to the point, unless Mr. Johnson means to say that *the passages I quoted* are such collections. For my own part I cannot doubt that they are Cosin's, and express his own opinions, and this is the view of Cosin's "learned editor." I had not overlooked the parenthesis which Mr. Johnson quotes. If he will refer to the passage again he will observe that, as it is printed in Cosin's works, it has no connection with what precedes; but in Andrewes' minor works (p. 146) it is given as a note to a previous observation upon Andrewes' interpretation of the rubric:

"Mention is there made of [cope] surplice, tippet, hood, *pro cujusque gradu*.

"I find not that."—J. C.

"But the Act of Parliament (I see) refers to the Canon, and until such times as other order shall be taken."

In this context it would mean that Cosin had come to understand Andrewes' view, which was that the Canons of 1604 represented the "other order" contemplated by the Elizabethan Act of Uniformity. It might mean also that he concurred in that view. It would be interesting to know the date of this final entry, because as late as 1640, in some "particulars to be considered, explained, and corrected in the Book of Common Prayer" (v. 507), he writes:

"But what those ornaments of the Church and of the ministers are is not here specified, and they are so unknown to many, that by most they are neglected. Therefore it were requisite that those ornaments used in the second year of King Edward should be here particularly named and set forth, that there might be no difference about them."

Accordingly we find that in 1662 he proposed that the rubric should specify the Vestments. His note is "that is to say, a surplice, etc." ("Correspondence, Surtees Society," ii. 44). I must confess I had forgotten this passage when I spoke of Cosin as "drafting" the new Ornaments Rubric. It certainly looks as though he had adopted the view of Andrewes; and yet, as the *etcetera* must have included the

cope, which was regularly worn at Durham, it is impossible to say that it did not include the alb also. (There was probably never any question of the chasuble; the first book of Edward, which spoke of "a vestment or cope" was sufficiently obeyed by the use of the latter alternative.) But, for whatever reason, Cosin's advice was not followed, and the ornaments of the minister were not specified. The most intelligible explanation of the action of the Bishops, leaving Cosin's personal view out of account as indeterminable, is that given by Sir C. Chadwyck-Healey in his evidence before the Royal Commission on Discipline (1608, 2). He considers that the Advertisements of 1566, followed by the Canons, represented a legal minimum requirement, which did not abrogate the rubric; and he points out that as late as 1668 Baxter was still asking that "the rubrick for the *old* ornaments which were in use in the second year of Edward VI. be put out."

3. In the April number of the CHURCHMAN the discussion is continued by Mr. G. S. Streatfield and Mr. C. Sydney Carter. Mr. Streatfield pleads earnestly that toleration of the use of Vestments in the Church of England would be a new barrier against reunion with other bodies of Evangelical Christians. I cannot myself see why a cope should form such a barrier any more than a surplice. It is inconceivable that Reunion should take any other form than a federation of communions, which would leave each free to arrange its own rites and ceremonies. The terms of Reunion at present before the public are those formulated in the Lambeth Conference "quadrilateral," and they do not contemplate even the common use of the Prayer-Book.

4. In reply to my contention that Cranmer retained the Vestments in 1549 as the vesture appointed for the ministration of Holy Communion, Mr. Carter charges me with not having noticed the fact that Cranmer allowed the cope as an alternative for the chasuble. But surely Cranmer's admitted preference for the cope, which he himself used at St. Paul's, only makes more conspicuous his continued allowance of the "Vestment" as being the historical dress of the clergy at that ministration. He might have substituted the cope. In the second book, being pressed between the lords of the Council and the foreign Reformers,[1] Cranmer abolished the special Vestments altogether. But the fact that the Prayer-Book of 1549 had a real existence and use of some years (which its successor had not) ought to prevent Mr. Carter from saying that to allow the use of the chasuble now would "endorse a view which is absolutely contradictory to the whole Reformation position," and "one also which is consistent only with the Roman theory of the Sacrament."

