

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

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

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

# THE CHURCHMAN

November, 1911.

## The Month.

Church  
Congress,

THE Church Congress of 1911 has come and gone. There are those who regarded the choice of subjects as uninteresting, and the place in which the Congress was held as unattractive, and the Congress in consequence was a small one. It is to be regretted, for both place and subjects present problems to the Church which it must face or fail. Subject after subject in the programme suggested the social and economic problems which modern England has to meet. Outside in the streets, hurrying to and fro from their work, were the multitudes of industrial workers which the Church has to win and help. In this England of ours the problems of the Church are the problems of the nation, and the problems of the nation are almost equally the problems of the Church. The Congress met in the Potteries. As in all great industrial centres, Lazarus, in need, but hardly knowing it, lay at the gate. In the Congress Hall we discussed his condition and his fate, not in the spirit of the Rich Man of old, but in real and cordial desire to help. The Congress considered industrial employments and their dangers, the feeble-minded, vagrancy, and unemployment, the training of youth for the work of life, and similar things. It only talked; it does not pass resolutions, and it has no power to act. Is it therefore worthless? Surely we may answer no. The Congress of 1911 compels us to ask the question which the Bishop of London put in his opening sermon: Why has not the Church more influence? And if we learn the lesson of the Congress aright we shall not only

endeavour to repair the harm which is wrought by class prejudice, by ecclesiastical controversy and by absence of sympathy, but we shall exert the spiritual power of the Church not only in the direction of social reform, but in the direction of that even more fundamental thing, individual conversion. The Church must be in the van of a social reform of to-day, but it must not forget its spiritual office.

In the Bishop of London's sermon he referred to the fact that in the 800 pages of the history of the Church of England in the Nineteenth Century, by the Vice-Provost of Eton, some 400 are devoted to the wearisome history of controversy. It is easy to exaggerate the significance of that proportion. The story of controversy takes much longer to tell than that of quiet, constructive, progressive work. But we are in entire agreement with the Bishop that controversy has hindered the progress of the Church. We are not anxious to apportion the blame, or, when the Bishop refers to controversies about vestments and incense and stoles, we might be inclined to ask who began them. We are anxious, however, to bring controversies to an end. The Bishop of London in his recent charge, and the Bishop of Southwell in his speech at the Congress, both appear to think that controversy will end with the permission granted to every man, within extraordinarily wide limits, to do that which is right in his own eyes. We venture to make two suggestions. We are not mere legalists, but we do think that somehow the recognition of authority should be restored in the Church, and we do think the rights of the laity should be properly safeguarded. Surely there is a line of cleavage between us and Rome; surely loyal Churchmen should keep well within it; and surely the clergy should not be allowed to carry their people right up to it, or even over it, without the exercise of discipline. If the Church is to perform the task which is before her, we must set our house in order, and neither anarchy nor an extravagant comprehensiveness will really help us in the task.

*Ecclesiastical  
Controversies.*

**Church  
Finance.**

The Report of the Archbishop's Committee has been published, and will provide us with food for thought for some time to come. Probably the great controversy will range round the question whether the system of apportionment shall be adopted or not. Undoubtedly the problem is a difficult one. If we adopt the system, who is to settle the basis? There are arguments against almost every conceivable form. The communicant is the obvious unit; but fifty in one parish can give, and ought to give, as much as 500 in another. If we ask for a percentage of all collections in church, how are we to deal with the parish that has a big subscription list or a sale of work? If a percentage of all the contributions from a parish, how are we to deal with the parish which is so poor that most of its income comes from outside? And so we might go on. In the Diocese of Manchester the Bishop has evolved an excellent scheme, but he and the diocese are still weighing the pros and cons of apportionment as against a system of voluntary contributions. If we are only dealing with small sums, it will be easier; but we all hope we are going to deal with large. Perhaps the solution will lie in the direction of using apportionment over large areas, such as rural deaneries, and then, with the aid of a wise committee, arranging a voluntary apportionment for parish and individual.

**The Church  
in Wales.**

The great gathering at Shrewsbury, and the debate at the Congress, breathed a spirit of real determination to repel the attack on the Welsh Church. We cannot help feeling that from the human point of view we are running a race with time. The Welsh Church has made such excellent progress during the last few years that every year makes it stronger to resist attack. At the moment there are two things to do—we have to convince the nation that the policy of complete disendowment is a policy of dishonesty; we have to convert our friend—and he really exists—the Liberal Churchman. We are hopeful because we believe that England is honest. We are a little afraid because there are grave possi-

bilities of bargains between political parties, and there may be an attempt to sell the Welsh Church to the highest bidder. We believe frankly that the Establishment is good for the nation, and we believe that an act of dishonesty is always bad for the dishonest. Hence, although maintaining our political independence, we are against the Government in this matter, and are glad to see the signs of effective opposition around us. We are particularly glad to see such definitely Liberal Churchmen as Dean Barker and Canon Hensley Henson speaking out, and most glad to see the latter appealing to the Nonconformist sense of fairness for support.

We have received, by the courtesy of Mr. Harold M. Wiener, a booklet with the title, "The Higher Critical Quandary." It contains a correspondence between Mr. Wiener and the general editors of the O.T. portion of the *International Critical Commentary*, Dr. Driver and Dr. Briggs. The correspondence refers to the treatment of certain critical matters in the volume on "Genesis," by Dr. Skinner, to whose editorship this particular book was entrusted. The main point at issue appears to be this: Mr. Wiener states that, in discussing the Divine appellations in Genesis, Dr. Skinner only records 50 cases of divergences from the Massoretic Text and bases his argument on them, whereas he knew all the time that the actual number of divergences was 189. The gist of the replies made by Dr. Driver and Dr. Briggs is: (1) That in the treatment of specific critical problems they are accustomed to rely largely on the judgment of their contributors; and (2) that in this particular case they are quite satisfied that Dr. Skinner was justified in omitting any prolonged discussion of these remaining 139 variants, on the ground that they are not of sufficient critical importance.

In the course of the correspondence, Mr. Wiener charges Dr. Skinner with both *suppressio veri* and *suggestio falsi*; he implies that this particular volume of the Commentary is one "intended to deceive." In reply to

Grave  
Charges.

this the editors say: "There appears to us to be absolutely no evidence showing that Dr. Skinner wrote with any intention to deceive; and we most emphatically deny that he did deceive, in that he wrote untruthfully, or that he omitted to mention any facts which were of any importance for the question at issue." In a further letter, Mr. Wiener speaks of Dr. Skinner's "deliberately arguing on a false issue after his attention had twice been publicly drawn to the true issue"; and a little later on the same letter says: "Here again it seems to me indubitable that Dr. Skinner wrote untruthfully." In the reply to this, Dr. Briggs and Dr. Driver say: "It is not easy for scholars to meet the charge of untruthfulness patiently. We have endeavoured to do so, assuming that the charge was based on a misapprehension on your part. But we do not think we should go farther. We, of course, accept your major premise, that untruthfulness is reprehensible, but this seems to be almost the entire extent of our common ground. We deny absolutely your minor premise, that untruthfulness is shown in Dr. Skinner's book."

**Our Own  
View.**

Into the subject-matter of this controversy we have no desire to enter. Those who wish to do so can read the correspondence for themselves. But of one thing we are absolutely sure—that neither in this Commentary nor anywhere else has Dr. Skinner ever intended to deceive anyone at all. Dr. Skinner is not only an Old Testament scholar of established repute, but he is a gentleman and a Christian. To imply that he, in this or in any other case, is attempting deliberately to mislead his readers is an indefensible and utterly unworthy thing. Unless we have entirely misread the whole correspondence, it is not error with which Dr. Skinner is charged, but wilful deception. We do not ourselves stand committed to the particular views on the Old Testament with which Dr. Skinner's name is identified. But we would assure him that we thoroughly deprecate and entirely disown such methods of controversy. We believe that Dr. Skinner is

animated by the sole desire—as earnest and reverent as that of any more conservative scholar—to understand and to teach the absolute truth, so far as he can learn it, about the Sacred Scriptures. Mr. Wiener may be right or he may be wrong on the point of scholarship. In either case it is greatly to be regretted that he has seen fit to accuse a distinguished Christian scholar of wilful deception.

In a recent number of the *Educational Supplement* to the *Times* there is an interesting letter on the subject of the teaching of classics at Oxford. The writer maintains that far too many men are occupied in this and far too much money is spent on it. In the course of this arraignment he runs a tilt against the general and widely-spread practice of giving each man at least an hour a week of private work with his tutor. The writer maintains that while this method of tuition may be appropriate to the hard-working Honours man, it is entirely thrown away on the average Pass man, and that, in either case, the hour is useless if spent in discussing the prospects of the College boat in the latest phrase of College politics. It may of course be admitted that any good system is capable of abuse, and when so abused becomes futile and ineffective. But we should be sorry to see this excellent practice fall into disuse. The private hour spent with the tutor has, in the experience of innumerable Oxford men, been infinitely more inspiring, infinitely more productive of lasting good, than many hours of formal lectures. It is the time when, in the individual contact of mind with mind, personal faults can be detected, personal difficulties can be discussed, as the sympathetic tutor realizes the distinctive character of the pupil with whom he is dealing.

We have referred to this letter and the topic it discusses partly for its own interest and partly because it suggests a far wider application of the principle. We venture to urge upon the clergy and upon all Christian workers the paramount need for *personal* and *individual* work—for dealing separately with particular

"The  
Private Hour."  
The same  
in Christian  
Work.

individuals. We hear much to-day of the Church as a Body, and the tendency is to view men in the mass, and to deal with them in corporate fashion, in the way of Guilds, Societies, and Brotherhoods. We are much obsessed by the idea of the Church as a social organism. So much is this aspect of the matter present to our imaginations that we are apt to forget the claims and the excellences of the other one-by-one method—the method of seeking and winning individual souls. It was largely the method of our Lord. Seven of His Apostles, we know, were called one by one. The records of His dealing with individual souls form one of the most precious parts of the Gospel narrative. Many of the great saints and leaders of the Church have done their most effective work in this way. We have said that we believe this to be one of the soundest features in the intellectual discipline of the older Universities. We believe, too, that in the winning of souls for Christ and in the edifying of those who are His, it is the secret—at present a somewhat neglected secret—of fruitful and effective work.

Some little time ago a number of Churchmen, Evangelicals and Liberals, who, for purposes of distinctive classification, would be called "Broad," or "Liberal," combined to form the Churchmen's Union. The Union has now its organ, the *Modern Churchman*, edited by the Rev. H. D. A. Major. In the August issue of this magazine an earnest plea is made by the Rev. A. W. Cunningham Craig for friendship and co-operation between Liberal Churchmen and Evangelicals. He instances three matters in which the two groups of Churchmen are at one : (1) Opposition to the sacerdotal conception of the Christian Ministry ; (2) obedience to the law at present regulating public worship in the Church ; (3) the attitude towards other Christian bodies, especially the Free Churches. On the other hand, he does not close his eyes to the points on which difference of opinion exists between the two groups. These he summarizes as (1) the attitude towards Biblical criticism ; (2) the policy to be followed in Prayer-Book revision ; (3) the education question.



In the September number of the *Modern Churchman* there is a reply—somewhat critical, but on the whole cordial—from the Evangelical side, written by the Rev. W. J. Sommerville, and in the *Church Gazette* for October there is an article on the topic written in terms that are both sympathetic and friendly. As this article is unsigned, we presume that it may be taken as expressing the “official” attitude of the National Church League.

Possibility of  
Co-operation.

We wish for our own part to express the warmest sympathy with the suggestions that have been so frankly made and so cordially received for a closer association. For the present we feel that it must rather be in the way of co-operation than of identification. We do not, as a matter of fact, think that on some of the points of “difference” younger Evangelical men are so far apart from the Liberals as Mr. Craig thinks they are. They are not, for instance, at all opposed to Prayer-Book revision in principle. They are only opposed to revision that is reactionary in character and subversive of truths asserted in the Reformation era. With regard to “Biblical criticism,” they welcome gladly all the light that reverent investigation can bring, and they would preclude nothing in the way of critical examination. What they dislike is that cool, detached attitude of merciless dissection—the spirit of ruthless analysis, mainly, at this stage, of a destructive character, which seems to them to characterize so much of the critical writing of the day. Evangelicals look upon the Bible as the Divinely inspired word of God. As such, they approach even the critical investigation of it in a spirit of awe and reverence. They do not accuse their Liberal brethren of a deficiency in this, but they think that the “Liberals” in a spirit of chivalry advocate the cause of extremer critics whose views they do not actually share. Once again, we welcome this movement towards co-operation, and we sincerely hope that the suggestions already made will not be allowed to sink fruitlessly for want of energetic action.

## The Continental Reformation.

BY THE REV. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D.

### II.—THE CONTINENTAL CONTRASTED WITH THE ENGLISH REFORMATION.

WE have restricted ourselves to the religious factors in the Reformation, and we have decided to adopt the religious rather than the non-religious view in studying it. We must now make a further limitation. We must endeavour to confine ourselves to the Continental Reformation and leave our own country out of the account. This suggests that some of the features in which the reforming movement on the Continent differed from the reforming movement in England should be pointed out.<sup>1</sup>

1. The two were alike in being the result of causes which had long been working, and which had greatly increased in force and volume during the preceding century; and to a considerable extent the causes were the same. But there were important differences, and only in certain particulars is the English Reformation parallel to the Continental one. It is specially interesting to notice the difference between the positions from which the two movements started. The English started with the desire to secure the ancient rights of the English Church, and to defend the English nation against the ceaseless encroachments of the Church of Rome. Centuries of experience had taught them that the only way in which this could effectually be accomplished was to cut themselves free from the jurisdiction of Rome. This, at the outset, was the main object, if not the only object.<sup>2</sup> No other changes, such as reforms in doctrine, or ritual, or discipline, were desired by any considerable number of persons; and nearly every official, whether in Church or State, was opposed to such changes. When at last a desire for these reforms became general, it was largely in consequence of what had already taken place on the Continent; and then the English

<sup>1</sup> A. L. Moore, "Lectures on the Reformation," pp. 319 *et seq.*

<sup>2</sup> A. Plummer, "English Church History," 1509-1575, pp. 50-64.

Church could do as its rulers thought best in the matter. It had freed itself from the hampering control of Rome, and had regained its constitutional liberty, therefore any ecclesiastical changes which were regarded as necessary could be executed at once. The organization of the English Church which had come down to it from Theodore of Tarsus (A.D. 668-690) remained intact; it was no longer impeded by Roman interference; and it could reform itself in any direction that seemed to be desirable.

This happy condition of things did not prevail on the Continent. There the process of reformation was reversed. The reforms in doctrine, ritual, and discipline came first, and these led on to a complete rejection of the authority of Rome. What was the consequence? Not only were reforms hampered by the interference of Rome, but Luther had no organization ready to his hand with which to effect them. The only ecclesiastical organization which existed was his deadly enemy. He had to build up an entirely new system, and had to do this long before the reforms in discipline and doctrine were complete. The result was dissension almost from the first. Luther had his view, and Zwingli his, and Calvin yet another, and there was no Convocation or Council to decide between them. The only substitute for a central authority, such as both Rome and England possessed, was the appeal to Scripture. And that was an appeal which settled very little. The text was not always certain; translations varied considerably, especially in the renderings of crucial passages, and interpretations varied most of all. Everyone claimed to have Scripture on his side.

2. Not only did the Continent begin with the reform of doctrine and practice, while England began with the rejection of Roman jurisdiction; both of them intended to end where they began. Neither had at first any intention of taking the step which was being taken by the other. When Luther agitated for reform in the matter of indulgences (A.D. 1517-1518), he had no thought of breaking with Rome: he wrote most submissively to his own diocesan and to the Pope.<sup>1</sup> When Henry VIII.

<sup>1</sup> Kidd, "Documents Illustrative of the Continental Reformation," pp. 27, 37.

broke with Rome (A.D. 1529-1532), he had no idea of introducing changes of doctrine; on the contrary, he ruthlessly persecuted those who advocated change (The Six Articles, 1539). Thus, the Continental Reformers would have kept just what England rejected, while England would have retained just what the Continent determined to reject.

3. Another point in which the English Reformation differed from the Continental was that in England the *paganism* of the Renaissance had little power. In general culture, and especially in literature, England felt the influence of the New Learning. But, while this aided the movement for reform by exposing the ignorant superstition and folly of monks and clergy, it did not corrupt society with a revival of pagan immorality. In England it was the increased knowledge of the Scriptures that was specially valued; in Italy and France it was chiefly the increased knowledge of the classics. In Italy, and especially in Rome, we find learning, a passion for the arts, and devotion to the refinements of culture, combined with ferocity, cruelty, and the coarsest forms of self-indulgence. On the one side, a seeming zeal for everything that is intellectual and beautiful; on the other, a dissoluteness worthy of the court of Elagabalus.<sup>1</sup> Erasmus said that the enthusiasm for classical literature was in some of the Humanists "a mere pretext for the revival of paganism, which is dearer to them than the glory of Christ."

Germany was closer to England in this respect. There, as in Italy, there was plenty of magnificence, luxury, and sensuality. But in Germany there was not much paganism among the Humanists. Some of them, like Melancthon, used their learning for the interpretation of Scripture. Others, like Ulrich von Hutten, were ready with verses and satires, and sometimes with swords, to free their country from Roman exactions and encroachments. Very few were enthusiastic for a revival of heathen thought and morals. The truth perhaps is, that the Renaissance, in its revolt from the obscurantist corporations of the Middle Ages, laid emphasis on the natural dignity of every individual. In the medieval system, the individual was lost in some

<sup>1</sup> Plummer, "English Church History," pp. 28, 29.

ecclesiastical order, or secular guild, to which he belonged. The New Learning taught him his own personal value. In some cases the sense of individuality led to libertinism ; each might do what seemed good in his own eyes. In other cases it led to deeper moral earnestness ; if the individual is so valuable, " self-reverence, self-knowledge, self-control " are the virtues which he is bound to cultivate. The former was the effect which it too often had on the Continent ; the latter was more often the effect in England. Or we may say that the New Learning taught each individual how much power he had over all his surroundings. This new sense of power made those who felt it eager to use it to the full. Italians exercised it in one way, Englishmen in another.

