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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

A Monthly Magazine and Review

EDITED BY THE

REV. DAWSON WALKER, D.D.

REV. F. S. GUY WARMAN, D.D.

VOL. XXVI.

(NEW SERIES. VOL. VII.)

LONDON: ROBERT SCOTT, PUBLISHER,
ROXBURGHE HOUSE, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.
1912

INDEX TO VOLUME XXVI.

SUBJECTS

AUTHORS

Robert Scott, Roxburghe House, Paternoster Row, London.

THE CHURCHMAN

January, 1912.

The Month.

Central Churchmen.

CANON DENTON THOMPSON, whose appointment to the Bishopric of Sodor and Man is a subject for real pleasure and congratulation, has conferred a boon upon us in the publication of the book to which we referred last month. He has collected the elements which go to make up Evangelical Churchmanship, and has presented them to the public as a homogeneous whole. We believe that they are in the main the elements which make up real Churchmanship, and that in consequence the title of the book is justified. We are thankful that the *Guardian* deemed the book worthy of a leading article, though we join issue with the article in its suggestion that the Canon is advocating the formation of a fourth party. The *Guardian* article betrayed a certain amount of ignorance of the Evangelical school. It is an ignorance which is frequently betrayed. In the past we have been somewhat to blame in the matter; we have not used the opportunities which the press, the magazine, the various diocesan and ecclesiastical gatherings have given us to make our position plain to the world at large. And now that the Rector of Birmingham has issued his book, people are writing and talking as if some new thing were being given to us for the first time. There must be no more of this. We exist to make an impress upon the life of the whole Church. We fail of our duty if we do not make it. There has been too much smug satisfaction amongst us; we have been too content with the possession of fundamental truths to pass them on as they ought to be passed

on. *Aurum accepisti, aurum redde* is a motto which represents a real duty. The discussion about this book has reminded us that we have not fully done that duty in the past. The book itself shows us how it must be done, clearly, fearlessly, fully, sympathetically, with broadminded liberality and with unsuspicious winsomeness. The book has given us a lead. If the book be followed, there are brighter days in store.

The Outlook for 1912.

The fact that these Notes are written as the old year draws towards its close makes it fitting that they should be prospective in their outlook, rather than retrospective towards the past. What the new year holds in store is more matter for wistful wonder than for definite prophecy. One thing seems certain—if the omens be true, and the present any forecast of the future, it promises to be a year of controversy and deep unrest. This is true of things social, of things political, and of things ecclesiastical. It is also true of the wider field of international affairs. The class warfare, of which the late strike was a symptom, seems likely to continue. The forces of Anglicanism and of militant Nonconformity are being arrayed for the conflict on the Disestablishment of the Church in Wales. Whatever view be held as to the excellence or otherwise of the present Insurance Bill, there is little doubt that its application in action will be attended by hostility and widely-spread resistance. We have heard, of late, how near the country was to a great foreign war during the recent summer. Let us hope that throughout the coming months better counsels will prevail, and that the responsible leaders of England and Germany may be divinely guided to the formation of a firm and lasting peace.

The Welsh Church.

The old saw is finding a new fulfilment, and we are sorry for it: "If you have no case, abuse your opponent's attorney." We are not inclined to shut our eyes to the Nonconformist side of the present agitation. We have admitted to our columns articles intended to show

that they have a side. We are most anxious that relations between the Nonconformists and the Church of England should be as amicable and as close as possible. We believe that no good will be done to either side by the use of unguarded and unkind language—language which all too frequently has little basis in fact, and only adds fuel to the fire of resentment and hostility which we would gladly extinguish. In the heat of battle men speak, and live to regret what they have said. Amongst the lesser combatants and the camp-followers on both sides we expect to find language of the kind referred to, and are prepared to forgive it. But we do venture to respectfully suggest to the leaders of the Disestablishment campaign that some of the language used of late has been unworthy of a controversy between Christian men. To call the Established Church "a pagan institution," as the press informs us has been done by one protagonist, though we should be glad to disbelieve it, is not only a false move in the controversy, but endangers the growing feeling towards unity which we are all so anxious to foster. We are compelled to fight, but we ask friend and foe alike to remember that one day we hope to live at peace together, perhaps here, certainly beyond the veil.

Our Present Need.

In addition to these general features of perplexity and unrest, Christian workers have special difficulties of their own. Is our work prospering as it should? Are we living our lives and doing our work in the proper spirit and on the right method? Or should we, as we enter on 1912, do well to submit our principles to revision and reconstruction? It is related that Tennyson once replied to a friend who questioned him about the dearest object in his life: "My greatest wish is to have a clearer vision of God." A recent writer in the *Methodist Recorder* has pleaded in earnest, forceful terms for renewed devotion to this ideal—"the vision of God." Are we not laying greater emphasis now on "action" than on "vision"? It is, no doubt, a noble ideal to be "up and doing," and the spirit of the age is loud in

its call for practical activity. It is difficult for true-hearted men and women to resist the call. They plunge bravely into a course of uninterrupted service and of ceaseless activity. At times they feel conscious of their lack of prayerful, thoughtful leisure, and they comfort themselves with the maxim, *laborare est orare*. But that maxim—as the writer above referred to rightly insists—is a sublime half-truth. If our work be our only prayer, it will grow weak and cease, because it no longer draws its strength and inspiration from the vision of God.