H. C. BEECHING.

[1] *Cf.* Bucer's "Censura," quoted in Dixon's History, iii. 283: "I wish that the vesture appointed for that ministration were taken away, not because it is impious, but because we ought to have nothing in common with Romanensian Antichrists." This is the view which the Puritans more logically extended to the surplice, the ring in marriage, the cross in baptism, the square cap, and most other "ceremonies."

"HIGHER CRITICISM AND ORTHODOX BELIEF."

(*The Churchman, March, p.* 193; *April, p.* 306.)

In Mr. Kimm's criticism of my article, I am credited with three "assumptions":

1. That "the main results of historical criticism are generally accepted as practically ascertained fact."

2. That modern critical views imply that "all the great expositors before Wellhausen had failed to show that the Scriptures as they stand record a progressive revelation."

3. That "man was led from crude beginnings up to the loftiest conceptions."

As to the first, so much depends on what we are to understand by "main results." My reference was chiefly to the composite origin of certain books of Scripture (p. 194), a conclusion which is accepted by a steadily increasing majority of the leaders in Biblical science at the present day, and even by Dr. Orr himself (see Professor Peake's criticism of the "Problems of the Old Testament" and Dr. Orr's reply in *The Interpreter* of April and July, 1908). That scholars have not attained to absolute unanimity in matter of detail, or that, here and there, are to be found those who reject the critical hypothesis in its entirety, proves no more than that evidence has different values for different minds.

In regard to the second and third, few, I believe, will be prepared to deny that the modern study of Comparative Religion, and the application of the hypothesis of Evolution to the phenomena of religious development, have enabled us to understand, in a way that was impossible to earlier times, the manner in which God's revelation was "conveyed through human media, which were subject to the limitations of humanity" (see "Pan-Anglican Papers," S.B. 24, by Dr. C. F. Burney, 1908). Nor can it be doubted that it is to the critical methods of modern times that we are indebted for the more complete demonstration that it has been the peculiar glory of the Israelitish race to have evolved from crude and primitive conceptions, often bearing close affinities to Semitic heathenism, the high monotheistic religion which prepared the way for the true Messiah.

Let us not be seized with that "panicky fear of Biblical Criticism" against which the Rev. F. B. Meyer protested at the Tercentenary Commemoration Meeting in the Albert Hall on March 29. Better to take to heart the wise words of Dr. Eugene Stock, quoted in the April number of the CHURCHMAN, and to look facts squarely in the face, even though they may appear to clash with our preconceived ideas. The purpose of my article was to show that there is no cause to fear lest the results of Higher Criticism may affect the hold which men have on

the fundamental principles of the Faith, and that though the *grounds* of belief may stand in need of revision, the belief itself need be none the less firm and true.

ALEXANDER HENDERSON.

"FRESH LIGHT ON THE DATE OF THE CRUCIFIXION."

(*The Churchman, April*, 1911, *p.* 265.)

Are not the arguments for the usual chronology stronger than the writer would have us think?

First, there is, above all, the age of the Lord. If He was "about thirty years old" at the Baptism, I do not like to think that He was really thirty-three. Herod died in March A.U.C. 750 or 4 B.C. If the Lord was born before his death, He must have attained thirty before March, A.D. 27. (Note, that as the year 1 B.C. is followed by the year A.D. 1, there are thirty years from 4 B.C. to A.D. 27, and not 31.) Allowing at least a year for the events of Matt. ii. before the death of Herod, we are brought to A.D. 26 for the Baptism.

Of all the data given in Luke iii., the year of Tiberius is the only one that is pertinent, as the others are satisfied by any of the years suggested.