4. Yet a fourth point of difference between our Reformation and the Continental one may be mentioned, and it is one of considerable magnitude. In England, the results which were attained were much more the work of the nation than of any one Reformer. Scotland in this respect was like the Continent. It had its Knox, whose self-confident faith, strong will, and strong speech, carried the Scottish people along with him, as Luther carried the Germans, and made him for a time a Scottish political leader as well as a religious reformer. But in England there was no commanding genius who was the soul of the movement and put the impress of his character upon it. There is little comparison in this respect between Henry VIII. and Luther, and still less between Cranmer and Zwingli, or Parker and Calvin. Such comparisons bring out contrasts rather than similarities.

5. One more difference between the two movements is of considerable interest. Both in the processes which led up to the Reformation, and in the actual struggle, much less use was made in England than on the Continent of ridicule and satire as engines of assault upon Rome. Here we had no Pasquino or Marforio, and not very much that will bear comparison with Sebastian Brandt's " Ship of Fools " ( " Narrenschiff " ) or Erasmus's " Praise of Folly " ( " Encomium Moriae " ) ; still less anything that can rival the immortal " Epistolæ Obscurorum

Virorum," by Crotus Rubianus and others, or the equally immortal "Pantagruel" and "Gargantua" of Rabelais, or even the "Vadiscus" and other pungent and witty products of that extraordinary compound of patriotism, passion, and recklessness, Ulrich von Hutten. It is quite true that some of these satires—notably the "Ship of Fools"—were soon translated into English, and had influence in England; while the "Praise of Folly" was made intelligible to those who knew no Latin by the speaking illustrations of Holbein. But they were not the work of Englishmen, and perhaps were never very widely read here; whereas they were devoured on the Continent. Moreover, there was on the Continent a vast amount of similar literature, written in the broadest humour, for the lower orders. Extravagant satires like "Karsthans" and "Neukarsthans," and the "Wittenbergische Nachtigall" of Hans Sachs, were immensely popular.<sup>1</sup> There were broadsheets, often illustrated with rough cuts, which were eagerly read by artisans in the towns and peasants in the villages; and those who were unable to read could appreciate the illustrations and get someone else to read to them. In England such things were far less common. In Scotland there were plenty of satirical verses, which have been collected in two large octavo volumes;<sup>2</sup> but perhaps one must be Scottish, or at any rate have more knowledge about details than most of us possess, in order to appreciate the witticisms. The rather tedious and monotonous lines of "Colyn Cloute," by that eccentric literary phenomenon, John Skelton, who had been tutor to Henry VIII., and was Poet Laureate early in his reign, give a fair idea of the kind of satire that was produced in England in attacking the ignorance of the clergy. Skelton was for twenty-five years rector of Diss in Norfolk, and we may assume that he knew a good many specimens of clergy such as he describes in his doggerel verses. One very soon becomes tired of reading them. Henry VIII. sometimes employed him to make fun of people, and among others he attacked Wolsey, who put him

<sup>1</sup> "Cambridge Modern History," ii., p. 159.

<sup>2</sup> Cranstoun, "Satirical Poems of the Time of the Reformation," 1891-1893. Dr. Kidd gives a better specimen in his "Documents," p. 695.

in prison. He fell foul of Alexander Barclay, who paid him in his own coin.

Barclay's English version of Brandt's "Ship of Fools" appeared in 1509, within fifteen years of the appearance of the original. It may be studied in a sumptuous edition in two volumes (1874), with the original illustrations, which add greatly to its interest.<sup>1</sup> It was the rage in the sixteenth century. Published in 1494, it was translated into Latin in 1497, and imitated in Latin in 1507. It was done into Dutch and Low German, twice into English, and three times into French. Selections from it were delivered from the pulpit by some of the best preachers of the day. Max Müller thus explains Brandt's immense popularity: "He writes in short chapters, and mixes his fools in such a manner that we always meet with a variety of new faces. There was room at that time for a work like the "Ship of Fools." It was the first printed book that treated of contemporaneous events and living persons. People are fond of the history of their own times. If the good qualities of their age are brought out, they think of themselves and their friends; if the dark features, they think of their neighbours and their enemies. The "Ship of Fools" is just such a satire as ordinary people would read, and read with pleasure. They would feel a slight twinge now and then, but they would put down the book at the end, and thank God that they were not as other men."<sup>2</sup>

Brandt divides society into 113 classes of fools, puts them into a ship, and sends them off to Narragonia, which we may regard as the Fools' Botany Bay. Many teachers, from the thirteenth century onwards, have been somewhat inaccurately called "forerunners of the Reformation." Brandt is really such. It is not as evidence of the scandals and corruptions which cried aloud for remedy that his poem is so valuable, but as the work

<sup>1</sup> Edited by T. H. Jamieson. See also Zarncke's edition (Leipzig, 1854) of the original "Narrenschiff." Barclay was a priest in the College of Ottery St. Mary.

<sup>2</sup> "Chips from a German Workshop," iii. In his work on "The German Classics," pp. 370-382, Max Müller gives extracts from the "Narrenschiff," and also from Johann Geiler's writings.

of one who actually began the work of reform. He does not expose the abominations committed by the greatest offenders among the clergy and laity, but the vices and follies of ordinary men and women. Like Luther, he used the vulgar tongue, and his verses became familiar to persons whom Luther's pamphlets did not reach. By his frank criticisms he helped the cause of reform, without any rebellion against the Church, or any special leaning towards the doctrines which were afterwards formulated by Luther. He was a Humanist, who frequently quotes Ovid, Catullus, Persius, and Seneca, and sometimes Cicero and Virgil, and thus was as much admired by Reuchlin and Erasmus as by the people. He is sarcastic rather than amusing, for his object is, not to raise a laugh, but to raise his fellows to higher aims. His shipload of fools is one of the best products of the surviving moral earnestness which prepared men's minds for radical reform. Barclay's rendering of it had more effect upon English literature than upon the English Reformation.

Some of the ephemeral sheets that were struck off for the enlightenment and amusement of the lower orders were very clever. Rather a favourite form was that of imaginary conversations—dialogues between peasants who freely criticize their superiors, between clergy and their parishioners, and so forth. In scores of these dialogues the peasant appears and “confounds with his common sense the learning of doctors of law and theology; he knows as much of the Scriptures as three parsons, and more; and he demolishes the arguments of Luther's antagonist, Murner.”<sup>1</sup> But few skits could be more telling than this story, which Johann Eberlin of Günzburg, himself a popular Swabian preacher (*circa* 1530-1550), relates. In 1521 he left the Franciscans and became an enthusiastic Lutheran teacher. He tells of a priest who confided to a friend that he really must begin to know something about the Bible. He has never read any of it, excepting what occurs in the services, and his parishioners are beginning to read it, or at any rate to know something about it. And they ask such puzzling questions

<sup>1</sup> “Cambridge Modern History,” ii., p. 175.



about persons and things in the Bible that he has never heard of. He intends now to study the Bible; where would be a good place to begin? His friend suggests that in the Pastoral Epistles of St. Paul there is a good deal that is very useful to a parish priest. So the perplexed pastor sets to work on the First Epistle to Timothy, where he finds to his confusion that the Apostle declares that a Bishop and a deacon must be the husband of one wife!<sup>1</sup>

But quite the most famous of the satirical writings which appeared in Germany during the first half of the sixteenth century is the collection of mock letters known as the "*Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum*." When Reuchlin had been attacked by ignorant bigots for showing that the Vulgate was sometimes incorrect, and for declaring that Jewish literature ought not to be burned, there was published in 1514 a number of letters in his favour under the title, "*Clarorum Virorum Epistolæ variis temporibus missæ ad Johannem Reuchlinum Phorcensensem*." This suggested the idea of making his obscurantist opponents ridiculous by publishing a collection of letters professing to be written on their side, but exposing the ignorance, stupidity, hypocrisy, and sensuality of the spiteful monks who were assailing Reuchlin and scholars generally. The style is all the more amusing, because the whole reads like a confidential and naïve confession out of the assailants' own mouths. These letters are addressed—without his leave and much to his confusion—to the comical person, Ortwin Gratius, whom Luther called *poetista asinus*, and who tried in vain to get this imperishable skit suppressed. In order to expose the ignorance of the supposed writers, the letters are written in dog-Latin, through which the German shows its idioms and vocabulary in an absurd manner here and there. A good idea of the effect may be got from Lord Dufferin's Latin speech, in his delightful "*Letters from High Latitudes*" (Murray, 1857). In Iceland, a dinner was given in his honour at the Government House, and a great many toasts had been drunk, when the Bishop rose and proposed Lord Dufferin's health in an eloquent

<sup>1</sup> Lindsay, "*The Reformation in Germany*," p. 308.

Latin speech. Lord Dufferin was just sufficiently primed to venture to reply in the same language, and this, he tells us, is the kind of Latinity which he produced: "*Viri illustres, insolitus ut sum ad publicum loquendum ego propero respondere ad complimentum quod recte reverendus prelativus mihi fecit in proponendo meam salutem; et supplico vos credere quod multum grattificatus et flattificatus sum honore tam distincto.*" That may suffice to give some idea of the canine Latin of the "Epistolæ," which are a caricature of monkish disquisitions, animosities, and tastes, as the "Provincial Letters" are of Jesuistical casuistry. A man eats a chicken in an egg, and his conscience is troubled when he remembers that it is Friday. A friend consoles him with the suggestion that an unhatched chicken is no more than the maggots in cheese, which anyone may eat on Fridays and vigils. He is not satisfied, because a doctor, who is a good naturalist, has told him that maggots belong to the order of fishes, which *may* be eaten on fast-days, whereas chickens may *not*. What does Ortwin think? Has he committed a mortal sin? or not even a venial one?<sup>1</sup>

Then there is that rascal Reuchlin, advising people to learn Greek and Hebrew, as if the Scriptures were not much plainer in Latin. It would only make the schismatical Greeks and the infidel Jews proud, if decent Christians took to learning their languages. It is said that the Inquisitor has no more money with which to bribe the judges in Rome, and if that is true, the rascal may be acquitted after all. Can't the Dominicans, with their fine stock of abuse, stop the gab of a layman who dares to dispute the theologians? Then, can it be necessary to eternal salvation that students should learn grammar from profane poets, like Cicero and Pliny? It can't be, because Aristotle says poets tell many lies, and it is sinful to tell lies; therefore to base one's studies upon lies must be sinful. The writers don't profess to be immaculate; they have their little weaknesses. But even Samson and Solomon were not quite perfect, and the writers have too much humility to wish to be better than those Christian saints.

<sup>1</sup> Kidd, "Documents," p. 11.

They try their hand at etymology, and derive *magister* from *magis* and *ter*, because a *magister* ought to know three times as much as anybody else ; but it may come from *magis* and *terreo*, because a master should inspire his pupils with fear.

There were forty-one of these letters ; to the third edition seven more letters were added. Then the same delightful result followed as that which was produced by Daniel Defoe's "Shortest Way with the Dissenters" (1703). Some of the people who were ridiculed took the satire as a genuine production of their own party, and expressed sympathy. This was too good an opportunity to be missed. In 1517 a second volume, of sixty-two letters, was published, renewing and rubbing in the ridicule. Unlike most continuations, it is considered quite equal to the first. But perhaps one would have sufficed, and much less coarseness would have sufficed. Erasmus tells us that he was delighted with some of the first letters, which were shown to him before they were published ; and there is a story that he laughed so heartily over one of them that he cured a bad tumour, by causing it to break. But it is certain that he afterwards condemned the "Epistolæ," partly because in later editions his name was introduced in some of them, and partly because he thought the buffoonery overdone. He writes to Cæsarius, August 16, 1517 : "I highly disapproved of the 'Epistles of Obscure Men.' Their pleasantry might amuse at the first glance, if such a precedent had not been too aggressive. I have no objection to the ludicrous, provided it be without insult to anyone."

The most reasonable conjectures as to authorship are that Crotus Rubianus (Johann Jaeger) planned and wrote much of the first collection, and that Ulrich von Hutten wrote most of the second. But the authorship is less important than the fact that such an attempt to move public opinion against ecclesiastical authority should be successfully made. It was a very early and "decisive demonstration of the power of the press."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Lord Acton, "Lectures," p. 86. There is an excellent edition of the "Epistolæ," by F. G. Stokes, with translation and notes. Chatto and Windus, 1909.

## Spade and Bible.

BY THE REV. M. LINTON SMITH, M.A.  
*Vicar of Blundellsands.*

### II.

WHEN we come to estimate the bearing of archæology on the historical character of the earlier Old Testament records, it will be necessary to go over ground which will be in some measure familiar to most readers of this article, for much of the material has been known for a considerable time; but it can scarcely be omitted in the attempt to form a general view of the case.

The patriarchal period will naturally occupy most of our attention; its historical character has been most widely assailed, and round it the controversy has raged hottest. With regard to this the spade has supplied a background, both of political history and of social conditions, from the monuments of Babylonia and Egypt, which is of the highest value; for Syria was always the debatable land between these two great centres of civilization, and each has left its impress on the thought and culture of that bridge of fertile country between them. Now it may be said at once that the broad outline of the Hebrew story fits in with the background which has been thus provided. The line of migration ascribed to Abraham seems to have been that taken by the second great Semitic movement, commonly known as the Canaanite, which probably gave to Southern Palestine its Semitic inhabitants, during the third millennium B.C.; and the references to journeys into Egypt receive abundant illustration from the wall-paintings of the tombs of the Nile Valley; the best known, perhaps, of these is the representation in the tomb of Khnum-hotep (*circa* 1900 B.C.) at Beni-Hassan of a family of Semitic immigrants under the chief Absha (= Abishai); while the political condition of the country, divided up into a number of independent principalities of small extent, exactly corresponds with the picture given in the Tell-

el-Amarna tablets of its condition after the relaxation of the Egyptian domination of the eighteenth dynasty, a condition which may reasonably be supposed to have preceded the establishment of that supremacy.

These general conditions, however, were more or less permanent in Canaan, and are therefore of comparatively little weight in establishing the historicity of the patriarchal narratives; for it would be possible for the writer to be describing similar conditions of a later date. But there are at least two points in which the story of Abraham touches the history of the time in a way to afford us a test. The first of these is the reference to the Hittites at Hebron, in Gen. xxiii. The historical character of this has often been doubted, on the ground that we had no evidence of any movement of the Hittite peoples so far south before the time of the nineteenth Egyptian dynasty (fourteenth century B.C.); there is now accumulating proof of their activity at a much earlier period. On the Babylonian side we learn that about 1800 B.C. they overthrew the first dynasty of Babylon, and the name of one of the kings of Gen. xiv. has been recognized as Hittite, Tid'al (=Tudkhula in cuneiform, the equivalent of the purely Hittite name borne by a later king, Dadkhaliya). In Egypt the name of the kheta has been read with much probability on a monument of the twelfth dynasty (2000 to 1788 B.C.), while it is highly probable that the name of the king of Jerusalem in the Tell-el-Amarna tablets, Abdi-khiba, is compounded with the name of a Hittite deity which occurs in other names of that people (a singular illustration of the reference to the origin of Jerusalem in Ezek. xvi. 3, 45). In view of these facts, gathered over so wide an area, is it too much to say that on this point Hebrew tradition, so far from antedating facts of a later period, has preserved the record of a historical situation which has only recently been revealed by other sources of information? In the light of this conclusion we may turn to the second point of contact, the story of the expedition of Chedorlaomer, in Gen. xiv.; round this considerable controversy has raged. It is possible, though the con-

clusion we have just reached with regard to the first point raised renders the view highly improbable, that we owe this story to a piece of antiquarian research on the part of the exiles in the sixth century B.C., of whose literary activity there can be but little question; and, as against any wild estimate of the complete re-establishment of the historicity of the patriarchal narratives by this incident, it must be remembered that there are certain improbabilities in the narrative itself which no evidence has done anything to remove—*e.g.*, the route taken by the invading force, and the names and number of Abraham's helpers; further, there is no mention of *this* expedition in any record as yet discovered; and, thirdly, the tablet on which the names of two of the kings, Chedorlaomer and Tid'al, are read is one which cannot be dated before the Persian period, and may be as late as the third century B.C. The "Idylls of the King" could scarcely be brought forward 2,000 years hence as valid historical evidence for the existence of Arthur; yet the period which separates Tennyson from his hero is about the same as that which separates the Babylonian poem from the events with which it deals, and even on this tablet the name of Chedorlaomer (Kudur-laghamal) is read with much uncertainty. On the other hand, there is no inherent probability, but rather the reverse, in a Babylonian, or Elamite, invasion of Palestine at this date. The Hebrew story has preserved the memory of an Elamite supremacy over Babylon at the period, which we know to have existed, and has given to its leader a name which is undoubtedly Elamite in form. It has preserved the names of two kings, 'Amraphel of Shin'ar (= Hammurabi of Sumer—*i.e.*, Babylon), and Arioch of Ellasar (= Eriaku of Larsa), the latter of whom was, with his brother, the last representative of the Elamite suzerainty, while the former was the man who in the thirty-sixth year of his reign broke down that suzerainty. Is it too much to argue from these two points of contact with external history that the tradition which has preserved such remarkable memories of the relations of its ancestors with alien peoples cannot be assumed to be wholly at fault in the memories

which it has preserved about those ancestors themselves, that the patriarchal narratives do contain a solid substratum of historical fact? But when this has been said, the weightiest conclusion that the evidence can bear has been stated: for the results of archæology up to the present, with one exception, contain no reference to, and tell us nothing directly about, the patriarchs; the one exception is the name, "Field of Abram," read by Professor Breasted among the place-names of Shishak's monument at Karnak (*circa* 926 B.C.).