The Vision of God.

Active workers, immersed in the direction of the manifold organizations which they have called into being, get into the way of thinking that they have no right to pause or to withdraw. And yet the example of our Lord Himself lends no countenance whatever to such a theory of life. We read of occasions on which He retired from the supplications and entreaties of the multitudes to be alone with God in solitary prayer. The same law held for Him as for us—that only through communion with God could His work be effective. What is needed to-day is not greater or more manifold activity; it is the vision that comes from communion with the Unseen and the Divine. To quote once more from the article referred to:

"We want to put God back again into His position of august priority. In the beginning—not of Creation only, but of all things—God! That clearer vision is exacting, it makes great demands, it is the issue of vigil and sacrifice, prayer and sacrament, but it holds the secret of all spiritual beauty and fruitfulness and power. When we see Him clearly we shall do our work as it always has been done when the Church wrought under the compelling inspiration of the Presence, and the world shall know and feel that there is a God in Zion."

Islington, 1912.

Islington last year reminded us that there were differences amongst us. Islington this year is to remind us of fundamental things, and in a moment the differences disappear. The papers are to deal with the call of God to holiness and to service, and will of course be devotional in character. We believe they will show Evan-

gelicalism at its best, setting forward those principles of our position which, in themselves unalterable, are capable of meeting the varying needs of successive generations. We are glad to notice that Canon Simpson is to deal with Christ's Provision on the Cross. Canon Simpson would perhaps be loath to reckon himself a member of the Evangelical school, but he is probably the most insistent exponent of the centrality of the Cross amongst our present-day preachers. His books are full of true Evangelicalism, and, after all, the true teaching of the redemptive work of Christ on Calvary is the first and essential test. Islington will give Dr. Simpson the warmest possible welcome. The whole programme presents a prospect of absorbing interest and real usefulness, and we congratulate the Vicar of Islington upon the prospect, as we believe we shall be able to congratulate him and to thank God when the Islington of 1912 has come and gone.

Conventions.

In the busy Yorkshire town of Halifax, in the great rural deanery of Islington, and elsewhere, Conventions have been held during the past few weeks. They have been wonderful gatherings, and pregnant with tremendous hope. Crowds have come to listen and to pray; speakers of all schools of thought have presented the great truths of the faith in such simplicity and clearness that none have been able to misunderstand, and with such loyalty to fundamental truth that few have been able to criticize or be hurt. It is a very hopeful sign that, in a matter where there is no attempt at sensation or excitement, so very many have been interested. The religious faculty is not dead, indifference is not supreme; what is needed is simply plain, earnest teaching, real witness-bearing, and the preachers of the faith can still turn the world upside-down. The Convention certainly captured Halifax, and the quiet, reverent demeanour of the crowds who came seems to point to real progress. We believe much the same was the case at Islington. Another aspect, and a no less hopeful one, was the happy way in which Churchmen of all schools of

thought combined to exercise together the teaching and evangelizing ministry of the Church. Men shared in the meetings together whom ten years ago no one platform could have held, and that without any sacrifice of principles, and without maudlin protestations of unreal unity. We are finding that there is a common faith, a common Christianity, and, as we find it more and more, we shall learn to shed eccentricities and concentrate our energies, as these Conventions did, on the proclamation of the truth as the truth is in Jesus.

Dr. Inge on Democracy.

We very much hope that the lectures recently delivered at Sion College by the Dean of St. Paul's on "The Co-operation of the Church with the Spirit of the Age" will be published in book form, and so made accessible to a wider circle. At present only newspaper reports have been available, and these, being fragmentary, are bound to be to some extent misleading. Sentences such as these the Dean has penned, and charges like these he has made, can only be rightly appreciated if taken with the whole surrounding context. The lectures certainly have the merit of fearlessness and candour. Dr. Inge has never been afraid to speak out frankly. His strictures on the present state of things have been received with a chorus of disapproval and amazement. But they are none the less valuable for that. The British democracy has reached a period in its history when it needs, above all else, a candid friend to tell it the truth about itself in plain and unsparing terms. There is very little doubt that many of the forces and tendencies at present prevalent in the body politic will, if allowed to proceed unchecked, lead in the end to disintegration and destruction of the whole national fabric. It is not at all inconsistent with general optimism to view with dismay some particular epoch in our nation's history. Dr. Inge is no pessimist, but he sees most clearly the elements of weakness in the present phase of English social life. We hope that his words will be brought within the reach of a wider circle of readers, and will be studied with the thoughtful attention that they well deserve.