In John ii. we have "Forty and six years has this Temple been in building." When was the Temple begun? Josephus states in two places that Herod began the Temple in the fifteenth and in the eighteenth year of his reign ("Ant.," xv. 11. 1; "Wars," i. 21. 1). He also says that Herod began his reign twice, "Having reigned since he had procured Antigonus to be slain thirty-four years, but since he had been declared king by the Romans thirty-seven." I regret I cannot go to first sources for these dates, but they are given as 37 and 40 B.C. On these data, Herod began the Temple in 22 B.C. Forty-six years from this time extends to A.D. 25. Shall we be far wrong if we allow enough play in our data to bring this to A.D. 26?

These two periods will then agree, and they will bring us to a date for the commencement of the Saviour's ministry four years before a date of the Crucifixion which is astronomically possible. There remains Tiberius. I do not feel satisfied that we ought to reject the earlier date for the commencement of his hegemony so lightly as we are invited to do. Suetonius says (Tiberius, xxi.): "Lege per consules lata ut provincias cum Augusto communiter administraret, simulque censum ageret." I have not the other accounts of this appointment, which may occur in Tacitus and Velleius, but, with this account alone, it hardly seems critical to speak in this connection of "obscure and uncertain titles," "a complimentary nature," "date uncertain, the whole business extremely vague," "supposition that the titles were conferred about the time of," "such titular honours." These reiterated

descriptions do not seem to agree with the statement of Suetonius, which is quite precise both as to the power (not the title merely) and the time. Furthermore, this appointment not merely conferred a title, but it definitely designated Tiberius as Augustus' successor, a step Augustus had up to that time been most averse from taking. A common share of the Imperium in the provinces and the appointment to the succession, if not what we should have expected as the occasion of Tiberius' hegemony, are surely not an impossible understanding of St. Luke. And if we admit it, we have all these four data—Tiberius, the Temple, Herod's death, and the astronomical condition—in close agreement. Any mathematician will recognize the enormous chances against such a combination, except on the basis of historical accuracy.

As regards the duration of the Lord's ministry, it is known to all that we have three Passovers carefully specified in St. John; but it is not so generally noticed that we have a fourth in the other Gospels. But I imagine St. John noticed it, and therefore left it out, as he seems to have left out on principle everything that was in the Synoptists. It is to be found in Matt. xii. 1, etc.: "They began to pluck the ears of corn." This, with the saying in John iv. 35, will give us three years or over for the period from John ii. to the end, to which we have to add the time between the Baptism and John ii. 13.

I cannot find that the astronomical table given differs, except in one point, from that given by Salmon, who states his calculation agrees with those of Wurm and Adams. The exception is in the year 29, where Salmon puts the 15th Nisan in April 4, and Dr. Fotheringham puts it a month earlier, both indicating unsuitable days. The Jewish Passover at present always follows the equinox; and if this rule obtained in the Lord's time, it seems that Dr. Fotheringham's date of March 19 is less likely than Dr. Salmon's.

W. BOTHAMLEY.

Notices of Books.

JOHN THE PRESBYTER AND THE FOURTH GOSPEL. By Dom Chapman, O.S.B. Oxford: *Clarendon Press*. 1911. Pp. 108. Price 6s. net.

This book contains what is probably the best discussion of the patristic evidence as to the identity of St. John which is to be found in any language. It is not as extensive as that of Zahn in his "Forschungen," nor are there such displays of recondite erudition. Again, there is not the complete statement of the evidence of Irenæus which is to be found in the admirable work of Dr. Lewis of Chicago. The special value of Dom Chapman's work lies in the exceptional value of his examination of the argument at its cardinal points, and more especially of his study of the evidence of Papias. Perhaps no other examination of the documents shows the same precision of reasoning, penetration of insight, and grasp of the facts.

The extraordinary excellence of Dom Chapman's work makes one greatly regret its brevity. This results in some serious sins of omission. When arguing very successfully against the hypothesis that there was more than one John of Asia (of distinction), he states, on p. 49, that there is no vestige in ancient literature of another John. He certainly ought to have mentioned the second John of Ap. Const., 7, 46. The writer of this passage probably worked on ancient material, though, possibly under the influence of Eusebius, he may have misunderstood it.