The mention of Egypt recalls to us the next period at which the stories of Israelitish beginnings offer themselves to the test of archæological research, that of the Bondage and Deliverance. It is of little value to urge the Egyptian colouring of the stories of Joseph and the Exodus, for Egypt was sufficiently unchanging to make it possible to get convincing local atmosphere at a date long after that in which the events are ascribed; there are, moreover, several indications that the stories in their present form are by no means contemporary with the events which they describe. The anonymity, for instance, of the Egyptian monarchs, who are all designated by the generic title of Pharaoh (= Per-o, "great house"), is in marked contrast to the specific descriptions in the later books, where Shishak, Tirhakah, and the rest are named. It has often been pointed out that the Egyptian personal names of the story are not those which are familiar to us from the monuments of the earlier period contemporary with the events, but those common at a later date, the period of the twenty-second dynasty, the period at which Israel was brought once more into definite relations with the Valley of the Nile; and if Professor Flinders Petrie's ingenious and attractive theory with regard to the census lists of Num. i. and xxvi. be accepted, we get the result that, while the numbers themselves are authentic, the writing in which they were incorporated was composed at a period when the true meaning of the census lists was lost, a result which can scarcely prove fatal to modern theories as to the composition of the Pentateuch.

There is reason also to believe that the Hebrew tradition is

an imperfect one, not giving an exhaustive account of the fortunes of the race. The most natural interpretation of the earliest reference to Israel by name, on the stele of Merenptah, seems to be that part of the tribes who ultimately bore that name never went down into Egypt at all, but remained as nomads in Southern Palestine. This conclusion is confirmed by the occurrence of the name Asher in Western Galilee in the name-lists of Seti I., who reigned at a date which is well within the period usually assigned to the Bondage, and by the more doubtful reading of other place-names of Palestine as Jacob-el and Joseph-el. Nor is this view altogether without Biblical support. There is a reference embedded in the lists of 1 Chron. vii. 20-24 to a contest between the immediate descendants of Ephraim and the men of Gath, which is not easy to reconcile the statement of the Book of Genesis that Ephraim was the son of Joseph, born in Egypt, whose descendants only became resident in the promised land after the Exodus. And, on the other hand, if the Hebrews are to be identified with the Apriw, or foreign workmen, who appear first on the monuments of the eighteenth dynasty, they cannot all have left Egypt under Moses, for this name continues to occur down to the period of Rameses IV. (1167-1161 B.C.), a date later than any assigned to the Exodus, save by the theory of Professor Eerdmann. Such indications as these must be taken into account in any estimate which is formed of the historical value of the Hebrew traditions on the subject of their adventures in Egypt.

But when all allowance has been made for these indications of late composition and incomplete record, there are a considerable number of points of contact between the Hebrew tradition and the results of archæology which give good ground for the claim that the tradition does embody valuable material which may be relied on as historical. These coincidences are not equally striking or cogent, but, taken together, they form a body of evidence which cannot be ignored.

There is, in the first place, the fact that the migration of Israel into Egypt falls just at that period when immi-



grants from Syria would be most welcome, and a foreigner would have the best chance of rising to the position of Grand Vizier—the Hyksos period, when Egypt was under the domination of a foreign Power. It has often been pointed out that this synchronism is corroborated by the statement of George the Syncellus, a Byzantine chronologer of the eighth century, that “it is generally agreed that Joseph ruled Egypt under Aphophis.” Aphophis will represent Apepa II., the last great King of this alien dynasty, towards the close of the seventeenth century; nor is it without significance that the name of another Hyksos king has been read, from his own scarabs, as Jacob-her.

In the next place, there is the phrase: “There arose a new king over Egypt, that knew not Joseph” (Exod. i. 8), which is singularly appropriate to the dynastic changes, which displaced the foreign rulers, and set the native Egyptian monarchs of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties upon the throne. Another phrase, “It came to pass in the course of those many days that the king of Egypt died” (Exod. ii. 23), is scarcely less appropriate to the sixty-seven years’ reign of Rameses II., the predecessor of Merenptah, the probable Pharaoh of the Exodus. That the period of the oppression should be compressed or foreshortened, as it must be if these allusions are rightly interpreted, would not be in the least surprising if the narratives were handed down by tradition for many a year before they crystallized in written form.

A further point, which has not always had due weight allowed to it, is the change of land tenure, ascribed to Joseph’s famine relief measures, in Gen. xlvii. 13-27. Here it is asserted that, as the result of these measures, all the land, except that of the priests, became crown property, and was held at a rental of one-fifth of the produce. Perhaps the most marked contrast between the Middle Empire which preceded the Hyksos period and the Later Empire which followed it was the supremacy of the crown at the latter date, as contrasted with the power of the great feudal lords of the earlier. The

steps taken by the Hebrew Vizier, according to the Biblical narrative, would be an adequate cause for this result.

The place-names of the narrative supply another point of contact. Goshen, through the LXX form Gesem., has been recognized in the name of the nome at the western end of the modern Wady Tumilat ; Succoth is generally taken as a Hebraized form of Thuku, the name of the district at the eastern end of the same ; Pithom has been found in Pa-Tum (house of the god Tum), the capital of Thuku, a brick-built store city of Rameses II., under the mound known as Tell-el-Maskhuta ; while a second store city, closely connected with the same king, has been discovered under the neighbouring Tell-er-Reztabeh ; and, though no equivalent of the name Raamses has been discovered there, its identification with that other store city of the Exodus is highly probable. In it has been found the tomb of an official, one of whose titles may be translated "keeper of the foreigners of Syria" ; and round it, at the level of the remains of the nineteenth dynasty, are beds of ashes from the camp-fires of a large body of tent-dwellers, who must have remained there a considerable period.

Two other matters may be referred to, in which archaeological evidence may be said to bear out the broad outlines of the Israelitish story. It has sometimes been urged that the escape by Sinai must be unhistorical, since that district was occupied by the Egyptians to protect the working of the turquoise and copper mines round Sarbut-el-Khadim ; but if the Exodus took place, as there is increasing agreement that it did, under Merenptah, it has been pointed out that only once in many years at that period was the district occupied in force ; and, further, with this date for their escape, the Israelites are brought into Palestine after the last campaign of Rameses III. (1187 B.C.), from which time Egypt ceased to interfere in the affairs of Syria down to the tenth century B.C.

The cumulative effect of these coincidences and synchronisms, subtle and even insignificant as they may appear individually, is not slight. They have been produced by the torture neither

of the Bible nor of the monuments, and they are based only upon such results as are very generally accepted. The evidence will not support any strong conclusions as to the accuracy in detail of the Hebrew tradition ; it offers no clear light upon the great names with which the early history of Israel is wrapped up ; it gives little reason to believe in anything in the shape of contemporary *written* chronicles ; and it will not satisfy the stalwart conservative, who must look elsewhere for support of any view of literal historical accuracy of the early narratives. But it at least throws the burden of proof upon those who would assert that Israel preserved no memory of her earliest beginnings, and that no reliance can be placed on Hebrew tradition as to events prior to the conquest of Canaan. It raises a strong presumption in favour of the view that the broad outlines of the patriarchal movements are historically correct, and that Israel preserved definite recollections of that long travail by which it was brought to birth as a nation ; and the discovery of the background against which the Israelitish history unrolls itself has only thrown into greater prominence the workings of that unseen power, which the choice spirits of that nation always declared to be its Guide and Protector.

In such a brief sketch as this whole fields of inquiry have of necessity been ignored. There is the question of the relations between the Creation and the Flood stories in Babylonian and Hebrew tradition, and of those between the codes of the Pentateuch and the code of Khammurabi ; there are the problems raised with regard to Israel's religion, in its earlier stages, by the excavations at Gezer, Taanach, and Megiddo, in its later stages by the temples at Aswan and Tell-el-Yahudiyeh ; there is the correction of the vague and confused dating of the historical books by the precise chronology of the Assyrian eponym canon, and the relegation of the Book of Daniel, *on archæological evidence*, to the category of pious Haggadah. But enough has perhaps been said to illustrate the service which archæology has rendered ; it has done nothing to show that Hebrew history differs *qua* history from that of other races ; it

shows the same features at different stages of its development, the same standard of comparative accuracy, when we can reasonably infer it to be based on contemporary written documents; the same tenacious memory of the broad outlines of its early movements before the days when written history can reasonably be postulated; the same overlaying of those outlines with a mass of material which the conscientious historian can only use with cautious discrimination. It reads us again the lesson which many find so hard to grasp—the lesson that our faith must not find perilous poise upon the pin-points of literal accuracy in historical detail, to preserve its balance upon which a dangerous amount of mental gymnastic and moral contortion is required; but that it must be based firmly and strongly upon the broad foundation of that great purpose which unfolds itself in the history, seen dimly at first in those early traditions in which it is hard to draw the line between historical fact and legendary fancy, between the personal ancestor and the personified tribe; seen more clearly in the birth of the nation through the travail of the bondage and the wanderings; coming into the clear light of day with the history and consciousness of king and prophet and priest; working itself out on the stage of the world's history, in which every conflict of the great empires of the Euphrates and the Nile was made to serve its ends; and finding its perfect consummation and crown in the person of Him who came in the fulness of the time to make known to the world that the God Who in the age-long process had revealed Himself as Power and Wisdom and Righteousness was also Love.



## Leading Characteristics of the Acts.

BY THE REV. F. G. GIVEN-WILSON, M.A.

IT is a commonplace to say that no books have ever been submitted to so rigorous and exhaustive an investigation as those of the Bible, and the reason for this is equally a commonplace. When so much that is vital to the Christian religion is bound up with questions of the authenticity and genuineness of its sacred books, it is inevitable that they should come under the severest criticism. Now the "Acts of the Apostles" affords a striking example of how a theory of its origin and purpose, which was put forward with all the weight of real learning, and under an attractive title which claimed to represent its underlying motive, has come to be recognized as untenable. The critics of the "Tendency school," as it has been called, who acknowledged as their leader the famous Tübingen professor, Ferdinand Christian Baur, held that the author of the "Acts" pursued his task of writing a history of the Early Church with a definite aim. His design was to reconcile the antagonism between the Jewish Christians and those Gentile Christians converted by the ministry of St. Paul. To accomplish this he purposely made his picture of the Apostle of the Jews similar to that of the Apostle of the Gentiles. Nor was it difficult for Baur and his school to show in support of their theory the many resemblances that were to be found in the ministries of St. Peter and St. Paul as recorded in the "Acts." Both perform miracles; both awaken the dead; both contend with a sorcerer; both are marvellously delivered from prison; and much more to the same effect. It is difficult indeed to believe that a book which betrays so simple and naïve a method should conceal so deep a design. If there are resemblances, the main features are quite distinct, and we cannot fail to see how widely different the two apostolic ministries are in circumstance and activity. Such coincidences as are undoubtedly to be found in the portraiture of St. Peter

and St. Paul may be explained by the fact that their lives were animated by the same faith, and exhibited the same spiritual power ; and, further, that the author was a literary artist, who took great pains in the selection of his matter, and wished to preserve some sort of unity out of the abundance of the material at his disposal.

It must not be understood that in consistently speaking of St. Luke as the author of the " Acts " the writer has taken for granted that the question is finally settled in favour of the Lucan authorship. He is aware that the view taken of the historical character of much of the first part of the book presents problems of great difficulty which cannot be ignored when the authorship is in question. At the same time he is satisfied that a strong case can be made in favour of St. Luke as the author of the Third Gospel as well as the " Acts," and that opinion has lately received the weighty support of so distinguished and careful a scholar as Professor Harnack of Berlin. The question of authorship is not involved—at least, directly—when we are discussing the subject matter of the " Acts "; though it is likely enough that the view we hold of the authorship will more or less influence the way in which we regard the book as a whole.

The object of this article is to bring together the leading characteristics of the " Acts "; and the first question to ask is, What was St. Luke's motive in writing his history ? What central idea filled his mind as he prepared himself for the task of writing an account of what passed among the disciples of Jesus when their Master was parted from them ? For a history this book is ; and those who are competent to judge do not hesitate to say that it is one of the most wonderful history books ever written. It is true that it is unlike all other histories : none the less it is a history—the only history we possess of the early days of the Church. The book has come down to us with the title " The Acts of the Apostles," or, more simply, " Acts." But it is doubtful whether St. Luke gave that or any other title to a book which was already intended to supplement his previous work, the Gospel which bears his name, and which records the life and teaching of Jesus. It

also seems certain that the Preface to his Gospel was meant to be an introduction to the whole book, of which the "Acts" is the second part; and perhaps the description of authorities given there refers to both parts of the work—the "eye-witnesses" being the authority for the life of our Lord, and the "ministers of the Word" for the history of the founding of the earliest Christian communities.<sup>1</sup>

It will be noticed that in his second volume St. Luke does not set up any single personality as its central figure, for the simple reason that no one could compare with the unique character of the Master, Jesus Christ. The material that he has gathered together is not a collection of facts and incidents, but is grouped around, and chosen with great care to promote a single idea, which is "the power of the Spirit of Jesus in the Apostles manifested in history."<sup>2</sup> There we have the keynote of the "Acts," and that theme alone seemed to satisfy all requirements. Everything worthy of memory in the history of the early Christian communities could be ranged round this central idea. This method would alone supply the best standard of selection, and at the same time would connect the whole subject-matter with the first part, which recorded the words and actions of Jesus.

We may well regard it as a real inspiration which led St. Luke to produce such a wonderful result, and to preserve such a unity of purpose from the mass of details at his disposal. He tells us that he spared no pains to get information about "the things which have been fulfilled among us"; and such evidence as he obtained from those who were "eye-witnesses and ministers of the Word" he sifted with great care, while for a large part of his history he was in direct touch with the facts he records. But, alike in reproducing the evidence he had received from others, and in recording the facts which he himself witnessed, he shows a marvellous insight in choosing only those facts and incidents that best served his purpose—which was to demonstrate in the

<sup>1</sup> Von Soden, "History of Early Christian Literature," p. 211.

<sup>2</sup> See Harnack, "The Acts of the Apostles," Introduction, p. xviii.

ordered sequence of history "the power of the Spirit of Jesus in the Apostles."

The title "Acts of the Apostles" is somewhat misleading if the term "Apostle" is used in a restricted sense. Of the great majority of the Twelve, St. Luke apparently knew nothing; or, if we may judge from his silence with regard to them, that "there was nothing to tell about them which passed beyond the limits of a single uneventful history."<sup>1</sup> He describes the ministry of Stephen and Philip, of Barnabas and Apollos—men who do not properly belong to the Apostolic circle, but whose work of evangelization is recorded because of its distinctive character. These minor ministries circle round, so to speak, the work of the two great Apostles—St. Peter and St. Paul. Indeed, the book of the "Acts" is most naturally divided into a record of the work of these two dominating personalities: in the first part St. Peter is the central figure, in the second St. Paul is absolutely supreme. Yet we cannot describe the "Acts" as "the combination of two apostolic biographies." The writer's central idea alone forbids that. The controlling theme of "the power of the Spirit of Jesus in the Apostles" keeps the biographical element within certain limits. Our curiosity is left unsatisfied on many points. We are not told what was the end of either of the two great apostles—St. Peter and St. Paul. St. John, who is always mentioned in the early chapters as sharing with St. Peter the leadership of the Twelve, vanishes from the scene, and is heard of no more. The appointment of the "Seven" is described in detail, but nothing further is related of them, or how they performed their duties. It must appear strange indeed that there should be an almost complete silence as to the subsequent history of St. Peter after the detailed account of his deliverance from prison. We are left quite in the dark concerning the conversion of St. James, the Lord's brother, and how he came to occupy a prominent position in the Church. Equally obscure is the origin of the body of "elders," who appear to share with St. James the government of the Church at Jerusalem. The

<sup>1</sup> Harnack, "The Acts of the Apostles," Introduction, p. xix.



transition is a startling one to find St. James, and not St. Peter, presiding over the Council of Jerusalem without the slightest explanation of how he obtained that position of prominence and authority. But, as Harnack points out: "The very fact that St. Luke does not describe this revolution arouses our confidence."<sup>1</sup> It is characteristic of his method as a historian that he relates nothing, as he expressly states in his Preface, which had not been handed down to him, or about which he had received no information.

If the theme of the "Acts" may be correctly expressed, as Harnack maintains, by the phrase "the power of the Spirit of Jesus in the Apostles manifested in history," it is important to observe how St. Luke worked out his central idea. The power of the Spirit of Jesus manifested itself most impressively in the Mission of the Apostles. It is his aim, therefore, to describe the victorious progress whereby the proclamation of the Gospel was carried from Jerusalem to Rome. This simple solution of the problem shows his genius. Within little more than a quarter of a century the new religion has spread from Galilee and Judæa throughout the Empire. It has made disciples of Greeks and barbarians, bond and free, and has been proclaimed even before kings and proconsuls. That is the great fact St. Luke is intent upon describing. It is nothing else than this—the expansion of the Gospel—which at last has penetrated to the very heart of the Empire, Rome itself. At the very beginning of the "Acts" this object is most distinctly proclaimed—"Ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto Me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judæa, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth"; and (to quote from Harnack, who emphasizes this point so finely) "it is expressed yet more impressively in the great scene of the second chapter, which, in fact, anticipates the conclusion of the mighty drama, where, in words which sound like a triumphant conqueror's list of nations vanquished in a great campaign, we read: 'Parthians and Medes and Elamites, and dwellers in Mesopotamia,

<sup>1</sup> "Luke the Physician," p. 125.