Greek at Oxford.

The Statute by which those undergraduates at Oxford who are candidates for honours in Mathematics and Science were to be permitted to offer only one ancient language for Responsions has been rejected in Convocation by a majority of 235. Oxford, therefore, continues to claim from all her intending students an initial knowledge of Greek as well as Latin. For this result our feelings can only be those of unmixed gladness. Towards the machinery by which it has been secured our sentiments may not be so wholly cordial. If members of Convocation are to be summoned back to Oxford to decide the final issue of some great question, it is a pity that the summons cannot be sent forth and responded to in vacation rather than in term. A meeting of non-resident members of Convocation in term-time is bound, to a great extent, to be an assemblage of clerics. They have their time largely at their own disposal. It would be interesting to know the feeling of the members of the teaching and other professions on a point of this kind. Schoolmasters especially, whose work is so closely linked with that of the University, might well have a better opportunity of recording their vote than is possible for them by a meeting held when their own school work is in full progress.

The Older Ideal.

The question of the retention of compulsory Greek is not one that concerns clergy in particular, but Oxford men in general. The ecclesiastical authorities may surely be trusted to see that Greek always retains its proper place in a system of theological training. We cannot help feeling, therefore, that the appeal to Convocation—though undoubtedly liable to grave abuse—does maintain the idea that Oxford does not consist only of her resident teachers at any given time, but includes a larger body—that is, the assemblage of her graduate sons who are keenly interested in the welfare of their Alma Mater and wish to give to her all possible support. For ourselves, we hold, as we have already said in these pages, that Oxford and Cambridge may well be

permitted to maintain intact the older ideal of education—that the study of the two classical languages is the proper basis of culture. We agree with the Warden of Keble that the maintenance of this ideal is for Oxford a sacred trust. If it be objected that Greek in the amount required at present is farcical, we would reply, "Let it cease to be a farce and become a reality." Oxford and Cambridge alike can afford to do this if they think it fit. Other Universities may even give expression to newer ideals; the ancient one ought still to find a home in the older seats of learning.

Miracles in the New Testament.

We have refrained up to the present from making any comment on the book on "Miracles in the New Testament," written by the Rev. J. M. Thompson. We only wish here to call attention, firstly, to the article in which Mr. Harriss deals with it, in our present issue; and, secondly, to the fact that the various articles and sermons contributed to the *Guardian* have been published by Longmans in a small and well-printed volume. Each of the contributions to this volume is worthy of careful and detailed study. The points elaborated by Dr. Lock are especially worthy of attention. He points to the fact that if Q be taken as our earliest canonical document and St. John's Gospel as one of our latest, there is an undoubted increase in the attribution of miracle to our Lord, and there is also a profounder Christology. Now, there are two ways of explaining this. It is at present customary, in certain quarters, to say that, starting from a comparatively simple and straightforward account of a non-miraculous Jesus, there has been a constant and accumulating growth of legendary accretion. On the other hand, it is possible that the later writers had not only fuller access to biographical detail about our Lord, but "a gradual deepening of insight into the meaning of His life." "And it is therefore as likely as not that the writer of the Fourth Gospel is far nearer to the true interpretation of what Jesus said and did and was than the compiler of Q."

Some Considerations on the Rev. J. M. Thompson's Book, "Miracles in the New Testament."

By the Rev. J. A. HARRISS, M.A.,
Vicar of St. Andrew's, Oxford.

AT an early stage of his book Mr. Thompson lays down certain conditions which should, he thinks, be observed in an inquiry into the nature and reality of New Testament miracles. *A priori* considerations as to the impossibility of miracles, or of finding evidence to prove them, are to be excluded. On the other hand, *a priori* considerations in favour of miracles must not be allowed to introduce any bias in weighing the evidence; they also must be ignored. That is the attitude that he claims to adopt in conducting his study.

It is natural to ask whether the author has succeeded in observing these conditions; and a further question suggests itself: whether it is really possible for an inquiry of this nature to be carried on without *a priori* considerations of some sort.

It will, perhaps, throw some light upon these questions if we examine briefly the definition of a miracle with which Mr. Thompson prefaces his inquiry. That definition describes a miracle, in the first place, as "a marvellous event occurring within human experience, which cannot have been brought about by human power or by the operation of any natural agency, and must therefore be ascribed to the special intervention of the Deity or of some supernatural being." This is followed by a further clause describing a miracle as "chiefly an act (*e.g.*, of healing) exhibiting control over the laws of Nature, and serving as evidence that the agent is either Divine or is specially favoured by God."

It is only fair to say that Mr. Thompson is not responsible for the form in which this definition is expressed. It is taken from Murray's Dictionary, and is used as a starting-point of the discussion; but, at the same time, the author puts it forward as

embodying the view of those who regard miracles as being due to supernatural agency.