Again, the passage of Eusebius, which Dr. Lawlor has shown to be a reproduction of Hegesippus, deserved further discussion. Here Dom Chapman understates his case. Not Hegesippus, but the "ancient tradition" which he cites, is the earliest authority for the banishment of the Apostle John to Patmos (H.E., 3. 20. 11). Hegesippus probably so describes it because it was derived from the elders of Papias.

Dom Chapman pays more attention than most people to the evidence of Leucius, but he is sadly brief. Leucius is the earliest writer to tell us that John of Asia was the son of Zebedee. Dr. James has proved his use of the Gospel and first Epistle (Camb., "Texts and Stud.," 5, 1, p. 144 *f*), and Leucius seems to ascribe the latter to the Apostle ("Ac. Joh." 88, 89). His evidence is the more important in that he gnosticizes and has to explain away the Apostle's antidocetic phraseology. But our author seldom or never bases an argument on a passage which he has discussed inadequately.

Perhaps he is not as convincing as usual on p. 69. He there tells us that the words in which Polycrates describes one of the daughters of Philip as "living in Holy Spirit" (ἐν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι πολιτευσαμένη) mean that she was a holy and venerable personage. So many of us have thought, but the surmise is not quite self-evident, and the phrase requires discussion. Moreover, it is not quite fair to say: "It is surely quite possible for two men of the name of Philip to have had daughters." The point is that the daughters of Philip of Hierapolis, like those of Philip the Evangelist, were prominent; and that while the latter prophesied, one at least of the former "lived in Holy Spirit." Dom Chapman, however, reduces the Hierapolitan daughters from three to two, and cleverly explains the mistake of Gaius. But enough of fault-finding. Even our author's failings—to wit, brevity and a slightly excessive dislike of German puzzle-headedness—lean to virtue's side.

It is difficult to write much on the other side of the account, for the simple reason that it is the great merit of the book that it deals with familiar material better than its predecessors. Among important points are the cogent argument that Papias was acquainted with St. John, the argument for the soundness of our text of the fragment of his work, a fresh and exceedingly interesting argument from the use of the terms "Apostle" and "Disciple" in Pauline and Johannine circles. But the position that an Apostle is never called an "elder" is, perhaps, slightly weakened by a fragment of a very ancient apocryphal work embedded in the Ethiopic "Contending of the Apostles," which speaks of "Thomas the Elder" (Budge, p. 517). Yet our author is probably right in holding against Zahn and Lightfoot, whom he greatly admires, that Papias inquired for statements of the elders (who were not Apostles) as to what the Apostles said.

He attributes the variation between the styles of Revelation and the Gospel to the amanuensis, and seems to be on the right track; but on p. 92 he forgets the traces of Paulinism in 1 John. He finds a considerable sense of humour in the Evangelist, an interesting and important point, which with characteristic brevity he fails to illustrate and to drive home by alluding to the similar quality so obvious in the letter to Laodicea. In his tantalizing way Dom Chapman expresses a conviction, which he does not attempt to justify, that the fragments which Feuardentius cites from Victor of Capua as from Polycarp (Lightfoot, "Ap. Fath.," 2. 2, p. 1001) contain in each case fragments of Papias. This is exceedingly interesting, and on a cursory reading the suggestion seems plausible, especially as regards the third fragment.

It is a great pleasure to extend so hearty a welcome to this book, the more so as we do not often have the opportunity of giving our *legatur* to a work on a Scriptural subject which is stamped with an *imprimatur*. We also owe our thanks to the writer's friends, who persuaded him to write some of his notes and subsidiary discussions. We hope that his pen in the future will be more prolific, and that when he writes he will believe that his subordinate studies and other chips from his workshop will be valued by his readers. It is seldom that one so regrets brevity. H. J. BARDSLEY.

OUR ENGLISH BIBLE. By H. D. Hoare. London: *John Murray*. Price 1s. net.