Pontus, and Asia'—and the rest. As far as the Roman Emperor rules, and farther still beyond the bounds of his Empire, the world now hears the Evangelic message and accepts it!"<sup>1</sup>

It is remarkable that even those scholars who do not admit the Lucan authorship are coming more and more to agree on this point—that in this central idea is to be found the key-note of the "Acts." And it is certain that from this point of view the whole course of the book not only becomes plainer and more instructive, but the reader is caught in the dramatic spirit which the author has imparted to his history, and is borne along in the onward sweep of the invincible progress of the Gospel, which it is his task to describe. Everything that might be held to hinder or obscure the reality of this progress is cut short. The second journey through Asia Minor is recorded with the utmost brevity. And if we accept the South-Galatian theory, here surely is a further proof for it, because St. Paul was traversing old ground ; and if on this journey he had founded new churches, we might reasonably expect that some description would be given of them. This fact also explains why the greater part of the third missionary journey is passed over in silence. But as the end draws near, and the goal is in sight, the narrative becomes fuller and more precise. The particular stages of the trial of St. Paul, and the details of the last voyage to Rome, are told at length ; because, as Harnack justly says, "that trial is a grand confession of Christianity before the whole world and its rulers, represented by the Roman governor and King Agrippa ; while the voyage and shipwreck tend to intensify the suspense of the reader as he wonders whether after all the Gospel will be proclaimed in the metropolis of the world through the preaching of St. Paul."<sup>2</sup> "And so we came to Rome." With these words the conclusion of the book is introduced, which closes with this brief record. "And Paul abode two whole years in his own hired dwelling, and received all that went in unto him, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching the things concerning the Lord Jesus Christ with all boldness, none forbidding him."

<sup>1</sup> Harnack, "The Acts of the Apostles," pp. xxi., xxii.      <sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. xxii.

Why, it may be asked, does the book end so abruptly? Why is there no mention of St. Paul's martyrdom and death? Simply because, with the bringing of the Gospel to Rome, the author considers that his purpose is fulfilled. He has shown how the work of introducing the Gospel of Jesus to the world has been accomplished by the first generation of Christian believers. "All that happened since those days was nothing new, but only the natural continuation of a development then set going."<sup>1</sup>

This great work was not done, could not be done, except in the face of the greatest trials and difficulties. Yet it is not the perils by the way, the hardships of travel, or the cruel discouragements which every pioneer of the Gospel must expect, that St. Luke is concerned to dwell upon. It is characteristic of him that he records the sufferings and persecutions of the Apostles without comment, his aim being to show how the "good news" was brought from city to city along the great trunk roads of the Empire. His attention is absorbed by the fact of its triumphant progress. But if he passes over the experiences of the Apostles and the treatment they met with, the way in which their message was received greatly interests him. And that brings us to another characteristic of the "Acts"—the relation of the Christian religion to Judaism. It is part of St. Luke's intention to prove that the Gospel of Jesus does not stand in opposition to the Jewish religion, but is its fulfilment. The speeches of St. Peter are designed to show that Christ is the fulfilment of prophecy. St. Paul, he is careful to remind his hearers, always makes a point of going to the Jews first. Whatever town or city he visits, he goes first to the synagogue of the Jews, and expounds to them their Scriptures to prove that Jesus is the Christ. Only when the Jews reject him and his teaching does he turn to the Gentiles. There is a very interesting incident recorded in the "Acts" which brings out St. Paul's anxiety, in the face of the strongest personal conviction, not to wound Jewish susceptibilities. When the

<sup>1</sup> Von Soden, "History of Early Christian Literature," p. 216.

Apostle came to Jerusalem to present the offerings he had collected for the mother-church as a token of respect and love from the new churches he had founded, it was represented to him how strong was the opposition to one who had taught that it was not necessary for Gentile converts to conform to Jewish customs and traditions. Accordingly, in order to remove the suspicions urged against him by the Judaizing Christians, who were doubtless especially prominent in Jerusalem, he submitted to the suggestion of St. James and the "elders" of giving some striking demonstration that he was a faithful observer of the Law. Joining four of the disciples, who had taken upon them the vow of a Nazarite, he allowed his head to be shaved, and, defraying their expenses, took part with them in the customary ritual purifications. When these were accomplished he presented himself in the Temple courts to offer the sacrifice which signified the fulfilment of the vow. The plan seems to have had the desired effect, and to have satisfied the scruples of the Jewish Christians of Jerusalem, for we read that it was unbelieving Jews from Asia who set upon him, and raised the cry that he had polluted the Temple by introducing uncircumcised persons within its sacred precincts.

In this connection we may note a further point which St. Luke had in view, though it serves only a subordinate purpose, and is a matter of incidental comment rather than of direct statement. Throughout his book he seeks to defend Christianity against the reproach of being a danger to the State. Almost without exception the Roman officials appear in a favourable light. It is the Jews who are the persecutors of the Apostles. It is they who represent St. Paul and his companions as rebels, who are turning the world upside down, and doing contrary to the decrees of Cæsar; while the Roman magistrates by their justice and clemency testify to the sincerity and law-abiding character of the Christians. At the same time it would hardly be right to suppose that St. Luke had a political motive in writing his book. The "Acts" is no apology for the Christian religion like those which were addressed in later times to

the Roman Emperor. In tracing the progress of the Gospel, till at last it was planted in Rome itself, the historian could not fail to notice, and so indirectly to record, the contrast between the behaviour of the Roman authorities and that of the Jews.

There is a further characteristic still to notice, which is a marked feature of the Third Gospel as well as of the "Acts," and makes for the unity of authorship of these two books. The Gospel of St. Luke is above all the gospel of joy and gladness.<sup>1</sup> With that note it begins and ends. The son promised to Zacharias shall bring him joy and gladness, and "many shall rejoice at his birth" (i. 14). The announcement of the angel to the shepherds of Bethlehem is, "Behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy . . . for unto you is born this day a Saviour" (ii. 10, 11). At the return of the "Seventy" Jesus "rejoiced in the holy Spirit" (x. 21), in giving thanks to the Father for the success of their mission. "There is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth" is the note of the three parables of the 15th chapter, peculiar to St. Luke. The people "rejoiced for all the glorious things that were done by Him" (xiii. 17); and Zacchæus received Jesus "joyfully" (xix. 6) at the prospect of entertaining Him at his house. When our Lord entered Jerusalem in triumph, "the whole multitude of the disciples began to rejoice and praise God with a loud voice for all the mighty works which they had seen" (xix. 37). After the Ascension, the disciples "worshipped Him, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy: and were continually in the temple, blessing God" (xxiv. 52, 53). With these words the Gospel closes.

It is the same with the "Acts." Not trials and sufferings, but joy and gladness, is the prevailing note. The first disciples took their food "with gladness and singleness of heart" (ii. 46). The Apostles departed from the presence of the Council "rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for the Name" (v. 41). There was "great joy" in the city of Samaria

<sup>1</sup> See Harnack, "Acts of the Apostles," Excursus III., "St. Luke and Christian Joy."

(viii. 8) when the word was preached there ; the baptized eunuch goes "on his way rejoicing" (viii. 39), after he had been instructed by Philip. Barnabas was "glad" when he had seen the work of God's grace among the Gentiles at Antioch (xi. 23) ; so were the Gentiles of Antioch in Pisidia, when St. Paul preached to them the word of salvation—" they were filled with joy, and with the Holy Ghost " (xiii. 52). At Lystra St. Paul declares the proof of God's gracious providence in that He gives them "rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling your hearts with food and gladness " (xiv. 17) ; and when he and Barnabas report their success in Asia Minor, as they passed through Phœnicia and Samaria " they caused great joy unto all the brethren " (xv. 3). Also the jailor at Philippi "rejoiced greatly, with all his house " (xvi. 34) when he believed and was baptized. If we want to see how unconquerable was the gladness of heart, and unflinching the outlook of faith, which were the result of the power of the Spirit of Jesus in the Apostles, we have only to watch St. Paul's conduct during the storm and shipwreck of his voyage to Rome. Though in the humiliating position of a prisoner, his courage and self-control, as well as a practical insight into the needs of the moment gathered from a wide experience in the most varied situations of life, compel the respect of those around him, until they finally defer to him as their natural leader. It is he who exhorts his companions "to be of good cheer," when they had given up all hope, and it is by obeying his directions that they all get safe to shore. A courage and devotion so sublime and unearthly, which nothing could weaken nor depress, was quickly recognized as a characteristic of the disciples of Jesus. When first the Apostles came into prominence, St. Luke records how the Sanhedrin observed "the boldness of Peter and John" ; and now that the goal is reached, and the Gospel has been triumphantly carried to Rome itself, he brings to an end this unique and wonderful history with a sentence which almost leaves us bewildered by its sheer simplicity, "And Paul taught the things concerning the Lord Jesus Christ with all boldness, none forbidding him."

## A Pragmatist View of Prayer-Book Revision.

BY THE REV. C. W. EMMET, M.A.,

*Vicar of West Hendred.*

IT is instructive to approach the question of Prayer-Book Revision from the standpoint of the Pragmatist. We must recognize that there is in this matter no "Absolute"—that is to say, in the outward forms in which the spirit of worship expresses itself, there is no Absolute Best, given once for all by a final revelation. The "best" is simply that which works best, which most effectually helps the largest number of people to enter into communion with God and to receive the infusion of His grace. It is obvious at once that this "best" varies in different ages and countries. The object of worship is the same for all Christians; its fundamental principles are the same. The Eucharist is, for instance, its supreme expression always and everywhere (this may, I think, be proved pragmatically by the appeal to experience and results); but the details and arrangements of services are not fixed once and for all.

This, of course, is the most ordinary of commonplaces; but does not Pragmatism glory in its attempt to bring to its own the obvious and the commonplace? And it is a commonplace that has not escaped the usual treatment meted out to its kind. How many of those engaged in the present controversy consistently realize that the fundamental purpose of Revisionist and anti-Revisionist alike should be simply to produce the Prayer-Book which will best help the worship of the greatest number of the members of the Church of England now in the twentieth century?

At this point it may be well to clear away a very natural misunderstanding. Will not our Pragmatist principles, consistently applied, lead to pure Congregationalism and unregulated anarchy? If every one is to have the service which helps him most, why not Benediction, *Ave Marias*, and the observance of Corpus Christi on the one hand, and Salvation Army drums

and the paroxysms of the converted on the other? There is no question that such things do, in fact, "help" certain types of mind up to a point. The answer is, that we are legislating (if the word may be allowed) not for the individual, or for isolated congregations, but for a Church. This implies at once a certain amount of uniformity; in order to help the greatest number, we must consider the needs of the average worshipper; and, further, it is practically—*i.e.*, pragmatically—inconvenient that the member of a Church visiting a place of worship belonging to his own communion should find himself in a completely alien atmosphere. More important is the consideration that to legislate for a Church implies loyalty to a certain doctrinal position. We are not discussing the revision of that position; whether it requires revision is a question which may be raised from many points of view, and may admit of equally varying answers. The point is, that it is not the question immediately before the Church now; and so, when we are told that certain types of service help people, and should, therefore, be admitted on Pragmatist principles, we reply that they are at once barred on the ground that they are out of harmony with the deliberately adopted standpoint of our Church. We can be content to let our Pragmatism work its will in strict subordination to this position.

It has plenty to tell us within these limits. It reminds us at once that the suggested alterations are not of the nature of new and untried experiments. A wise revision will fasten mainly on what has already been tried, and proved by experience to have a "prayer-value." "Take what has worked well; drop what has proved a failure," is the advice of Pragmatism. Vestments: they undoubtedly help, not an isolated congregation here and there, but many Churchpeople, to realize the special presence of Christ in the Eucharist, and we may assume, though here we touch the centre of controversy, that they are *not* inconsistent with loyalty to the Church of England. It is equally certain that they hinder the worship of many others. Then they must be optional, says the Pragmatist, care being



taken to secure that the congregation in which they are used is one which is actually helped by them. This is really the fundamental question; from this point of view it becomes a side-issue, a mere point of archæology, whether they were used in any particular century or country, or whether they are ordered by an ambiguous rubric of the sixteenth century. It may be added, in passing, that the Pragmatist will readily allow that a rite which has worked well in the past may be presumed, with fair probability, to work well in the present also. But he will urge that this is only a presumption, and that it must be tested by the appeal to facts. We are prejudiced in favour of the old, not because it is old, but because it is likely to work well now; if it does not, it must go; or, if it needs adaptation, it must consent to that adaptation, and not invoke the sanctity of an inviolate past.

And then the Athanasian Creed. Here, again, surely the same principles apply, though again I am fully aware that the contention will be vehemently disputed. Some good people are apparently helped by it just as it stands, and can imagine nothing more edifying and uplifting to the soul for a Christmas or Easter morning. But there are others—a section negligible neither in number, intellect, or spirituality—who find that it does not confirm their faith, quicken their sense of worship, or give them a higher conception of God. Their experience has proved that in fact it does not work well, and the Pragmatist claims that the verdict of religious experience should not be ignored.

We may now submit to his decision matters which are less controversial, but of at least equal practical importance. We take him to a Sunday evening service, and show him an average congregation, whether in town or country. He will notice at once that most of those present are very simple, and we feel bound to point out to him that they are also very irregular in their church-going; perhaps half are "oncners"; a good proportion are attending their only service for a fortnight

or à month. It is very regrettable, no doubt ; but it is a fact which no one at present seems able to alter. It is then of supreme importance to make the most of the opportunity ; if they are sent empty away now, many of them will go fasting for an indefinite period. Evensong ? Well, as a whole, it is supremely beautiful, and even the simple love it. Our Pragmatist may pass that ; he does not want us to throw the Prayer-Book into the melting-pot. We can keep the general outline ; but what of the details ? The Psalms may chance to be very long, somewhat unintelligible, and perhaps even a little unedifying. He cannot help noticing that the congregation, so far from finding in them a help to worship, is actually bored. And knowing something of his Psalter, he asks us why we have picked out these particular Psalms when there are many others which would appeal so much more certainly to the spiritual sense. Do we think that what we have chosen will really help our people most ? Is it not possible that if they saw they were to join in a smaller number of appropriate Psalms they would make more of an effort to enter into their spirit than they do when they are appalled at once by a solid fifty to seventy verses ? We answer that the choice of our Psalms is not dictated by anything so superficial as the needs of our people ; they are what they are because it is the *n*th day of the month.

Our friend waits, still hopefully, for the lessons, and he hears perhaps a long historical narrative from the Old Testament of no very obvious spiritual value, and when it comes to the turn of the New Testament the fragment of a difficult technical argument from an Epistle. It may be a Sunday in Lent or after Easter, but there is nothing appropriate to the thought of the season. Again he asks us whether we could not give our sheep better provender from the rich store ready to our hand ; he reminds us that many of them will be hardly fed at all till their next monthly or fortnightly visit. And again we reply that our Old Testament lessons have been fixed once for all a generation ago, and that for the New Testament lesson we are usually guided by our consideration of the position which the

earth has reached in its annual journey round the sun ; it is the  $n$ th day of the  $x$ th month, and this algebraic formula is of supreme spiritual value. He retorts by asking why we have not chosen our hymns according to the same sacred principle, instead of condescending to have some regard to the teaching of the day and the needs of our congregation ; and he goes on to point out that we have deified our *sors liturgica*, and that, though our goddess may sometimes treat us well, at other times she plays us scurvy tricks, and even exercises an ironical humour which is a little out of place when so much is at stake. Do we really think that our present use of the Psalter and our existing Lectionary are the best calculated to nourish the spiritual life of our people ? If not, it is a small matter that we offend the Pragmatist ; we may be incurring the condemnation of the shepherds who feed the flock amiss.

But we must set some limits to the eloquent indignation of our friend, though he will have a few other criticisms to pass on the details of our services. We can only emphasize the fact that his principles are of wide application. They test the Men's Services which are popular, Three Hours' Services, Harvest Festivals, Special Mission Services, and so on. These are not recognized in the Prayer-Book, but they have been tried and work well, without in any way coming into collision with the teaching of the Church of England. "By their fruits," says the Pragmatist. He does not ask us to surrender anything that really answers its purpose, or to embark on new and hazardous experiments, but to open our eyes to the facts of religious experience, and to recognize once for all that services are made for man, not man for services.

A word in conclusion as to method. Will not the Pragmatist give his vote for something in the way of an Appendix or Supplement ? He will do this not merely on the obvious ground that such a reform is the most easily secured under present conditions ; he will probably prefer it on its own merits. He insists that though all have at bottom the same spiritual needs,

the ways in which they may best be met vary greatly. He therefore asks for as much variety as is consistent with a due regard for other principles. A formal revision of the Rubrics and text of the Prayer-Book will tend to be on hard-and-fast lines. An Appendix can work its way by means of permission rather than of command, by including as much as possible, rather than by making a final choice between alternatives.

Again, an Appendix will not fetter a future generation. The complaint of the Pragmatist is that what may have helped the sixteenth century, does not help us now, and he recognizes equally that the needs of our grandchildren will not be precisely the same as our own. Therefore, he does not wish to fashion for their shoulders a yoke similar to that which has been too heavy for our own. He asks for a Prayer-Book which can be adapted to the varying needs of successive generations, and which will leave the door open for properly regulated experiments in order that all that from time to time is proved to work well may in due course receive the stamp of formal recognition. The Pragmatist is bound to follow the teaching of experience, but he does not believe that the experience of his own generation closes the chapter.



## Sponsors and Witnesses.

BY REV. W. B. RUSSELL-CALEY, M.A.,

*Vicar of Havering-atte-Bower.*

ONE of the most difficult questions which presents itself to the thoughtful and earnest clergyman of the present day is that of sponsors in baptism. The longer his ministerial experience, and the more varied his spheres of work, the more is the fact impressed on him, reluctantly, perhaps, but certainly, that our present system of choosing, or else quietly ignoring, sponsors in baptism, is working exceedingly badly, or rather not really working at all. The custom is not answering the end for which it was instituted, and very often is only bringing into contempt and derision the sacred ordinance it was intended to solemnize and safeguard. The question is not one of merely academic or antiquarian interest; it is one which touches the very springs of our Church life, and must tell incalculably on the spirituality of both the present and the future.