I venture to think that there are many who, while holding to that view, would hesitate to accept this statement as satisfactory. The first half of the definition, reduced to its simplest terms, asserts that the cause of a miracle is to be found, not in man or Nature, but in God or in the sphere of the supernatural. If we consider for a moment the conception that lies behind this, we see that man and Nature on the one hand, and God on the other, are regarded as separate and distinct from one another. They are viewed practically as antithetical; the activities of the one are independent of, and apart from, those of the other; the possibility of the movements of the Divine combining with, working through, and becoming part of those of man and Nature is not contemplated. Here, on the one side, is "human power" and "natural agency" as one possible sphere of causation; here, on the other, is "the special intervention of the Deity" as another. Is it not obvious that the mind which devised this definition regarded the world of phenomena, including all human history and human life, as a world with which, at any rate ordinarily, God had nothing to do; and if anything at all, then it was of the nature of a "special intervention"? It suggests the work of a Deist who would represent the world as created indeed by God, but then left to go on its way without Him, except on rare and special occasions. It seems to know nothing of God's permanent presence and power in the world, working in and with and behind the things seen. It is difficult to imagine that Mr. Thompson can really believe that this fairly or adequately represents the conclusions of Christian thought to-day, with its strong hold upon the principle of Divine Immanence, in regard to the nature of a miracle.

But, further, a definition, if it is to be of any use, ought to furnish a standard by which the matter under consideration can be judged. Of what use to this end, it may be asked, is the definition here given? The test it suggests must, from the nature of things, fail in its application. At first sight, perhaps, it

may appear to provide a good working principle. If any event can be proved to be due to human or natural agency it is not a miracle; and, conversely, if it cannot be so proved, then it is a miracle, and must be ascribed to God. But how is that proof to be given? In order to apply the test adequately a complete knowledge of all that constitutes natural and human activity is required. If it is to be determined, therefore, whether this or that particular event occurring within human experience is or is not of the nature of a miracle, the whole course of Nature's workings and the whole range of human actions must first have been thoroughly explored; the causes which produce all their observed effects, the limits which define all their remotest possibilities, must necessarily have been accurately calculated and determined, as a qualification for a fitting judgment. But is our knowledge of causation so complete that we can deliver that judgment? What scientist or philosopher would be bold enough to say that he knows perfectly well what Nature and human thought and volition are capable of producing? Even if he thinks that he now knows sufficiently well the ways and movements of physical phenomena to justify him in speaking of the uniformity of Nature, yet he must admit that there are unexplored secrets that still evade his scrutiny, and the question of causation is confessedly a debatable ground; and even if one side of man's complex being can be studied and classed among the phenomena and subject to the laws of the physical world, yet the spiritual side of his nature, his capacities of thought and consciousness and determination, are so subtle and mysterious that they are always suggesting to us wider and greater wonders and possibilities of energy and life in the future. The utmost that we can do, therefore, in this direction is to judge according to our present knowledge of Nature and humanity; but then, how extremely circumscribed and imperfect that present knowledge is! The test cannot be regarded, therefore, as final. At the best the process of reasoning and the proof offered can only be tentative. The last word—whether the cause of the event rests with natural or human agency or

with God—which is the very thing we want to get at, is left to conjecture. And hence at the end of the process we find ourselves just at that point where, if we are to move on farther towards anything approaching to personal conviction, some presupposition is almost inevitable. A man will throw into one or other of the evenly balanced scales the weight of something—call it what you will, an impression, a tendency of mind, a persuasion, a hope—that comes from his own personality and is purely subjective, and the scale will accordingly go down on this or that side. But that "something" is in reality a presupposition. This, of course, would apply to any definition that might be framed of such a subject. Mr. Thompson, in his notes upon the definition, appears, if I understand him aright, to concede that this is the case; for he points out, in effect, that we are restricted to two possible ways of explaining a miracle: either it is viewed in the light of an exception to Reality as understood by natural science and formulated in the laws of Nature, and must then be "due to the special intrusion of a supernatural agency," or it is viewed as an event which, while being imperfectly understood at present, will ultimately be found to be no exception, but capable of explanation in terms of human or natural agency. Those are the two divergent views—the view, we may say broadly, of the religious mind in the one case, and of the critical mind in the other. But the view is, after all, in either case a theory, a guess—the one expressive of a certain faith in supernatural agency, the other no less a certain belief in the laws of Nature. Both are presuppositions. And Mr. Thompson leaves us in no sort of doubt as to which view he personally favours. To his mind "the original events were not miraculous"; and later on in his book he frankly avows that he thinks Christianity would be better off if freed from the miraculous features altogether. This is an attitude of mind which cannot be said to be the outcome of an unbiassed study of the literary and historical evidence. It is an attitude which points clearly to the presence of a bias already possessing the mind while dealing with the evidence.