This is a reprint, and a most timely one, of a most interesting account of our English Bible. Mr. Hoare is a layman, and he writes for laymen. But he is a scholar, and he has the happy capacity to give exact information in a form which is most interesting and attractive. He writes with careful judgment, and his criticism of the Revised and Authorized Version is just the sort of criticism which is necessary, if presently we are to solve the vexed question of Authorized versus Revised. The book has a useful Bibliography, and is altogether quite the best and cheapest general account of the English Bible that we have seen.

STUDIES IN THE PASSION OF JESUS CHRIST. By Charles Henry Robinson, D.D. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 2s. 6d. net.

We can never take into our hands a book by one or other of the three brothers, of whom now only two survive—in the persons of the Dean of Wells and the writer of this little book — without being the better for it. Assuredly, this book will be a help to all those, and they should be many, who read it. It naturally divides into two. The first sixty pages contain studies of the Seven Words from the Cross; the rest of the book tells of some of Christ's legacies to His Church, the legacy of Love, of Joy, of Peace, and of Humility. The book is full of telling illustrations from literature, from the Mission Field, and from a ripe experience. It is a book to be read and pondered, not to be reviewed. We would gladly gain readers for it, and we believe that they will be grateful. Perhaps to quote one of its illustrations will incline some to seek the rest—"A savage Bechuana, on hearing the story of the Cross, was deeply moved, and exclaimed: 'Jesus, away from there. That is my place.'"

THE DOMAIN OF BELIEF. By Henry John Coke. *Macmillan and Co.* 1910. Price 7s. 6d. net.

It was, perhaps, unfortunate that Mr. Coke should have felt himself obliged to begin this book of studies in philosophical problems with a discussion of the Freedom of the Will, Fatalism and Responsibility. For though this is by no means the least valuable portion of the book, it is certainly the most difficult for the ordinary reader, and may frighten him off from the effort to penetrate farther into a work which is a really admirable example of destructive criticism, levelled at the main contentions of materialists. Mr. Coke's restraint is one of the best features of his work. For instance, in his discussion of fatalism and responsibility, he never presents himself as championing that *libertas indifferentiæ*, which, it is to be feared, many orthodox thinkers mistake for free-will, whereas, in point of fact, it reduces all human action to pure chance, which is, religiously, as valueless as automatism. To speak as he does of the "personal agency of the Ego," with, as its corollary, personal responsibility resting on man's capacity for deliberation, is much more intelligible than vague language about free-will. The section on Immortality suffers somewhat from the use made of the idea of an eternal mind-stuff. Immortality is as purely transcendental a conception as the idea of freedom or of God. But to favour the idea of an "eternal mind-stuff whose sum is infinite," which can be made in any way parallel to our conception of energy, however abstract that may be, is to oscillate in an unconvincing way between the physical and metaphysical planes. The chapter on God is written in a spirit of deep reverence, as well as with an honest fronting of the difficulties, the chief difficulty being, to Mr. Coke's mind, the abstract conception of Omnipotence. This is the more interesting because of recent years Dr. Rashdall and Dr. Forsyth, from different points of view, have called us to a reconsideration of the meaning of this attribute, when applied to God. Mr. Cope clearly thinks that unconditioned Omnipotence and evil are irreconcilable. The latter part of the book is taken up with an exceedingly able criticism of Weismannism, in the course of which Mr. Coke seems to us to make point after point against the new doctrine in the most legitimate way. Mr. Coke has little to say of Christianity, save to distinguish between its permanent bequests, mainly moral, and its "præternatural element which will pass away in the coming enlightenment," a remark which hardly does justice to the rigour of Mr. Coke's own critical principles elsewhere. It has been a pleasure to read the work of this candid and philosophical thinker, and lecturers in apologetics should include it in their libraries. But why has Mr. Coke grudged us an index?

J. K. MOZLEY.

ST PAUL AND MODERN RESEARCH. By J. R. Cohu. *Arnold.* (Price not stated.)