There are many questions which immediately rise to our minds. Why do we ask for sponsors for children, and witnesses for adults, in holy baptism? Why do they so very seldom correspond to the legal and ancient requirements of the Church? Why are they so difficult to produce? Why do they so seldom attempt to carry out their duties, and seem so hopelessly indifferent to their obligations? Why do we clergy so constantly and necessarily baptize without sponsors, or, at any rate, with those we cannot help knowing are really most unsuitable? These are questions which every thoughtful minister has forced upon his attention with terrible urgency and perpetual frequency. The real truth is that in scarcely a single instance do we, or *can we*, carry out the requirements of our Church in their strict letter and intention.

Let us begin our consideration of the subject by recalling some facts regarding the history and origin of sponsors in baptism before we go on to consider some of the difficulties and

dangers of the present position, and how we may best meet them. Whether the tradition be true that the institution of sponsors began with Bishop Higinus, about A.D. 141, is a matter not of any great consequence, but it is manifest that the peculiar circumstances of the Primitive Church rendered such persons very necessary to the safety and well-being of the Church. Surrounded by bitter and cunning foes, exposed to hypocrisy within and treachery without, it was of the most vital importance that when anyone came forward to offer themselves for baptism, there should be some trustworthy and reliable persons willing to vouch before the assembled Church as to their suitability and sincerity. It was largely the principle of self-preservation which called into practice such a reasonable and simple means of protection.

It may be urged there is no direct Scriptural authority for persons taking on themselves such responsibilities, but while this may be literally true, yet the idea, tendency, and effect of the institution is decidedly Scriptural, and there is nothing contrary to any principle in the Word of God. We can find several analogous commands, though no absolutely identical obligations. But if we cannot produce direct Scriptural warrants for this institution of sponsors, we can certainly show that it was one approved and practised in the earliest and purest ages of the Church. The Apostolical Constitutions, Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Augustine, all bear witness to this fact, besides the decrees of early Councils and the testimony of ancient liturgies. We have, then, conclusive and varied proof that this requirement of competent persons to be sponsors was a primitive custom general throughout the Catholic Church, and approved by the most venerated of the early Fathers.

The next question is, What persons did the Church consider most suitable to fulfil this important function? Generally deacons and deaconesses were selected, as being most in touch with the rank and file of the Church, and most capable of judging of the personal character and family surroundings of those desiring baptism, and also best able to see afterwards to their regular

instruction in Christian doctrine. (Is there not a survival of this primitive practice in the old parish clerk being sponsor for half the parish?)

But while the Church, wisely under the circumstances, preferred to have such persons as deacons and deaconesses to guarantee the suitability of candidates for baptism, she as wisely laid down firm rules regarding those who might not act as sponsors. She forbade catechumens, heretics, and penitents to act in this capacity, and usually she required the sponsors to have been confirmed, and thus implied that she desired sponsors to be also communicants, a condition our Church has adopted in her Canons. Parents were not generally allowed to act as god-parents (although St. Augustine certainly seems to imply the contrary), and even if they did so act it was not *as* parents, but only as believers and reliable members of the Church, probably when other trustworthy and suitable persons could not be found, or were unwilling to act. It is to be noted, however, that the earliest Egyptian forms of ritual permitted parents, and many branches of the Church have ignored the point as trivial, or openly consented to it, as does the Prayer-Book of the Irish Church. As time, however, passed on, and the power of the monastic Orders increased, together with their ceaseless encroachments on family and parochial life, the Church evidently felt obliged to limit their influence as far as possible. Monks and nuns were very different people to the primitive deacons and deaconesses; therefore the Council of Auxerre, in A.D. 578, passed a Canon making it illegal for monks or nuns to act as sponsors. The root idea of the whole matter was a very Scriptural and beautiful one. It was that the Church was the spiritual mother of all her children, and therefore was rightly and anxiously careful to safeguard their spiritual interests, and watch over their religious training and education. She avowed that it was as surely her duty as her privilege to see that every one, young or old, admitted to her communion should be properly instructed in the doctrines and duties of their belief. There was, indeed, the most urgent need for such trustworthy and consistent sponsors, in the early ages of the Church especially.

The dangers of lapsing from the Faith through the horrors of persecution, or the seductions of the world, or the sophistries of heresy, were very tremendous and constant ; and the Church, in her own interests and with a due regard to her Divine Master's honour, sought out loyal, consistent, and truly pious members of her society, who should come forward, and in the face of God and the congregation testify to the sincerity and suitability of the neophyte (or infant), and promise to see that he should be correctly, faithfully, and systematically instructed in " all things that a Christian ought to know and believe to his soul's health," and thus be enabled to lead a godly and a Christian life. That the Church was right in recognizing the healthy influence of older and experienced believers in the training of younger ones is certain, but whether she rightly excluded parents as a rule is open to question. Personally I view sponsors as *religious executors*, appointed that they may safeguard the spiritual interests of the child in the event of the parents' death and personal incapacity, or special circumstances (as in the case of a parent's residence abroad, or adoption of a sinful life, or heretical opinions), but not called on to interfere under ordinary conditions. The fact that godparents generally neglect their duties, and that parents often present themselves as sponsors, does not affect the question of the original intention, and if this primary idea could be resuscitated it might prove of incalculable benefit to the life of the Church. The institution has fallen into disrepute and contempt, because it has been scandalously carried out, but its utility has never been questioned in any branch of the Catholic Church.

The Church of England, during the troublous times of the Reformation, had much and constant intercourse and controversy with those Protestant communities on the Continent which were, amidst fire and sword, persecution and tyranny, forming themselves into organized Churches, whether after the Calvinistic, Lutheran, Zwinglian, or Arminian type, but the need of sponsors in baptism was acknowledged, it may have been because their circumstances were often as perilous as those of the Primitive Church, but so it was ; and, although now the Protestant



non-Episcopal Churches of Europe have discontinued the practice, it has rather died out than has the principle been repudiated. The Episcopal Churches of Europe require sponsors, but, with a curious inconsistency, make no inquiry or rule regarding their faith, which is the reason we so often see royal princes having for their godparents persons of widely different faiths. Our own Reformers were very strong on this subject of sponsors, and their writings bear witness to the strong practical common sense with which they viewed the problems of that changeful and critical period.

The Church of England has always held to the necessity of sponsors both in the old Sarum use and since. The Reformation produced very little change in this particular. In the Prayer-Book of 1549 the address was specially written for the sponsors, but is largely derived from the Liturgy of Cologne. The questions addressed to the sponsors are modified from the Sarum use, and in 1549 were addressed *to the child after* its baptism, but in 1552 were addressed to the sponsors *before* the baptism, and in 1549 the sponsors laid their hands on the head of the child before the putting on of the chrisom, but in 1552 this was withdrawn. It is noticeable also that, while in 1549 the questions were asked of the child, yet in the closing exhortation the minister says, "Forasmuch as these children have promised by you," showing the vicarious position in which the Church regarded the sponsors to stand to the child. The next alteration was in 1661, when the words were added "in the name of this child," and also the demand for obedience, "Wilt thou, then, obediently keep God's holy will and commandments," etc. ? Next, if we inquire as to the *number* of sponsors, we find the Church of England occupies a unique position. It was not till 1661 she fixed the number as three—two of the sex of the child and one of the other sex. I have heard it argued that, though there must be three, there may be more, but I fail to see where the permission comes in.

The Roman and Greek Churches require *one* sponsor, though they permit two, but it must be a male for a male, a

female for a female, and, if two, a male and a female. The sponsors must be Romanists, and anyone over seven years of age can occupy the position.

This action of the Romish Church tends to emphasize the extraordinary and far-reaching doctrine which she teaches of spiritual affinity, which prevents sponsors marrying those for whom they stand, and also most of their relatives, and this idea seems to form the groundwork of the prohibited degrees in marriage. Rome also requires sponsors at confirmation, which need not apparently be the same as those at baptism. I think it is a matter of serious importance for us to consider whether we do wisely to ask and expect (for we seldom get) so many sponsors.

When we come to the Canons of the Church of England, those of 1604, we must consider Canon 29, which is as follows: "No parent shall be urged to be present, nor be admitted to answer as godfather for his own child, nor any godfather or godmother shall be suffered to make any other answer or speech than by the Book of Common Prayer is prescribed in that behalf, neither shall any person be admitted godfather or godmother to any child at christening or confirmation before the said person so undertaking hath received the Holy Communion." This Canon was altered by the Canterbury Convocation in 1865; but the Crown refused to ratify the alteration, and the Convocation of York did not assent to it.

We may well regret its wording, and, I think, also its intention. Surely parents should be persuaded to, not dissuaded from, attending their children's baptism, as their prayers and interest are of such supreme importance; neither ought they to be debarred from acting as proxy for a godparent, if such a one is unable to attend. Who more suitable?

The restriction that the godparents shall be a communicant seems to me a wise and practical one, as insuring, as far as human foresight can, that the godparent shall be a sincere, active, and acknowledged member of the Christian Church; but it does not appear to prohibit Nonconformists from being god-

parents if they are willing so to act. The expression "god-father or godmother" at christening *or confirmation* is worthy of note, as it implies that a godparent is expected to be present at the child's confirmation, and so personally see that the promise made at baptism that the child "shall be brought to the Bishop to be confirmed" is really and truly carried into effect.

Seeing, then, that this custom of sponsors is of great antiquity, and has been of proved utility, we need to ask, Has it become obsolete? Is the requirement now needless owing to our changed conditions of life? There seems to me only two courses open to the Church—either she must abandon the requirement of three sponsors, and relax the stringency of her rules, or she must stiffen her demands and see them carried out in their literal exactness. In view of the growing worldliness of the Church, and the terribly perfunctory and mechanical view held regarding baptism, as a mere fashionable excuse for a social merry-making, or else as some mysterious process by which certain spiritual benefits are conferred irrespective of conditions or character, it appears to me that the duty of the Church is to raise the national sentiment and inculcate a high ideal regarding this Sacrament. The difference now shown in reverence with regard to the two Sacraments instituted by Christ is not only alarming; it is appalling. No ritual is considered too gorgeous, no ceremonial too extravagant, no language too extreme, when it is employed to direct attention and inspire reverence with regard to Holy Communion, or the Supper of the Lord; but the other Sacrament is treated with scant reverence—any time, any service, any congregation, any apparel or vestment is good enough. Nothing special is asked as regards preparation or condition; nothing is done or attempted to impress on people the idea that the two Sacraments stand on an equal level of Divine institution, and are equally worthy of most reverent and thoughtful reception, and should be safeguarded by well-considered restrictions and restraints.

We have our Baptism Service in large parishes certainly

either on week-day evenings, when scant congregations attend, on Sunday afternoons when only children are present, or else at times specially arranged when no one is present except the infants and the one or two adults who come with them, and these adults absolutely ignorant of their duties as sponsors—often quite ignorant of their Prayer-Books and the answers they are required to give.

Now, can we get three sponsors, in these days, all communicants, for each child? I think *not*. Very rarely are three of any sort forthcoming in our poor or large parishes. Usually we must christen with one sponsor, and that the mother or a friend, or not christen at all. Probably many will say: "Well, let the child be baptized, anyhow!" But how, then, are we to teach the child what its godfathers and godmothers promised for it in its baptism, when it never had any godparents to promise anything on its behalf? Who is responsible to bring it to confirmation? And if we make baptism such a merely mechanical act, can we impress on the child the indispensable requirement of repentance and faith before it can benefit by the Sacrament? But I take no such low view of this Divinely appointed Sacrament. I believe it is pledge of a Divine promise and covenant, fraught with eternal blessings if received under the proper conditions. Now, this being so, it appears to me we cannot be too urgent in our demand for proper and pious godparents (or godparent) to see that the child is taught what baptism is, what it involves, and what it requires. It is no good advocating a doctrine of perfection; the present conditions of our home life do not lend themselves to it. But why not have not less than one *godparent*, nor more than three—male for male, female for female—and that one a qualified communicant? Then have the name of the godparent, or godparents, entered in the Baptism Register with the parents' names, and then at confirmation require the godparent to sign a requisition to the Bishop, asking for confirmation for the godchild—this to be countersigned by the clergyman. It would keep the godparent in touch with the child, and show there was something real and practical in the spiritual relationship. If we are going to check and dissipate

the loose views of baptism which are so sadly common, we must take some trouble, and the Bishops and other dignitaries should take more trouble too.

Why should clergy baptize any child brought to them as a mere matter of course? Why not demand at least one godparent, who can and must produce a certificate of confirmation, or a letter testimonial from his or her clergyman, saying they are communicants, and of pious life and conversation? Is it impossible to impress upon persons coming forward as godparents that the office is not fully discharged by the gift of a silver spoon and fork or some valuable or invaluable presents, but really means a very solemn duty and responsibility, and must be so regarded? It will be necessary to refuse some godparents, to decline to baptize some children, to face the usual cries of "want of charity," priestly arrogance and intolerance, etc.; but in the end it will pay in the highest and noblest sense; we shall raise to its proper level the initiatory Sacrament; we shall show a due regard to the spiritual interest of the children; we shall lay the foundation of a better, more serious, more suitable view of confirmation and all its attendant duties and privileges; we shall have done our best, as far as human foresight can, to provide that all children brought to holy baptism shall be truly brought up in "the nurture and admonition of the Lord."



## A Vision of Service: The Pleiades.

BY THE VEN. ARCHDEACON MOULE, B.D.

“When I consider Thy heavens, the work of Thy fingers, the moon and the stars, which Thou hast ordained; what is man, that Thou art mindful of him? and the son of man, that Thou visitest him?”

IN a recent number of the *CHURCHMAN* (January, 1911) there appeared an interesting and suggestive article, entitled “Restricted Horizons: A Plea for Breadth.” I desire in the following paper to extend the horizon of duty and of hope yet further, to the heights and breadths of the redeemed creation of God.

The words of the psalm which head my article seem to me to serve a double office. They first of all deny the old principles of astrology. That mysterious science swayed the world both in the East and in the West till the dawn of the eighteenth century; and this science is still in full force in China under the teaching of Taoism. I have in my possession a large collection of books full of the curious arts of this system, given to me before his baptism by a former professor of the art. Tennyson, in his drama “Harold,” puts into the mouths of a courtier and of Morcar these words:

“Lo! there once more—this is the seventh night!  
Yon grimly-glaring, treble-brandished scourge  
Of England. . . .  
It glares in heaven, it flares upon the Thames,  
The people are as thick as bees below,  
They hum like bees,—they cannot speak—for awe.”

To which Stigand replies:

“War there, my son? Is that the doom of England?”

And Harold:

“Why not the doom of all the world as well?  
For all the world sees it as well as England.  
These meteors came and went before our day,  
Not harming any. . . .”

Representing thus the faith in this superstition, and also the scepticism about it, 900 years ago.

This art continues also in the imagination of the not inconsiderable multitude who consult and believe in almanacks, such as are largely read at the present day. David will have none of it : "When I consider Thy heavens, as I keep watch over my flock by night, the work of Thy fingers, the moon and the stars which Thou hast ordained, I know then that it is not the stars which remember man and control his destiny, and visit him for judgment or for mercy ; but it is Thou, Lord, who didst make the stars."

But now, in the second place, do the words suggest that there is a true astrology—namely, a family connection, and perchance a family sympathy, between the multitude of stars and yet greater multitude, perhaps, of planets and this earth, which has been called "the sorrowful star"? The learned astrologer in "Guy Mannering" is made to explain that the influence of the constellations is powerful indeed, but that the influence of Him who made the heavens is more powerful still. Bacon, while rejecting the old elaborate astrology, full of superstition, yet thought that there was something in the science, and that the stars had something to do with man. Is this possible, and if so, is it of any practical importance and interest to us?

The words of the psalm which I have quoted may, I think, be paraphrased thus : When I consider, Lord, Thy constant upholding and sustaining care over the majestic stars and planets which fill the sky, I wonder that Thou couldst spend time and thought for this small earth, far off from Thee by sin, and for mankind, deliberately wandering from the mighty Maker. Can it be that this one stray sheep from the great sheepfold on the celestial mountains can be thought of, and remembered, and sought for by Thee? Yes, and honoured afterwards by Thy very coming ; for "we see Jesus made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour, that He by the grace of God should taste death for every man." And this at once makes possible the idea of con-

nection and of sympathy—far off, indeed, but of influence more potent than we imagine—between this earth and the other members of God's great family in creation.

I saw Donati's comet in 1858, and also the great comet of 1861-62, flaming more in pity than in fury over China, distracted by the T'ai'ping rebellion. "The very stars in their courses," we read, "fought against Sisera." And was not the star in the east, the star of Bethlehem, partly a pledge sent from afar, from those depths of grace through which just before the multitudes of the hymning heavenly hosts had come, that the heavens and the earth are truly one in sympathy and in eternal destiny?

This subject has been brought to my mind by special observation of the Pleiades. Any who were awake and stirring at a very early hour in July, 1905, would have been rewarded by most entrancing sights of glory and beauty. I was during that month in the hills west of Ningpo, in the province of Chekiang. The dawn was just breaking at a quarter to four, and on the now lucid eastern sky the morning stars were blazing, a double phosphor, for both the morning star, Venus, and Saturn were rising over the still hidden sun; and by their side, only a little above them, the Pleiades were riding in extreme beauty. In three months' time that constellation had reversed its place, and, instead of rising just before the rising sun, it rose in the dull autumn evenings exactly at sunset, for some days together, and culminated at midnight.