It wants the evidence to show in one particular direction. But if that is so, then what has become of the restrictions which he laid down for the inquiry that there should be no *a priori* considerations? He has committed himself to one most radical presupposition before starting. The truth is that Mr. Thompson has, if he will pardon the writer for saying so, made a mistake in method. If he really wished to conduct his inquiry without any prior assumptions for or against, and to base his conclusions strictly upon the evidence available, he should have left out altogether this definition and his own slight treatment of the questions which it raises. As it is, it only confuses the issue at stake. If, on the other hand, holding, as he unquestionably does, to start with, the conviction that miracles are, if not impossible, at least highly improbable and certainly undesirable, he should have left out that misleading reference to the exclusion of *a priori* assumptions, and should have given more fully the reasons that would justify his own position, as well as some consideration to the claims of the other side.

It is not difficult to trace the influence of this preconception in the treatment of the evidence throughout Mr. Thompson's book. As an example, let us consider the method in which the evidence of St. Paul's letters is dealt with. This is considered under three headings—evidence bearing upon (1) the miracles of the Gospels, (2) upon miracles in the early Church, and (3) St. Paul's own claim to work miracles.

In regard to the first point, it is said that there is practically no evidence at all. St. Paul makes no references whatever to our Lord's miracles; and, indeed, with the exception of the Eucharist, the Death and Resurrection of Christ, he ignores the earthly ministry altogether.

Mr. Thompson is unquestionably right in saying that throughout St. Paul's Epistles there is an absence of any reference to the Gospel miracles. The explanation of this is to be found in the generally recognized fact, to which Mr. Thompson refers, that St. Paul's own spiritual experience had made the Person of Christ, crucified, risen, and exalted, the centre of

his conception of Christianity; and in the light of this central truth the details of our Lord's earthly ministry were of subordinate interest to him. This does not, however, prove that he knew nothing about them, or considered them of no account. The purpose that St. Paul had before him in penning his Epistles was not one that would specially call for any mention of this feature. The evidential purpose that our Lord's miracles served should be remembered. It is clear from the Gospels that they were aids to faith to those who were immediately associated with Him in the ministry and saw His works. Their value as credentials was limited to the circle of those who witnessed them, and naturally they would carry less conviction as evidences of our Lord's Divinity to those who only heard about them, but did not see for themselves. Viewed from the evidential point of view, our Lord's miracles helped to confirm the faith of His followers and keep them together as a united body until the greater and more convincing evidence to His Divine Sonship supplied by the Resurrection to an extent superseded the former. And, further, we have to remember that miracles were being wrought within the Christian Church itself during the Apostolic period; and there was, therefore, the less need for its teachers to refer back to the former miracles of the Gospels, since that particular form of evidence was available in the supernatural manifestations going on in their midst. But while there are these reasons why no special references to the Gospel miracles should occur in St. Paul's letters, that does not warrant the conclusion that the Christ of history was nothing to him. There are, as is well known, several expressions scattered through the Epistles which almost certainly presuppose an acquaintance on the Apostle's part with our Lord's life and teaching as recorded in the Gospels. At least some knowledge of His birth and family position underlies the words "born of the seed of David" (Rom. i. 3), "born of a woman, born under the law" (Gal. iv. 4). It is difficult to imagine that St. Paul could write, "I entreat you by the meekness and gentleness of Christ, I who in your presence am lowly among you"

(2 Cor. x. 1), without some acquaintance with our Lord's words in St. Matt. xi. 29, "I am meek and lowly in heart"—not only because the language is similar in the two passages, but still more because the thought of our Lord's character appealing to men by reason of its meekness is common to both. St. Paul elsewhere speaks of "the words of our Lord Jesus Christ" (1 Tim. vi. 3) as evidently well known; of the Lord having given a definite charge on the subject of married life (1 Cor. vii. 10), where the teaching embodied in St. Matt. v. 32 and xix. 3-10 may be referred to; of the Lord having left instructions as to the support of the preachers of the Gospel (1 Cor. ix. 14), which suggests the charge to the Twelve or to the Seventy in St. Matt. x. 10 and St. Luke x. 7.

Again, Rom. xii. 14 and 17, where St. Paul urges the duty of returning good for evil: "Bless them that persecute you: bless, and curse not. . . . Render to no man evil for evil"; and 1 Cor. iv. 12, where he says of himself, "Being reviled, we bless; being persecuted, we endure," show a striking resemblance to the teaching given in St. Luke vi. 28—"Bless them that curse you." And the manner in which St. Paul expounds the duty of loving one's neighbour as being the fulfilment of the law, in Rom. xiii. 8-10; and the emphasis upon the need of bearing one another's burdens, because by so doing the law of Christ will find its complete fulfilment, in Gal. vi. 2, suggest a very real dependence upon some well-known utterance of our Lord upon the same subject, such as we find reproduced in St. Mark xii. 31 and parallel passages. As a last illustration we may notice the use which St. Paul makes of the metaphor of the steward's office in 1 Cor. iv. 1 *f.*, recalling so vividly the parabolic teaching in St. Luke xii. 42 *f.*, and showing a resemblance to it not only in the phraseology, but in the general idea of a trust imposed and a consequent responsibility to the Master, who will demand at His return an account of the stewardship. These allusions are sufficiently frequent to make us hesitate before saying off-hand that the Christ of history was comparatively nothing to St. Paul.