Mr. Cohu does not write as a specialist for specialists, but he has read some of the more important books, and gives his results in a clear and readable form. Works of this kind are very useful within their limits, and we can heartily commend the book before us to readers of the CHURCHMAN. It will be well that they should have read the parts of it with which many of them will disagree. Mr. Cohu's subject is St. Paul as a theologian, and

he has the first qualification of a commentator's enthusiastic admiration for his author. He holds that the Apostle's reign is not over, but only beginning, and quotes from Havet, "This is not Paul's theology: it is theology." Yet there is a Jewish vein in St. Paul's thought, and he needs interpretation. "Theology," Mr. Cohu well says, "is a living organism, and as such its highest life depends on perfect adaptation to environment."

Some criticism is necessary. When Mr. Cohu writes, "When Paul and Jesus clash," he does not do himself justice. Mr. Cohu holds the centrality of the Cross, but is very perplexed by the Pauline doctrine of propitiation. He should, at any rate, have referred to the Apostle's deep suggestion, "made perfect his obedience." The chapter on the Apostle's conversion is satisfactory, but what can these words possibly mean, "whether subjectively or objectively Paul saw Christ verily and truly"? Not the Fall, but th possibility of the Fall was a "necessary stage." The note on the Virgin Birth shows great confusion of thought. The first Gospel insists *both* on the heirship to David *and* the Virgin Birth, and a careful exegesis makes it almost certain that St. John held the latter as well as our Lord's pre-existence. But Mr. Cohu writes from the point of view of a real belief in the Incarnation, and is almost always worth reading and often helpful.

H. J. BARDSLEY.

OUR GRAND OLD BIBLE. By William Muir. London: *Morgan and Scott.* 1911.

An enthusiastic and well-written account of the history of the English Versions from Wycliffe's to the Revised Version, with some mention of the earlier attempts to translate the Bible. With the possible exception of Thomas Cromwell, whose memory is too kindly treated, the history is, as far as we can judge, accurate and fair. We should like to suggest an alteration of the title, which is not happily chosen.

PRAYER AND PRACTICE. E. E. Holmes. With an Introduction by the Bishop of London. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 2s. 6d. net.

Highly recommended by the Bishop of London as a "delightful" and useful book. Though we do not find ourselves in agreement with all the views expressed in it, yet it contains a good deal of helpful thought and many simple illustrations from everyday life which make it easy reading.

THE CONQUEST OF HABIT. Charles Seymour. *The Speakers' Library.* Strand, London, W.C.

The author of this little book is a professor of elocution. He has written books on that subject, one of which is already in its third edition. The present volume, which seems to be his first attempt at a new subject, is a little confused, and leaves a good deal to be desired in the way of arrangement. Part III., entitled "Little John," seems to be out of place in a book dealing with the "Conquest of Habit."

THE EUCHARIST: A study. Mrs. Amy A. Brooke. London: *David Nutt.* 1910. 6d. net.

The title of this pamphlet is somewhat misleading. It is a collection of curious facts relating to primitive religious rites and practices. Though the

facts in themselves are interesting, we are not sure that they really throw much light on the meaning of the Christian Sacrament of Holy Communion.

THE ORIGIN OF THE PENTATEUCH. Harold M. Wiener. London: *Elliot Stock.* 1s. net.

Mr. Wiener supplies, in a brief and readable form, a *résumé* of his arguments against the Wellhausen theory of the Pentateuch. Though largely consisting of quotations from the author's previous writings, this little book is very welcome. It draws attention, in a clear and forceful way, to the enormous difficulties which beset the accepted critical division of the Pentateuch, and the historical reconstruction which it presupposes. We hope it will be widely read.