Now, with this is connected a significant fact in the history of the world. Just this period, and marked especially by this phenomenon of the Pleiades rising at sunset, is the time observed in ancient days, and observed still, for mourning for the dead—an almost universal mourning, apparently for a universal sorrow. This period, or the days near to it on either side, is observed in the far North and in the far South, and in the East we have it in China. The mid-autumn festival is the anniversary of the release for a time of the spirits in prison, their reincarceration, and the propitiatory offerings in memory of the dead. And in



the West, sad Hallowe'en, All Souls' Day, and the more joyful and hopeful All Saints', coincide with the Pleiades rising through the gloaming. For whom is this universal mourning for the dead intended? No special names are commemorated, but a sorrow seems to come sighing up from the buried ages, which touches, or should touch, all mankind. It is remarkable that this is the exact period of the bursting of the flood which destroyed the old world; and it is not unreasonable to believe that we have here, besides the growing weight of testimony afforded by geology, a significant hint of the universality of the flood. The history of that catastrophe might indeed have been spread all over the new world by the sons of Noah; but it seems more probable that the legends of the flood which are found among all nations are the records of those signs of the universal cataclysm which the new human race found then in all lands. The Chinese highly-coloured legend of the great Yü, and his subduing of the flood, falls well within the limits of Noah's life. Call it a mere fancy, yet I dare to imagine that the great doom and sorrow of this "sorrowful star," in a rising mist of tears, was caught up by the watching, sympathizing heavens. The Pleiades have a feature almost unique, I think, in the visible heavens—that of incessantly flashing clear and then half disappearing. Tennyson's description of them refers to this—"A swarm of fireflies tangled in a silver braid"—and this silver braid, like mist, partially hides them continually. Is this the mist of ancient tears—sorrow for the sins which brought the flood, and for the obstinacy of the dead in rejecting the long-suffering of God through 120 years of warning?

Not pausing to notice here the references to the Pleiades in Homer, in Horace, and elsewhere, and also in ancient Chinese literature, it is an interesting fact to remember that in the Book of Job (which we will make bold to regard as history, and not as mere drama), the Lord Himself, subduing and ending Job's distressed assertion of self-righteousness by one glimpse of the power of His works, refers to the Pleiades and their "sweet influence," which may point to the halcyon days which often

brood over the sea at the time of their sunset rising ; or it may refer to other and more mysterious influences.

But it may be said that mere fancy is of little practical value. Is there any hint in the Bible of this almost immeasurably distant sympathy and union between the celestial order and our own ? I think there is one passage of the utmost significance and interest. I remember attending a Thursday afternoon prayer-meeting in the Church Missionary House a few years ago. The leader, instead of mentioning special items of missionary information, directed our thoughts to one great object and result of our work, far beyond the bounds of this wide, yet little earth : "To the intent that now unto the principalities and the powers in the heavenly places might be made known through the Church the manifold wisdom of God." It is noteworthy that this great result follows immediately after St. Paul's reference to this grace given, to preach unto the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ, making all men see what is the dispensation of the mystery which from all ages has been hid in God, who created all things.

I believe that one feature in the explanation of the philosophy of the plan of salvation will be that the knowledge of the fall of man and of the redemption effected only through the precious blood of the Son of God, made known to all creation, will make sin for evermore impossible. The speaker at the meeting to which I refer suggested that, amidst apparent failure in our enterprise, the certainty of this final and vaster success, affecting all creation (for are not the principalities and powers in the heavenly places most probably there in the "many mansions," our Lord's own wealth of stars and countless planets?)—the thought of this might well remove all idea of discouragement. But it is important to avoid even the suspicion of the possibility of failure in the work of the world's redemption ; for it is the news and the subtle omnipresent effect of that redemption which, made known to these principalities and powers, will thus affect for eternal good the eternal inheritance. My subject in no sense belittles the work of the redemption of this earth ; it

rather ennobles it further and enhances its value. If the Gospel triumphs, then all is well in all worlds. If it fails, then all fails. And this thought lifts us to that consideration which (if I mistake not) astronomical science is endorsing—namely, that this world is in reality the very centre of all creation. The earth is the active dominant partner, the “hub” of the solar system, and that system lies in the heart of other systems of suns and planets. Our earth is in the Milky Way, and these great solar systems are in the actual centre of that pathway of souls, that broad beam of silvery light spanning the heavens, and containing, it may be, all the hundred millions of God’s stars, by perspective arranged thus to our sight, with outriding stars on either side. Is this so? Something must account for the Psalmist’s explanation. I consider Thy heavens, full of great planets and vaster stars. Why on this little earth are Thy love and care concentrated? Is it for this reason that the earth is the beating heart and centre of all creation, and that God’s wisdom, justice, righteousness, power, and boundless love—exhibited and active here by the grace of his Divine Spirit, who “garnished the heaven,” and by the grace of His dear Son, “without whom was not anything made that was made”—affect now, and will for evermore affect, all for good, all creation, to His glory?

“Man,” say the Chinese, “is the soul of all things.” My subject is not so unpractical, and transcendental, and imaginative, after all, but of practical import. For if so, what a supremely noble and magnificent enterprise is this once despised and still much criticized mission work? Sir Francis Younghusband, in a lecture on India delivered at Cambridge, spoke in words of enthusiasm of the grandeur and sublimity of our task in India, treating the people there, not so much as subjects, or even as of the same original race, but, what is more, as *comrades* in the battle of life, our great object being to give some practical help towards the general welfare of mankind, giving them an impulse and initial guidance, starting them fairly along the path that leads to the highest pinnacle of human glory and attainment.

“If ever we leave them,” to quote his words, “may it be in the attitude of having their arms stretched out to the Divine.” Now, is not this still more true of our wider enterprise, of results to be obtained in India, in China, in Japan, and in all the world, by the power of the Holy Ghost, and with influence not bounded by time or limited by the space of this earth alone, but the sublime hope of taking part in the “restitution of all things,” the “reconciling to God of all things in heaven above and in earth beneath,” shaken and loosed from the harmony of allegiance, mysteriously alienated now—for if not, why is reconciliation spoken of?—by the breath, if not by the act, of moral evil?

The eager and almost resentful question, “How can these things be?” needs, perhaps, less and less consideration as the boundaries of possibility seem less and less restricted to our opening eyes. Yet it is perhaps worth noting, as I pass to my conclusion, that, apart from the general and dominant consideration that with God and in His works and ways all things are possible, ideas of time and space and distance may not be positive, but only relative to our present bodily earthly frames and surroundings. The distances of space are being, if not annihilated, yet almost ignored by the application of power and essences in Nature placed there long ago by the Creator, and now grasped by the hand of experiment. Space above us, the firmament, the “expanse,” the air and the strata of the ether, show symptoms of being other than we had imagined, more kindly, more yielding for transit; and travel through the depths and lengths of creation for the redeemed and evangelizing Church may be easier, simpler, swifter, than we now imagine possible.

We labour from love to God and from love to man to make known the name of Jesus Christ in all lands; and this name is conquering, and will conquer, in love; and “things in heaven and things in earth, and things under the earth, all shall bow to Him”—all shall confess that He is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.

## Lamennais.

BY THE REV. J. GREGORY-SMITH, M.A., HON. LL.D. (EDIN.)

**S**Ocialism, or more properly Collectivism, in one shape or another, is in the air at this time all over Europe. The question at issue between, as Thucydides says, "those who have and those who have not" is, indeed, coeval with the earliest rudimentary forms of society, when snatching was the law in vogue. But it is intensified and exacerbated now by the appalling contrast between colossal wealth at one end of the social ladder, and at the other end utter destitution. Disraeli said, some fifty years ago, "We are two nations in England, rich and poor." The problem to be solved grows daily more and more instant for legislators and philanthropists, or rather for all who think. Although a century yawns between *L'Avenir* of Lamennais and the *Clarion* of to-day, it is worth while to pause for a moment over one who, in his day, if not a deep thinker, was an ardent and eloquent mouthpiece of democracy in France.

Hugues Félicité Robert de<sup>1</sup> Lamennais was born in 1782 in Brittany, and inherited fully the pugnacity, the excitability, the proneness to a pensive melancholy of that hardy race. Now and again in the picturesque imagery which lights up his oratory one stands on the wild coast of Brittany and hears the waves surging against the rocks. He was a voluminous writer. But in these pages it must be enough to fix our thoughts on what is the most characteristic of all that he wrote, "Les Paroles d'un Croyant, etc."<sup>2</sup>

Some are still alive who can recall the stormy days of 1848. when the bourgeois government of "The Citizen King" came down with a crash in Paris. A shudder ran through London when, late one evening, a rumour came, happily not true, that

<sup>1</sup> The prefix of nobility was granted to the father of l'abbé Lamennais by Louis Philippe.

<sup>2</sup> "Les Paroles d'un Croyant." "Une Voix de Prison." "De l'Esclavage moderne." *Précédés d'une Étude sur Lamennais*, par M. de Sainte-Beuve, etc. Paris: Calman-Lévy.

Guizot had been dragged "à la lanterne." Lamennais was the stormy petrel of the hurricane which swept Louis Philippe from his throne, and shook the foundations of social order far and wide. In his earlier days he had been a loyal comrade of Montalembert and Lacordaire. But as the political ideas of *L'Avenir* diverged more and more from theirs and towards the ideas of '92, estrangement ensued. Smarting under the ban of the Papal Curia, Lamennais raised again the old war-cry of "Liberté, Egalité, Fraternité." In 1837 Montalembert wrote of him, in a letter to a friend, as "Le plus dangereux des ennemis de l'Église" . . . "il a souffleté l'Église." "The champion," wrote another of Lamennais' friends, "is become the adversary—the firebrand." But, while reprobating his politics, sometimes as "un égarement," sometimes as "un' apostasie," they add, "c'est un esprit noble . . . il est passionnément sincère."<sup>1</sup> There never could be doubt of that; nor of his religious convictions. Even in his most frantic outbursts against "the oppressors of the people," he wrote as a devout Catholic. He was no "Modernist."

Lacordaire could sway by his voice the crowds who flocked to Notre Dame to hear the great Dominican. "Le maudit" had to speak by his pen. It is a remarkable testimony to his eloquence that two men, both representative of modern French literature, neither of them in sympathy with his beliefs—Renan and Sainte-Beuve—eulogized Lamennais, perhaps overmuch, in their prefaces to his writings. He began his career as ultramontane and legitimist; was buried, 1854, in Père la Chaise, without religious rites, unfrocked and excommunicated for his revolutionary writings.

Lamennais' style is characteristic. "Le style, c'est l'homme." In his fervid rhetoric, a torrent of invectives, worthy of Swinburne, bears him headlong. Quick, broken sentences, like the stabbings of a short sword, save the ceaseless flow of declamation from monotony. What one desiderates in vain is the close

<sup>1</sup> "Le Recit d'un Sœur," i. 96. Par M<sup>me</sup> Augustus Craven. Paris: Didier et Cie. This book was "couronné" by the Académie.

and careful reasoning, the judicial impartiality, the self-restraint, which alone can untie the knot. One is tempted to say of him, as of Garibaldi, "Gran cuor, piccola intelligenza."

"Les Paroles d'un Croyant" and "Une Voix de Prison" are mere shoutings, a tissue of passionate tirades, now fierce, now pathetic, against "oppression." It is oratory for a mob, an appeal to the emotions, not to the reason. Page after page is fragmentary as the ancient oracles. Like the old Hebrew prophets, Lamennais calls to heaven and earth to redress the wrongs of humanity. Scene follows scene, as in Apocalyptic visions. Each is more lurid and ghastly than the one before. They are incoherent, inconsequential, as the slides of a magic lantern or the fantasies of a fever. There is no attempt at argument. There would have been more meaning in these philippics in the days when a prince-bishop could begin his sermon with "Chretienne canaille!" when a king could speak of war with all its horrors as "Le jeu de rois"; when the nobles of France protested in a formal document against inferior classes being styled their "brothers"; when a famished crowd were told "to eat grass." Faults enough there were in the bureaucracy of Louis Philippe. But to call it "the worst tyranny that the world has ever seen" is preposterous. Lamennais tosses his firebrands about indiscriminately.

"L'Esclavage" is calmer. He describes slavery rightly as destroying the personality. So with Aristotle the slave is "a living implement."<sup>1</sup> But Lamennais, playing on the word "master," applied it to the employer in modern times, and insists that the workman is a slave nowadays. If there were no other difference—and there are many—the fact that the workman is no longer, like the slave in Hellas or the medieval serf, chained to the same place and to the same master, vitiates the comparison. True, in the long run, capital can outlast labour in a strike. But the labourer, if the chances are against him, can take his services elsewhere. Exaggeration defeats itself. "Freedom," he says, "has never been won except by force."

<sup>1</sup> ἔμψυχον ὄργανον.

It was not "by force" that Wilberforce and his friends won the emancipation of the slave. "All laws are bad," he cries, "and all rulers;" as if there had never been a St. Louis on the throne in his own land.

It would be impossible to find in all this fiery eloquence anything like a system. He continually contradicts himself. After vociferating again and again, "Fight for your freedom, fight 'à la morte,'" he ends with the tame and prosaic counsel, "Petition!" He denounces all governments as tyrannical, all laws as concocted by selfish schemers, and yet he glorifies Napoleon, the incarnation of selfishness. He tells us, what is true, that "the aim of government should be the common good of all." Why does he narrow the words to mean one class only? "La suprême volonté du peuple," he says, must be obeyed. But by "the people" he seems to mean, not the whole nation, but what he calls—it is a questionable word—the "proletariat." It is this perverse one-sidedness, this narrowness of sympathy, which weaken the force of what is sound and true in his pleadings. He is for ever appealing to Heaven; but he forgets that his ravings against authority militates against the submission, which he preaches, to the Divine Will. For, though authority of every kind may be abused terribly, lawless, anarchic self-will means a pandemonium on earth. He argues, with Rousseau,<sup>1</sup> that all men are "naturally equal." The huge disparities, not merely between child and adult, but between the clever and the stupid, between naturally good and evil dispositions, make it nearer to the mark to say that nature is essentially unequal.

It is more easy to see what Lammenais was not, than what he was politically. He does not say, with the extreme Socialist, "La propriété, c'est le vol." "Chacun a le droit," he says, "de conserver ce qu'il a." Rich and poor there must be, he admits, to the end of time. He was no Fifth Monarchy man. When he says to the destitute, "Christ vous delivra," he is not dreaming, like the Anabaptists of Munster, of a visible kingdom of Christ on the earth. He was no Luther, propounding a new

<sup>1</sup> At the age of twelve Lamennais was well acquainted with many of Rousseau's writings.



theology ; no Savonarola, attacking the iniquities of the Papal court. Kingsley, in "Yeast," sees deeper into the causes of our social inequalities. Mazzini goes deeper into that which is the fount and origin of all social evils, personal slavery to self. Mazzini is ever hopeful. To Lamennais the world, as it is, seems a dismal charnel-house. It would be ridiculous to class him with Tom Paine and the levellers of the eighteenth century in England. A devout believer in Christianity, he writes at times like an Anarchist.

"None but himself can be his parallel."

Lamennais tries to justify his violent language by the appeal to Scripture. But there is nothing in Christianity to encourage the notion of a dead level in the affairs of men. On the contrary, the Word is, "To each his due"—severally, proportionately, with regard to time and place. Christianity reflects and recognizes the ever varying complexity of nature.

But, if the arguments of Lamennais are illogical and unpractical, if his flights of eloquence end too often in a shriek, what is the good of disinterring his memory ?

It is an object-lesson, and a very impressive one, in several ways. It shows that noble inspirations, unless practicable, evaporate in air ; that the ideal without the actual is useless.

"Vis consilii expers mole ruit súa."

And yet, own it one must, there is a reality under these hysterical utterances. They are a protest, more needful now than ever, against that cult of material prosperity which, like a black shadow, dogs the steps of advancing civilization, and which arrays class against class, selfish luxury on one side, against selfish grasping on the other. "Convoitise" is the burden of his cry—"Beware of coveting !" Feudal tyranny is long past—the Chartist riots, which some can remember, seem to us less conceivable now—but the rift still remains between rich and poor, still menaces the solidity of the social fabric. Strikes, surely, will cease, the agitator's occupation will be gone, when the vital principle of profit-sharing shall bind Labour and Capital together indissolubly. Then, at last, the rift will be closed.

## The Missionary World.

AT the moment of writing, three great centres of political interest are charged with missionary import. There is the Turco-Italian war, exposing a large area of possibility for international complications and bearing upon two such widely different questions as the presence of Islam in Europe and the balance of power in the Mediterranean. This links itself not indirectly with the second centre of interest—the visit of King George and Queen Mary to Delhi for the Durbar, necessitating a passage through the eastern Mediterranean. The Durbar, in turn, opens the question of the relationships between Great Britain and India, and is fraught with many issues for good or for evil. We shall do well to pray, for the sake of the spread of the Gospel, that the good understanding subsisting between the King-Emperor and his Indian subjects may be maintained unbroken, and that the designs of any who would exploit it for unworthy ends may be frustrated. In the Farther East, all eyes are drawn to China. The serious rebellion threatening the Manchu Dynasty may not only directly affect foreign missionaries and Chinese Christians, but also lead to international complications. China needs our earnest prayers, lest her liberation should be delayed by this internal conflict. It was almost bound to come, as the *Times*, in a leader on October 14, on the crisis in China, points out, quoting a suggestive sentence from Tocqueville: “Experience proves that the most perilous moment for a bad Government is that in which it begins to reform itself. The ills borne patiently because they seem to be inevitable appear insupportable when once the idea is conceived of getting rid of them.” Intercession should also be made that the nations politically and commercially concerned in the condition of China may be delivered from that spirit of self-interest and self-assertion which would lead to undue interference at such a time.