A careful student would feel even still greater hesitation before endorsing Mr. Thompson's sweeping generalization that the early Church shared in this indifference. St. Peter's speeches, he says, in the Acts show this. But he must surely have forgotten the words in Acts ii. 22 and in x. 38. In the one St. Peter is reported to have said: "Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God unto you by mighty works and wonders and signs, which God did by Him in the midst of you, even as ye yourselves know"; and in the other, "Who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil." These alone show that St. Peter not only knew and preached of the earthly ministry generally, but also of the miracles of our Lord specially, as important and striking proofs to those who witnessed them of the Divine character of Christ's mission.

(*To be concluded.*)

The Continental Reformation.

By the Rev. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D.

IV.—The Merits and Shortcomings of Erasmus.

APPARENTLY Erasmus did not know, and did not wish to be convinced, that the evils of the time required stronger and sharper measures than those which he was able and willing to employ. There was a huge jungle, in which most of the vegetation was hopelessly corrupt and could bear no good fruit. But it had life enough in it to endure, and to continue to choke the one tree whose leaves might serve for the healing of the nations. Nothing less drastic than the axe would have been of any use; and Erasmus proposed to turn the wilderness into a garden by gradual and persistent pruning. What Luther said of the trifling reforms, which were every now and then proposed by a Pope, who at least wished to make a show of doing something, would apply here: "They piffled at curing warts, while they overlooked or confirmed ulcers." In short, the time for a serious battle had come, and Erasmus rather petulantly proposed, and continued to employ, a diverting policy of pin-pricks. It was not magnificent, and it certainly was not war.

Yet Erasmus did not spare himself. He did not look on and criticize, while he left others to do the work. His industry was extraordinary, and it reminds us of Origen and Jerome. It is all the more amazing when we remember that he suffered from chronic weak health, and was sometimes seriously ill. He was at times plagued with stone, and in his later days with gout. He had a capricious digestion, and he could not endure the smell or taste of fish. His heart, he said, was Catholic, but his stomach was Lutheran; not even on fast-days would it take fish. Yet, in addition to his numerous writings, he kept up a voluminous correspondence with all kinds of people, high and low; often with persons whom he had never seen, and of whom he knew nothing but what their letters told him. He sometimes wrote

forty letters in a day, and about three thousand still survive. He wrote fast, as did Luther, and he says of himself, "I precipitate rather than compose." And this heavy correspondence was a voluntary addition to the heavy amount of literary work, in editing Fathers, etc., which he undertook for the great printer, Froben, and for others. But he says, himself, that these demands upon his pen caused him more pleasure than fatigue. The more he wrote, the more he wished to write: *crescit scribendo scribendi studium.* Without literary work life, to him, was not worth living.

Erasmus lived for literature, and especially for literature devoted to a religious purpose. It was for this that he so carefully guarded one kind of independence, while he seems to us to have sacrificed another kind. He kept the command of his own time and of his own mode of employment. He freed himself, so far as was possible, from his obligations as a priest. He might, if he had liked, have become a Bishop or a Cardinal; but he knew that, if he accepted what so many clerics were scheming and sinning to obtain, his time would no longer be his own. Yet he needed money, and plenty of it, and he did not much care from whom he received it. He had not much feeling about independence with regard to that. He showed much deference to those who helped him, or might be induced to help him financially, and his enemies might say that he sometimes condescended to be a toady. But we must remember that in those days it was a recognized thing that an impecunious author was dependent upon the benevolence of the wealthy. Not until a century or two later was a writer paid by the public who bought his books; he had to rely upon the gifts of a few rich patrons: and Erasmus, whose expenses were heavy, took money from a number of benefactors in various countries. Travelling in those days was very costly, except to those who could travel on foot; and to Erasmus travel was often a necessity, because of the character which he soon established of being an international leader in the New Learning.