Received: MODERN DISCIPLESHIP. By Edward S. Woods. London: *Student Christian Movement.* Price—paper 1s. 6d., cloth 2s. 6d. A valuable series of studies by the former Vice-Principal of Ridley Hall. A book to be read. BULBS AND BLOSSOMS. By Amy Le Feuvre. London: *R.T.S.* Price 1s. Another pretty little book for children from this writer's prolific pen. THE SOUL'S TRIUMPHANT WAY. By Rev. J. A. Hutton. London: *Robert Scott.* Price 1s. net. Three devotional studies usefully and practically written. CHRISTIAN DISCIPLESHIP AND SOCIAL LIFE. London: *Student Christian Movement.* Price 6d. A valuable series of Bible Studies of the type to which the S.C.M. is making us accustomed. THE GOSPEL OF THE RESURRECTION. By Brooke Foss Westcott, D.D. London: *Allenson, Ltd.* Price 6d. Bishop Westcott's famous book brought within the reach of all. GLORIOUS COMPREHENSIVENESS. By an Oxford Priest. London: *Cope and Fenwick.* A far-fetched plea for reunion with Rome. We do not wonder that the writer hides his name. PAGAN AND CHRISTIAN PARALLELS. By W. H. Howard Nash. London: *Hunter and Longhurst.* Price 6d. net. This is a valuable little book, dealing in a very effective way with the frequently-urged contention that Christianity has borrowed most of its distinctiveness from earlier pagan thought. We warmly commend it. THE HOPE OF GLORY. By Venerable Archdeacon Wilberforce. London: *Elliot Stock.* Price 1s. net. Two Lenten addresses by the Archdeacon of Westminster, in one of which he tries to show that the Incarnation itself is the Atonement. GAINS AND LOSSES; OR, EASTER AND LENT. By Right Rev. S. H. S. Walpole. London: *Robert Scott.* Price 1s. net; cloth 1s. 6d. The reprint, in book form, and slightly extended, of the article which appeared in our columns two months ago. CAUGHT ON THE WING. By Iver McIver. Edinburgh: *W. Blackwood and Sons.* Price 3s. 6d. net. A volume of nicely-written poems. RECORDS OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE. Edited by Alfred W. Pollard. London: *Henry Frowde.* Price 5s. net. This book contains in full the historic documents, in Latin, French, and English, which lead up to the various English translations of the Bible. A most valuable aid to a student of the subject. PERSONAL ECONOMY AND SOCIAL REFORM. By H. G. Woods. London: *Student Christian Movement.* Price 1s. 6d. An inquiry into the spending and earning of money from a Christian point of view. COMMEMORATION CARDS. London: *Morgan and Scott.* A set of illuminated text-cards commemorating the tercentenary of the Authorized Version. THE FACT AND FEATURES OF THE LORD'S RETURN. By Hubert Brooke. London: *Robert Scott.* Price 2s. net. A series of Bible-readings from one whose work is too well known to need commendation here. THREE FACTS OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH. By J. W. Greaves. Birmingham: *Cornish Brothers.* Price 2s. 6d. net. WE YOUNG MEN. By Hans Wegener. Philadelphia: *Vir Publishing Company.* Price 2s. 9d. net. A useful book, dealing frankly and carefully with a delicate subject. THE OFFICIAL YEAR-BOOK OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 3s. As useful as ever, and as full of food for thought. TEMPERANCE SKETCHES FROM LIFE. By Mrs. George S. Reaney. London: *H. R. Allenson, Ltd.* Price 2s. 6d. net. A series of interesting little stories which will prove very useful in the parish. PEG WOFFINGTON. Price 6d. THE HOUSE OF A THOUSAND CANDLES. Price 7d. THE ROMANCE OF A PRO-CONSUL. Price 1s. London: *Nelson and Sons.* CORONATION LITERATURE. We have received from the *S.P.C.K.* Forms of Thanksgiving for Coronation Day; also from the Oxford and Cambridge University Presses. They vary a little, and all are so well done that it is odious to make comparisons. We have received Coronation Services from the Oxford Press, and also some really beautiful Coronation Prayer-Books. We advise any who wish to give Coronation presents to children or others to at least see these excellent volumes.