\* \* \* \* \*

The Anglican Church is developing a corporate care for foreign missions, sincerely if not rapidly, in the region of thought

and prayer, if not yet in that of adequate action. The missionary utterances at the recent Church Congress have been valuable. The Diocesan Boards of Missions are doing useful work. The annual report of the Board of Missions for the Diocese of Manchester, compiled by the Rev. E. N. Sharpe, Rector of Kersal, is an illustration of many others. It opens with a brief historical and business statement, gives a list of clergy from the Diocese on service abroad (out of sixty-two names eight are marked as being C.M.S. missionaries), and then a tabulated statement of money collected for foreign missions. The summary on the last page shows that out of a total of £18,629 3s. 6d. contributed in the Diocese, £9,484 4s. 1d. goes to C.M.S., £5,196 8s. 5d. to S.P.G., and the remainder to other missions. The Central Board of Missions has also issued its *Fourth Annual Review*, specializing this year on China. The book (which can be had for 1s. net from the Church House, Westminster) has much interest as a project and an ideal, but it will gain when more literary skill is expended upon it. The summaries should either be all rewritten by one capable hand, or else be avowedly quoted from some recognized source. They do not at present provide matter for a really constructive survey. But this corporate work is far from easy to do, and one welcomes it too warmly to be critical.

\*                     \*                     \*                     \*                     \*

November opens and closes with missionary events. The first, pertaining mainly to the C.M.S., is the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Gleaners' Union. Those who have known the inner side of Missionary development during the last quarter of a century will realize how great a part the Gleaners' Union has played in evoking prayer and work. Founded, under the leadership of Dr. Eugene Stock, as a union of individuals linked only with headquarters, it soon began to cover the country with a network of local branches; it extended into the Mission-field, and took strong root in the Colonies. The success of the Gleaners' Union led to the formation of similar unions by several other societies. For some years there was a haunting

sense that the Gleaners' Union had "done its work," but of late it has been revealing marked vitality, and is likely by steady development to make a large contribution to the desired "efficiency" at the Home Base.

\* \* \* \* \*

The close of November brings us to the Festival of St. Andrew, now associated throughout the whole Anglican Church with Intercessions for Foreign Missions. Whether these take the form of a service in church, or a meeting in a parochial hall, the following quotation from the Edinburgh Conference Report on the Home Base is applicable :

"It is often forgotten by those who are responsible for the conduct of prayer-meetings on Missions that careful preparation is necessary . . . not only for the leader of the meeting, but for all present, if they are to participate in the ministry of intercession. The whole plan of the meetings needs careful thought. The subjects for prayer must be explained and set before the people, so that they may be inwardly stirred to pray, and preparatory exercises are necessary to make vivid to the mind the privilege of prayer and to awaken a sense of God's presence. . . . In Christ's teaching prayer is not the utterance of vague aspirations, but has been divinely ordained to receive definite and unmistakable answers."

In addition to the "St. Andrew-tide Manual" published by the Central Board of Missions, and to the special Litany issued by the C.M.S., a new manual of intercession called "A Vision of Earth" will be found invaluable. It is timed to fill forty-five minutes, but is easily capable of abbreviation. It very beautifully suggests topics for meditation and silent intercession covering the whole world. The price is twopence; the manual is published by the C.M.S.

\* \* \* \* \*

The influence of missionary deficits is more widespread than the Church at home believes. There lies before the writer a copy of the *Arya Patrika*, a weekly organ of the Arya Samaj, published at Lahore, containing an article called "A Lesson from the Christian Mission." The writer states that his Society has "not only to reform our Hindu brethren, but . . . to check the Islamic and Christian influences both here and abroad." He goes on to quote at length from a popular

London weekly paper figures showing the C.M.S. deficit; and the deficits of the Wesleyans, the Baptists, and the L.M.S. Here are some of the sentences which have thus been circulated in India :

"There have been frantic efforts to wipe off the liability. . . . The old idea of going forward with missionary work wherever there is an open door has been abandoned.

"The difficulty of getting money is breaking down the enthusiasm of the officials. Somehow or other people's hearts are not touched as they used to be.

"The number of Free Churchmen who support missionary societies by a personal gift is very small, probably not more than one in seven. This figure is certainly better than the one in sixteen which is the proportion for the Anglican Church, but it is not much to boast about."

The article closes with a quotation so cogent that we quote it again : "In conclusion, I should like to put a plain question : Ought foreign missions to be dropped entirely ? My view is that as a nation we ought to take one of two courses—either drop foreign missions entirely and say these things are not our duty ; or, alternatively, we ought to give the missions that support which is their due. It should be one thing or the other." The aim of the *Arya Patrika* is to show what Christian missions "think of their means and sources" with a view to stimulate the Arya Samaj to more earnest propagandism. But it is deeply humbling that we should furnish them with such a text.

\*                     \*                     \*                     \*                     \*

In October, though the missionary monthlies teem with interest, one turns special attention to the first number of the *Student Movement* for the winter, and to the quarterly issue of *The East and the West*. The former is not avowedly a missionary magazine, but no lover of foreign missions can afford to miss it. It chronicles, and in part directs, the spiritual life of many of those centres where missionaries are in the making, and from time to time it publishes articles of peculiar value from thoughtful younger men and women already in the Mission-field. For instance, in the current number there is a delightful sketch of "The First Summer School of Study in India," by the Rev.

A. C. Pelly, of the Oxford and Cambridge Hostel, Allahabad. *The East and the West* is, as usual, refreshingly varied. The opening article on "Indian Methods of Evangelization" is noteworthy. Mr. G. Sherwood Eddy's survey of "The Situation in China" is distinctly good. The Rev. Roland Allen on "The Will to Convert in Mission Schools" is onesidedly forceful. Dr. Murray, of Selwyn College, is timely and suggestive on "The Board of Study for the Preparation of Missionaries." Two other quarterlies call for sympathetic reference—the excellent record of the Friends' Foreign Mission Association, *Our Missions*, of which the present well-illustrated number is devoted to China; and the smaller magazine, *Blessed be Egypt*, which is the organ of the Nile Mission Press.

\*         \*         \*         \*         \*

In the S.P.G. *Mission Field* there is an editorial note announcing the issue, and urging the use, of two "missionary plays" for children. No objection can be taken to the text of the plays themselves, though one is far more dignified and worthy than the other, but some of the best friends of the S.P.G. are distressed at the provision from headquarters of material for regular dramatic entertainments. We sympathize deeply with these friends. Only those who have borne the responsibility of local work know how difficult it is to maintain its spiritual tone, and there is evidence that definitely dramatic entertainments, however carefully guarded, tend to lower it. The C.M.S., with all its development of work amongst young people, has kept clear of this. We wish it had been so, too, in the case of the S.P.G.

G.



## Discussions.

### “SPADE AND BIBLE.”

(“*The Churchman*,” October, p. 749.)

It is, perhaps, unfair to criticize a paper before it is completed, but in his interesting communication, “The Spade and the Bible,” Mr. Linton Smith appears to me not to grasp the real matter at issue between those who feel compelled “*stare super antiquas vias*,” and the fashionable, up-to-date schools of Old Testament teachers. I am an out-and-out traditionalist, but the question to my mind is not whether the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua were written by one man, or by twenty, but whether the writers were able, by the time at which they lived and the authorities they had access to, to hand down a record which, weighed by the rules of historical criticism, may be accepted as generally true history, or, on the other hand, do these six books give us myths and folklore first put into writing several centuries after the settlement in Canaan. I am aware that the Higher Critics allow that embedded in this folklore is much ancient matter of a trustworthy character, and the moderate English School probably allow Moses and the Patriarchs to be real historical characters; but I fear they would find it as difficult to write out any detailed incidents in their lives which they would consider historically established as they would to do the same for King Arthur.

It is because this is the real issue between the parties that the evidence, which Mr. Smith disparages, seems valuable. If one wishes to know whether an historical book contains true accounts or not, especially if it deals with remote times and other works to compare with it are few and fragmentary, he will be anxious to see if the state of society and civilization in which its characters and incidents are placed is such as it represents; and, therefore, the discoveries as to the old life of Western Asia which the last half-century has seen, appear to have a great bearing even on facts that they do not directly demonstrate.

Without “any judicious manipulation and selection” let me just mention some of these discoveries. To begin, then, the reading of the hieroglyphic and cuneiform writings has shown that the age of the Exodus was, in Western Asia and Egypt, a distinctly writing Age. Writing was more general, I would venture to say, than it was in England in Anne’s reign. Now, is this a discovery which has no bearing on our present issue because we have not dug up autograph copies of Genesis and Exodus? Surely it goes to the very root of the question. If Moses led out his people at this period, it is almost unthinkable that he was not compelled to legislate for them, and that such legislation should not have been at once expressed in writing;

and it is scarcely less easy to believe that the way in which the Exodus was brought about, and some account of the events which marked the people's progress from Egypt to Palestine, should not also have been written *down at the time*. This discovery, therefore, seems to go a very long way to prove that in the days of Moses and Joshua Israel had a written law, and very probably written records, which, by whatever hand they were written, were rightly considered to be issued with the authority of the great Legislator. Now, I will admit that in the stormy days between Joshua and David Israelitish culture must have suffered; but there is no reason to believe that the knowledge of writing was lost, and much reason to believe the contrary, and therefore the very awkward question confronts the higher critics at what period before J and E and D, to say nothing of that gentleman P, "born out of due time," did this genuine Mosaic legislation vanish altogether, or become so obsolete that it could be almost entirely rewritten? This, I think, is a question that calls for an answer. The New Testament has passed through a similar ordeal. To readers of the *Record* I need not argue the point that the dogmas and practices of Christendom in the fifteenth century were very far removed from the letter and spirit of the New Testament, and yet even in that period the genuine book did not perish and have its place taken by another embodying the ideas of the priests of those days. Indeed, can the critics, who profess to follow sound historical methods, supply us with *any* analogous case?

Then, again, the discovery of Khammurabi's laws seems to me strongly to support the Traditional School, for not only does it explain much in Abraham's treatment of Hagar, but it shows an archaic mixture of law and religion, which suits the still early date of Moses far better than the epoch at which the present School of Critics place P, or, rather, the various P's. And while on this subject, may I crave for a little enlightenment on one simple matter? One argument in favour of the Higher Criticism is that it is in harmony with the law of development. Now, what I cannot understand is how the legalism of the P school is a development of the spiritual teaching of the Prophets. Here it always has seemed to me the higher critics have built their pyramid on its apex.

Then, thirdly, the discovery of the Tell Amarna tablets shows Palestine to have been in those days in a condition which squares with that depicted in Joshua, and accounts for the conquest of the country by a race who have never been a warlike people; while the discoveries at Gezer, and elsewhere, show that the Amorite races did practise the abominations which were said to have drawn down God's wrath on them. I do not wish to weary your readers, but I should like to point out one discovery which enables us roughly to date one of the authorities the writer of Genesis used. If one compares verses 1, 4 and 5 of Gen. xiv., we observe that in the first verse Amraphel, King of



Shinar, is given the precedence, while the latter verses clearly show that at the time of the raid Chedorlaomer was the ruling sovereign. I will not taunt the Higher Critics with their former dogmatism over this part of the history which they have now very wisely dropped, but it is only comparatively late discoveries that have taught us that Chedorlaomer was at first the chief sovereign in Elam and Lower Mesopotamia, and that his power was broken by Khammurabi or Amraphel, and therefore the record here used was probably made soon after the latter's victory.

Before concluding may I ask your readers to read through *continuously* the Hebrew Old Testament; and then ask themselves, Is the Hebrew of the Pentateuch later in date than that of the Prophets and Historical Books? Of course, people may be so occupied over words that they may be blinded to style, unable to see the wood for the trees; but if the Pentateuch is not more archaic Hebrew than Jeremiah, say, I shall expect to hear that Chaucer has been discovered to be later than Crabbe.

I have, unfortunately, been so much at issue in these remarks with my friend Mr. Linton Smith, that I am glad to find some point in which I do agree with him. He calls attention to the uncertainty which attaches to the Hebrew text, as it does to almost every document of antiquity. Mr. Wiener has done yeoman service in showing how the existing versions prove that we are no more sure of the true readings of particular passages than we are of certain passages in the New Testament; and that this uncertainty very frequently besets the use of the words Jehovah and Elohim, and very unkindly throws great doubt as to the mood of the verb in Exod. vi. 3,<sup>1</sup> on which the critics have based so much, which perhaps they will be wise now to sponge out. But does not this uncertainty as to the words of the original text cut away the ground from under the mangle-mangle to which the critics have reduced the text, sometimes a single verse being broken up between two or three different authors. I feel very grateful we traditionalists are not required to believe in this absolutely unique patchwork.

Mr. Smith also allows "responsible scholars," whoever they may be, to believe in the "general historicity of the stories of Ahab," a disagreeably limited admission; but I would ask, May scholars believe in the *historical* truth of the histories of Ahab's contemporaries—Elijah and Elisha—as recorded, say, in 1 Kings xvii., 2 Kings i., ii., iv. and v. ? and if not, why not ? Are the detailed accounts of Gideon and Samson credible history ? Or, when the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews and St. James based exhortations to their fellow-Christians on the relation between God and His servants, as shown by the Bible accounts of these men, were they only following "cunningly devised

<sup>1</sup> The Septuagint reads τὸ ὄνομά μου κύριος οὐκ ἐδήλωσα αὐτοῖς.

fables" ? It is because the legitimate outcome of the Higher Criticism compels such questions to be asked, and not from any dislike to sound criticism resting on proved facts, and not on such unsubstantial imaginings as J and E, and P and D, that an increasing number of people are looking into the foundations of this still fashionable teaching, and find them, to say the least, unsatisfactory.

I. D. TREMLETT.

### "THEOLOGY AND PASTORAL THEOLOGY."

(*"The Churchman,"* October, p. 773.)

To an untrained layman "Pastoral Theology" taken as a science seems a misnomer. It is as though the duty of a shepherd were to feed his flock on the agricultural science of the production and upkeep of suitable pasture, instead of simply to lead the sheep to the pasture itself already provided, where they may satisfy their hunger to the full.

The title of this paper gave hope that a clear distinction between it and the science of Theology would be afforded. It is, therefore, a disappointment to find a subject so vital to the efficient training of candidates for Holy Orders should be treated entirely academically.

It is, however, the writer's main contention that in practice the distinction between the two sciences has not been kept—that one has been allowed to obscure the other as in the case of Dogmatics, Liturgies, and Ecclesiastical History. These, he says, should be studied first of all as part of General Theology alone, and afterwards "gone over again" as part of Pastoral Theology.

He seems just here to miss the point—the real distinction between the two subjects—viz., that the latter is no science at all, but the art of applying pastorally certain of the definite results obtained from Theology. How much or how little of the science of Theology the candidate should study for himself to fit him or unfit him for pastoral work depends on his capacity for utilizing it. The author of "Across the Bridges" would be able to give valuable advice to an examining chaplain on that question. Certain it is that before he decides on becoming a candidate for Orders in the Church of England, the student must conscientiously "approve" of the doctrines of the Prayer-Book (see last clause of the preface), after satisfying himself that they may be proved by most certain warrant of Holy Scripture. This implies a thorough knowledge of a considerable amount of the New Testament.

He should, of course, have had a good all-round education, including the elements (not a smattering) of the natural sciences and their correlation—an important part of the "Science of God"—together with the mathematics which they require, and which would lead him to form a habit of correct thinking.

Again, as a *sine qua non* he should know the Love of God, and

heartily desire to devote his life to the communication of the same to his fellow-men.

It follows, then, that the chief subject of his pastoral study, whether subsequent or previous to the above, will be the nature of these fellow-men—their various habits of mind and expression, their doubts and difficulties, their various spiritual needs, and how to show them that these needs have been satisfied in men like themselves and in himself. This would be best carried on during some years of secular occupation that brought him into contact with men, with an extension of such contact in his hours of leisure as at a “settlement,” or otherwise.

He must learn, in fact, how to put himself in the place—not so much of a shepherd, but of the leading sheep of a flock—one who has gone the way to the pastures and fed there, and is able to tell them in their language all he knows of the one true Shepherd of their souls, and of his.

In the letter of Samuel Johnson, cited by Mr. Rogers, the need of such training and the humiliating result of its neglect is strikingly shown. A clergyman had in his parish a woman whom he could not bring to Communion, “and when he *reproved* her or *exhorted* her she only answered that *she was no scholar*. He was advised to set some good woman or man of the parish to talk to her in a *language level to her mind*.” (Italics to save comment.)

The student must (would that we might say of course) learn to use his natural voice in speaking, reading, and talking. Then, with the presupposed Love of God in his heart, he will find the proper performance of a prescribed liturgy an easy matter, requiring no special study of “Liturgies” or the Laws of “devotion and worship.”

F. A. LE MESURIER.



## Notices of Books.

INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY. By the Right Rev. Archibald Robertson, D.D., Bishop of Exeter, and the Rev. Alfred Plummer, D.D. Edinburgh: *T. and T. Clark*. 12s.

Of making many commentaries there is no end, but that before us will take a high place in the final array, besides adorning the series to which it belongs; moreover, “much study” of it is *not* “a weariness to the flesh.” Indeed, it is not extravagant to predict that “Robertson and Plummer” on 1 Corinthians will be as indispensable to the theological student as “Sanday and Headlam” on Romans. In spite of its 500 pages it is not obese. It does not suffer from the pointless platitudes and nebulous speculations and fantastic theorizings which increase the bulk and decrease the usefulness of some commentaries. What is more, it is not a congealed mass of cold and clever criticism, penetrable and appreciable only by the keen scholar; it

is a living, glowing book, which will appeal to a much wider circle. With deft touches and flashes of expository genius, the authors have fertilized phrases hitherto unappreciated and made them bear fruit under our eyes, thus providing a rare field for the preacher. In fact, it is a well-balanced book in which are welded together sound scholarship, cautious criticism, simple wholesome English, exposition, in which reverence and common sense are equally blended, and an up-to-dateness, which includes even Deismann's "Light from the Ancient East" amongst its references.