This intense devotion to literature in the one leader and not in the other was one of the causes of the rupture between

Erasmus and Luther. Erasmus was content to work on, ploddingly, towards something like the ideal sketched by Plato; not exactly that kings should be philosophers, and philosophers kings—Erasmus did not care much about philosophy; but that there might be a condition of things in which rulers should be scholars, and scholars rule. Luther had no patience with such methods. Ignorance was not the only enemy, and the souls in darkness needed something better than epigrams and editions of the Fathers. To Erasmus, Luther's indifference to literature was shocking. The Revival of Learning was the aim of Erasmus's life; the Revival of Christian Learning was the aim of the latter half of it. When he asks, What is life without letters? he gives us the clue to a good deal that is puzzling in his seeming inconsistencies. And when he declares that the Lutherans are the enemies of literature, he is placing them on the same level with the monks whom he treated with such scorn. No more severe condemnation could be given. To the Archbishop of Cologne he wrote: "I abhor the Evangelicals, as for other reasons, so because it is through them that literature is declining in every place, and is upon the point of perishing: and, without literature, what is life?" To the Chancellor of Mons he wrote: "I have an irreconcilable war with all Lutherans. I cannot love heresy and schism; I cannot hate literature." Yet on Gal. i. 6 Luther himself laments the decay of learning. There are very many people who *non solum sacras literas sed etiam omnes alias literas fastidiunt et contemnunt.*[1]

For many years Erasmus was in a strange position in Europe. If he had many friends and admirers in almost every country, he had everywhere made foes. A writer who used ridicule and sarcasm so frequently and with such skill was sure to do that. And he spared no one. It is a mistake to suppose that he reserved these weapons for ignorant monks and clergy, or even for ecclesiastical abuses in general. Kings and princes

[1] On Luther's break with Humanism see A. C. McGiffert, "Martin Luther, the Man and his Work," ch. xviii.; B. J. Kidd, "Documents illustrative of the Continental Reformation," p. 170.

come under his lash. In the "Adagia," attacks upon them are common. This famous book was published first in 1500, when Erasmus had not yet mastered Greek, and it consisted of some hundreds of proverbs and other utterances, with observations upon them. By 1508 the hundreds had grown to thousands, and the book was republished with the title, "Chiliades Adagiorum." It was so pungent in attacking abuses that the Council of Trent wished to suppress it; but it was so popular that all that they ventured to do was to publish an expurgated edition.

Surprise is sometimes expressed that Erasmus was never prosecuted for so ceaselessly holding up to ridicule the powers that be, both in Church and State. The Dominicans did their utmost to get him condemned at Rome, but they never could succeed, and he was never seriously molested anywhere. It seems a strange thing to say of a single scholar, who was so poor as to live on the bounty of wealthy patrons, but he was really too powerful to be prosecuted. He had already made himself the darling, not only of the increasing army of scholars, but of everyone who could enjoy polished witticisms, *before* the controversies which set Western Christendom in a blaze had begun. Camerarius wrote of him: "The man who can draw a letter from Erasmus at once acquires immense fame and celebrates a lordly triumph." Hardly anyone had any idea of the revolution for which these witticisms were preparing the way; and not a few, even of those who were hit by them, were quite content to laugh with the rest. Such exquisite raillery was worth an occasional smart. Moreover, the jests of Erasmus are full of common sense and sound advice. If he had not Luther's power of touching men's hearts, he could rouse and convince their minds. He was no apostle; but, in an age in which scholarship was regarded as almost divine, Erasmus was a king among scholars, with no one anywhere near him in the same field; and he was allowed the privilege embodied in the principle that "the king can do no wrong."

There was another thing which helped to preserve him from prosecution: both sides hoped to have this powerful contro-

versialist as an ally. He had said so much in condemnation of Popes, prelates, monkery, and the medieval system generally, that the Lutherans claimed him and hoped to gain him. In August, 1523, Erasmus himself wrote to Zwingli: "It seems to me that I have taught nearly all the things which Luther teaches. The only difference is that I have taught them less fiercely (*atrociter*), and that I have kept clear of certain riddles and paradoxes." But this fierceness of Luther and Hutten and others made Erasmus more and more determined not to join them, but to go on dealing with the controversy in his own way. The next year, 1524, Erasmus published his "Spongia," in which he takes a mediating position. If only each side would state its case with moderation, no fundamental difference would be found to exist between the two. It is the exaggerations of the extremists that make an understanding impossible. Let a number of learned persons meet and discuss the points of difference; then a great deal might be done to heal the strife. This neutral position was very distasteful to the Lutherans, and very disappointing to the Romanists. Adrian VI.[1] twice wrote to him, imploring him, out of regard to his reputation, to take up his pen against these novel heresies. His successor, Clement VII., with Charles V. and Henry VIII., all of them expected him to come out of the trenches and attack Luther in the open field; but, excepting a few shots in letters and pamphlets, he did nothing. He wrote to Clement and apologized for the rudeness of his earlier writings; if he had foreseen the sectarians of that day, he would have suppressed a good deal. Clement sent him a donation of 200 florins, and told the monks who had been abusing Erasmus to keep their tongues quiet. Erasmus continued to criticize the old scholasticism, and to point out the contrast between the primitive and the medieval Church; but, in the end, his disgust at Luther's methods was almost as great as his disgust at those of the monks.