In the Introduction no words are wasted on establishing the authenticity and integrity of the Epistle; they are regarded—and rightly so—as proved up to the hilt. Neither is there any disturbance of the generally accepted views with regard to occasion, place, and date. Naturally, interest chiefly centres on the discussion of the second visit. There seems to be little doubt in the mind of the writers that the visit *was* actually paid and not merely purposed, 2 Cor. xiii. 2 turning the scale of evidence—but when? And that question is left open—left open to be, we doubt not, more thoroughly threshed out in the Commentary on the Second Epistle, which is happily to be treated by the same collaborators, though, in the face of the clashing authorities, so carefully summarized here, it would be rash to hope even then for a definite pronouncement on a problem so bristling with difficulties. In deciding the date of the Epistle, Turner's—rather than Harnack's—conclusions have been followed, and A.D. 55 is regarded as, beyond question, *i.e.*, the closing months of the Ephesian Missionary campaign. The twelve pages of Introduction dealing with doctrine are full of interest and all too meagre. We expected, and should have welcomed, something more than the three or four small paragraphs devoted to the nature of the risen body; and the scantiness of the section on Church Organization is only compensated for by an excellent addendum to the chapter on Spiritual Gifts. Both emphasize the fact that permanent and responsible Church officials were hardly yet thought of. "*Munus*, in the sense of *donum*, has not yet passed into *munus* in the sense of *officium*, and the process of transition has scarcely begun." Perhaps, too, it is crispness of treatment which gives rise to feelings of uneasiness as we read the discussion on the Institution of Holy Communion. For instance, here is one sentence, as arresting as though it had been printed in big type—"The Christian Passover once for all slain is eaten at every Eucharist." Taken by itself it wraps up a great truth. But the garment is hardly large enough; it needs expansion. Besides, it is disquieting to find this sentence summarizing a whole section, whose aim is to justify the term "sacrifice" as applied to the Eucharist. "Sacrifice" it is, but in a sense which does not need such elaborate and intricate argument as is used here to justify the use of the term. However, here again reference to the notes on the text is reassuring. We are told (chap. x. 3) that "it is remarkable that St. Paul chooses the manna and the rock, and not any of the Jewish sacrifices as parallels to the Eucharist." Not only is it "remarkable," but, we may add, instructive. Again, the writers refuse to believe that *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε* can be twisted into any such fantastic translation as "sacrifice this"; and in the note on "this is My Body," they make it clear that the very fact of the Institution preceding the Passion robs the phrase of all "carnal ideas." There is yet one interesting point of comparison. Embedded in the note on

*ἀνάμνησις* is this sentence: "The early Christians seem to have regarded the Eucharist as a commemoration of the Resurrection, as well as of the Death, for they selected the first day of the week for this memorial"; while this striking sentence sums up the force of *καταγγέλλετε*: "The Eucharist is an *acted* sermon, an *acted* proclamation of the Death, which it commemorates." Now if this be so, if the Holy Communion was looked upon as a memorial of the Resurrection—*i.e.*, of a *living* Christ, and if it is an *acted* sermon we are at a loss to discover how we are to see (as the writers do in the Introduction) in these two words, *ἀνάμνησις* and *καταγγέλλειν*, "the relation of the Eucharist . . . to sacrificial conceptions."

The rest of the Introduction is mainly concerned with the literary features of the Epistle, the most interesting section being a series of variant readings carefully worked out to illustrate the mutual relationships of documents or groups of documents available for the text of the Epistle.

Passing on to the Commentary, we may say that the arrangement is beyond reproach. Sectional division is, of course, the rule: each section being headed by a *précis* of its contents, followed by a free versical paraphrase. Interpolated in smaller type amongst the exegetical notes are notes of textual criticism, while the frequent footnotes are too valuable to be skipped. We have already made some general remarks on the excellence of the notes. A quotation or two from them will clear us of the charge of having over-estimated their merit. We select chapter ix. 27: "Lest that, by any means, when I have preached (*κηρύξας*) to others, I myself should be a cast-away (*ἀδόκιμος*)." "The metaphor of contests in the games perhaps still continues. There was a *κῆρυξ* at the games, who announced the coming contest and called out the competitors. . . . This the Apostle had done in preaching the Gospel. . . . But he was not only the herald to summon competitors and teach them the conditions of the contest, he was a competitor himself. How tragic, therefore, if one who had instructed others as to the rules to be observed for winning the prize should himself be rejected for having transgressed them! . . . Manifestly exclusion from the contest, as not being qualified is not the meaning: . . . it is exclusion from the prize that is meant. His effective preaching and his miracles will avail nothing if he has broken the rules of the course." On almost every page unpretentious phrases are made to leap out of the commonplace by a twist of the pen. Here are random illustrations, chapter i. 18, *τοῖς σωζομένοις*: "It is not quite adequate to render this 'to those who are in course of being saved.' Salvation is the certain result of a certain relationship to God, which relation is a thing of the present"; or, again, the note on *καὶ φανερώσει* (chapter iv. 5), "Two things are necessary for an unerring judgment of human actions—a complete knowledge of the facts and full insight into the motives. These the Lord will apply when He comes; and to attempt to judge men without these indispensable qualifications is futile arrogance."

Of the more burning questions of the Epistle the first which calls for comment is that of the Corinthian factions. The Christ-party is regarded as composed of anti-Paulinists, "more advanced Judaizers than those who used the name of Kephas." Were they docetists who objected to the name Jesus, and used the name of Christ in opposition to it? In dealing with the problems of marriage the writers strike at the root of many misconceptions

by pointing out that the Apostle's legislation is particular, not general. He is not writing a marriage treatise, but giving particular answers to particular questions applicable to the particular circumstances of a city like Corinth. Moreover, Eph. v. 22-33, knocks the bottom out of the charge of belittling marriage not infrequently levelled against St. Paul on the strength of vii. 2. The long section of the Epistle treating of τὰ εἰδωλόθρυτα is skilfully handled, the sequence of the Apostle's argument and the great principle which underlies it being made to stand out in bold relief. Passing on to the ritual disorders rife in the Corinthian Church, it is satisfying to turn to xi. 10 and find a simple and reasonable solution of its difficulties. The woman is not to discard the veil in public worship for two reasons. She ought to have control (ἐξουσία) over her head; to withdraw the veil is to hand over the control to others and allow them to stare her out of countenance. And then there are "the angels"; they, too, "are present at public worship," and the woman's unveiled head would be a greater shock to them than to men. The quotations we have already given from the section on the Lord's Supper are sufficient indication of its conservative and unbiassed treatment. There is no attempt to wring an unfair interpretation from the Greek, or to make words mean more than they say. We cannot pass over it, however, without noticing one other passage. After commenting on the impossibility of discovering the exact words of consecration, the writers continue: "Just as we do not know the manner of our Lord's Presence in the rite as a whole, so we do not know 'the supreme moment of consecration.' It is lawful to believe that we should *not* be in a better position for making a good use of this mystery if all these things *were* known." And yet there are those who would wish us to transfer our court of appeal from the Word of God, with its simplicity of direction and teaching, to the writings of the Church Fathers, who disagree among themselves in a futile attempt to settle with dogmatic definiteness "the supreme moment of consecration"!

There is little in the chapter on Spiritual Gifts which calls for special comment, but the beauty of the "Psalm in praise of Love" which follows, is adorned by the opening expository paraphrase and the pregnant notes on the text—those on the attributes of love being strikingly suggestive. Here is a sample: "When love has no evidence, it believes the best; when the evidence is adverse, it hopes for the best. And when hopes are repeatedly disappointed, it still courageously waits."

The great Resurrection chapter receives an attention equal to its importance. In dealing with that famous crux of verse 29, "those who are baptized for the dead" the writers, although committing themselves to no definite conclusion, rule out of court the theory of vicarious baptism, and incline to the view which gives ὑπὲρ the force of "out of respect for"—*i.e.*, in response to the earnest desire or prayer of some Christian relative or friend for their conversion. It is evident from the additional note on the chapter that the authors do not regard favourably the more modern view that σπείρεται of verses 42-44 does not refer to the "sowing" of the dead body in the ground, but to the planting of the germ of vitality in the material surroundings of the human body—a vitality which, when freed from the clogging limitations of the flesh, is destined at death to "begin a new career under far more glorious conditions."

The First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians is intensely practical, so is this Commentary upon it. If the hope expressed by the Bishop of Exeter in his Preface, that it "may, with God's blessing, have a usefulness of its own to students of St. Paul" is not fulfilled, it will not be the writers' fault, and we shall be surprised.

W. E. BECK.

THE HEBREW PROPHETS FOR ENGLISH READERS. Edited by the Rev. F. H. Woods, D.D., and the Rev. F. E. Powell, M.A. In Four Volumes. Vol. iii., Obadiah, Ezekiel, and Isaiah (xl. to lxvi.). Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911.

This is an excellent edition. We are glad to see the Hebrew Prophets made more accessible and intelligible to English readers than hitherto has been the case. The Prophets are, and have been, often read by people with but the scantiest idea of what they really mean. The Higher Critics, whatever their shortcomings, have made a great literature a real and a live thing to many to whom hitherto they have proved a complete enigma.

In this edition we have the Revised Version text, printed in poetical form, with short introductions and brief annotations. The work has been well done throughout. We are inclined to think that the editors sit too closely to the theories of the Higher Criticism; but it is not the Higher Criticism run wild. Readers should be on their guard, and not take everything for ascertained fact that they see set down in print. Any day some discovery in the nearer East may well upset many cherished fancies. But whether we agree with the editorial standpoint or not, we shall find in this edition of the Hebrew Prophets a real and substantial aid to the better understanding of some of the greatest pieces of literature that have come down to us. Hence we commend the book to the attention of our readers.

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF MAN. By H. Wheeler Robinson, M.A. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1911. Price 6s.

Professor Robinson's book comes most opportunely, and, backed as it is by thoroughness of Biblical scholarship, adequate knowledge, historical, scientific, and philosophic, and a fairness and power of judgment capable of rightly evaluating things new and old, its worth is all the greater. Beginning with the Old Testament and New Testament doctrines of man, in the course of which the most careful attention is given to the various terms which dominate Biblical psychology, especially in the case of St. Paul, who is shown to have remained true to Hebrew, as distinct from Greek conceptions, Professor Robinson passes to a survey of the dogmatic anthropology of the undivided Church, noting the characteristic differences of East and West, and devoting much attention to the Pelagian controversy and the teaching of Augustine. To this great thinker, and to the deeper conception of human nature, its weakness and its need of grace, which he introduced, full justice is done, while it is adequately recognized that his teaching by itself fails to secure full moral responsibility for man and is involved in theories of original sin and racial guilt which have, at the very least, to be restated in an age suspicious as to the correctness of Augustine's psychological and historical presuppositions. The anthropology of the scholastics and of the reformers is next reviewed, followed by a consideration of the

larger horizon revealed through modern contributions by natural science, metaphysics, and sociology. Mr. Robinson accepts the conception of evolution as "one of the greatest value for the Christian doctrine of man," provided that it is realized that life transcends any analysis of itself into chemical or biological forms, and that present values are more important than origins; and in the pages devoted to philosophy he shows how the constant philosophic emphasis on the reality of spirit needs to be supplemented, as is the case to-day, by greater emphasis on the value of personality. The book ends with a discussion of the present position, included in which is a singularly well-balanced treatment of the problem of sin and salvation, of the Atonement, and of the psychology of conversion in its different types. In the midst of such great matters and others—the relation of true moral freedom to the Divine foreknowledge, for example—Professor Robinson's hold on what he calls "the central mystery of personality," with its distinctive values, the moral ones uppermost, for God as well as for man, gives him the power to make others see what he sees, even if the conclusions he draws from that may not always be approved. He will not please those whose minds are still essentially scholastic, who will not admit that one iota of formulated doctrine must be changed in the face of wider knowledge; but all those who rejoice to see how a Christian thinker can honestly and ungrudgingly welcome modern thought, without burking its conclusions, and still remain equally honestly convinced of the adequacy of the Christian idea of man, should by all means read this book.

J. K. MOZLEY.

THE INCARNATION. By E. H. Gifford, D.D. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 1s. net.

Dr. Gifford was a theologian and accurate scholar of no mean order. His Commentary on the Romans in the *Speaker* still retains a very high place amongst many. His reputation will not suffer with the publication of these two essays, and we are grateful to the Dean of Canterbury for editing, to the publishers for issuing, and to the National Church League for instigating this new volume.

The main portion of the book is taken up with a very careful and complete discussion of Phil. ii. 5-11. This passage has frequently been interpreted to admit dangerous views of the relationship between the Divine and the Human in the Person of our Lord. Some of those views have depended upon a partial examination of the passage before us. Here we have a thorough examination, the study of which will help us to a truer appreciation of its meaning.

A sermon on the authorship of the 110th Psalm follows this discussion. Dr. Gifford argues against the Maccabean date, and we think conclusively. He argues for the Davidic authorship; the whole question is certainly difficult, and without committing ourselves to Dr. Gifford's conclusion, we do feel that much more can be said for an early date than is usually allowed.

This book should be read and studied. Its publication under the auspices of the National Church League is another indication of the appreciation in which the Evangelicals of to-day hold sound scholarship.

ADVENTURES AMONG TRAPPERS AND HUNTERS. By Ernest Young. London: *Seeley, Service and Co.* Price 5s.

True stories of thrilling adventure in all parts of the world.



VISIONS AND REVELATIONS. Discourses on the Apocalypse. By the Rev. J. T. Dean, M.A. Edinburgh: *T. and T. Clark*. Price 5s. net.

The late Archbishop Benson was once asked what was the impression left upon an average reader by the Apocalypse; he replied: "It is chaos." Doubtless the fanciful theories and absurd perversions of history with which commentators have perplexed students have much to answer for. Possibly we shall never know the exact meaning of the Visions, for the key has been lost. But, in its broad outlines, the book is not unintelligible, if some sort of clue be given. Mr. Dean's work supplies just the clue needed; and we think that a careful study of its pages will enable the student to grasp the essential meaning of the greatest of all eschatological writings with something approaching to real clearness. The spiritual significance of the Apocalypse is well brought out, and we are sure that the great lesson of the Visions is one that is of singular import in these days.

IN THE CLUTCHES OF THE CARDINAL. By William A. Reid. London: *Marshall Brothers*. Price 3s. 6d. net.

This is a simply written romance of the early Scottish Reformation. The story is interesting, as well as based on history, and the incidents follow quickly, without a great deal of introduction or unnecessary description. The character of the Cardinal, showing the corrupt state of the Church, and also those of the Reformers, are plainly drawn, and the reader is left to draw his own conclusions as to their relative merits. The writer gives, in a short story, a very good idea of the state of the Church and country of Scotland during the period of history dealt with.

LIFE WORTH WHILE. By Frederick A. Atkins. London: *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 1s. 3d.

A brightly-written book for young men. Mr. Atkins believes in inculcating rightly-guided ambition into our young people. He deplors the loss of the adventurous spirit. From a definitely Christian point of view, he encourages the young to make the most of their opportunities, and he writes so brightly that we believe he will be read. Here is one *bon mot*: "The worst of the young man of to-day is that he is all for a small salary, a silk hat, and security of tenure."

CHURCH PRAYERS AND THE PSALMS. London: *Stead's Publishing House*. Price 2d.

This little book contains Morning and Evening Prayer, the Litany, and the Psalms, and is so arranged that no person, however unfamiliar with the Church Service as a whole, need find any difficulty in following the service.

CARETAKERS. By Mrs. Russell. London: *H. R. Allenson*. Price 2d.

A thoroughly excellent little pamphlet, intended to help a conscientious mother in dealing with her boys and girls, as they begin to grow up, in certain delicate subjects. We warmly commend it.

POST-OFFICE AND ITS STORY. By E. Bennett. London: *Seeley*. Price 5s. net.

The author tells the story of this great national institution from its earliest beginning to the present day in an extremely interesting and breezy manner, interspersed with many a good anecdote. The many illustrations show the working of the different departments.

Received: THE VOICES OF GOD. By A. E. Joscelyne, D.D. London: *Robert Scott*. Price 1s. net. A helpful little series of addresses for the deepening of the spiritual life.

GETHSEMANE—CALVARY. By F. Gillett Cory. London: *Marshall Brothers*. Price 1s. net.

A plea for revival, that our Lord may see of the travail of His soul in Gethsemane and Calvary and be satisfied. THE STATE OF THE CHURCH. By Rev. Andrew Murray.

London: *J. Nisbet and Co*. Price 2s. 6d. Dr. Murray pleads in his own inimitable way for more prayer, in view of the many problems which the Christian Church has to face.

A book to be pondered. THE GREAT ANDES OF THE EQUATOR. By E. Whympfer. London: *T. Nelson and Sons*. Price 1s. net.

THE BIBLE, THE EMPIRE, AND THE WORLD. By W. Collins Badger. London: *J. Nisbet and Co*. Price 1s. net.

ST. JOHN IN THE ISLE OF PATMOS. By A. L. Woodward. London: *H. R. Allenson*. Price 1s. net.

THE POISON OF TONGUES. By M. E. Carr. Price 7d. THE ADVENTURES OF MR. VERDANT GREEN. By Cuthbert Bede, B.A. London: *T. Nelson and Sons*. Price 6d. net.

THE ROMANCE OF AERONAUTICS. By Charles C. Turner. London: *Seeley, Service and Co*. Price 5s. Aviation is beginning to have its library, and here we have a popularly-written account of the early beginnings, and of the more successful of modern attempts.

MEDICAL SCIENCE OF TO-DAY. By Willmott Evans. London: *Seeley, Service and Co*. Price 5s. net. Another popular book of science dealing with modern medicine, in which germs and X rays and all the great discoveries are simply described.

PORTFOLIO OF WESTMINSTER ABBEY. By Arnold Fairbairns. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 1s. net.