His refusal to receive the vagabond Hutten, when the latter

[1] Kidd, "Documents," p. 105.

fled to Basle in his hour of need, increased the estrangement between Erasmus and Luther. Then came the controversy about freewill, which placed them before the world as opponents. Luther, like Zwingli and Calvin, denied freewill; and Erasmus, urged on by Henry VIII., attacked him for doing so. Perhaps the controversy was not unwelcome to Erasmus. It enabled him definitely to take up a position of direct opposition to Luther, without retracting anything which he had said on the Lutheran side. Harnack regards the "De libero arbitrio" as the crown of all the writings of Erasmus, but a very worldly treatise, and deeply irreligious.[1] Near the end of 1525, Luther replied in his famous "De servo arbitrio," perhaps the most carefully written of all his works, and one of the most dignified in tone. Erasmus soon answered it with his "Hyperaspistes," in which he says: "Luther promises himself a wonderful reputation with posterity; but I am inclined to predict that no name under the sun will be held in greater execration." He was very angry; and this rupture between the two leaders may be said to mark the final break between Humanism and Lutheranism. No disciple of the Renaissance, which had insisted so clearly upon the value, and power, and independence of the individual, could assent to the doctrine that there is no such thing as freewill.

Critics are not agreed as to which is the best of the writings of Erasmus, but there is not much doubt as to which was the most important, and the most fruitful of results. Quite in the first rank, and in a class by itself, must be placed his Greek Testament. It was produced in a hurry, in order to be in the field before the more carefully prepared edition of Cardinal Ximenes. Erasmus published his in February, 1516, and in April he writes to Nicolas Ellenbogen: "The New Testament has been hurried out headlong rather than edited." It was made from a few manuscripts of poor authority. Erasmus had not got the materials for constructing a critical text, and he would not have known how to use them if he had possessed them.

[1] "Dogmengeschichte," iii., p. 714.

Yet it is by means of this hastily produced work that he did most to further the best interests of the Reformation. Not all his wit and learning effected so much real and permanent enlightenment as this imperfect reproduction of the words of Apostles and Evangelists in the original language. According to modern standards of what a critical text ought to be, its imperfections are glaring; but it was the first Greek Testament issued from the printing press, the first that was made accessible to all who could read Greek. Students now saw plainly that what for centuries had been the Bible of Western Christendom was only a translation, and not always a trustworthy translation, of what the inspired writers had penned. Erasmus gave a Latin translation of his own, which differs considerably from the Vulgate. Readers could judge for themselves whether Erasmus or the Vulgate was the better representative of the Greek. He also published "Paraphrases," which became so famous, that in 1548 it was ordered that a translation of these "Paraphrases" should be placed in every parish church in England, side by side with the English Version of the Bible, which had been placed there by order of Henry VIII. Even without these helps, the publication of the Greek text showed that there were many places in which, although the Vulgate rendering was right, yet the traditional interpretations were quite wrong. The Vulgate might possibly bear the proposed interpretation, but it was impossible to make the Greek do so.

It is perhaps no exaggeration to say that in publishing Greek Testaments Erasmus did more to free men's minds from the thraldom of the clergy than all the tumultuous pamphlets of Luther. He had no sympathy with those who thought it dangerous to allow the laity free access to the Bible. In an Exhortation to the Study of the Christian Philosophy, which forms the Preface to his New Testament (first edition, 1516), Erasmus says: "I utterly dissent from those who are unwilling that the sacred Scriptures should be read by the unlearned, translated into their vulgar tongue; as though Christ had taught such subtleties that they can scarcely be understood by

a few theologians, or as though the strength of the Christian religion consisted in men's ignorance of it. The mysteries of kings it may be safer to conceal, but Christ wished His mysteries to be published as openly as possible. I wish that even the weakest woman should read the Gospels, should read the Epistles of Paul; and I wish that they were translated into all languages, so that they might be read and understood, not only by Scots and Irishmen, but also by Turks and Saracens. I long that the husbandman should sing portions of them to himself as he follows the plough, that the weaver should hum them to the tune of his shuttle, that the traveller should beguile with their stories the tedium of his journey." Again and again Erasmus writes of the hearty reception which his New Testament received, even in quarters where opposition might have been expected. Four months after its publication he writes to Bishop Fisher: "This book was feared before its appearance, but, now that it is published, it is marvellous how it commends itself to all theologians who are either learned or honest." A year later Fisher writes to him from Rochester: "The New Testament can now be read and understood by everyone with much more satisfaction than it could before."

It may seem strange that a man with such deeply religious aims, who lived on a literary treadmill during the latter portion of his life in order to give his contemporaries and their successors a better idea of the essentials of Christianity, should have been compared with Voltaire. Erasmus has been called "the Voltaire of the Renaissance." We need not wonder, for the resemblances between the two writers are too obvious to escape notice. And yet a careful comparison leads us rather to a contrast. Each of them was the greatest literary power in his own age, and acquired, especially among men of letters, a European reputation. Both of them were courted by kings and princes, and had friends and correspondents in many countries. Both had lived in England and admired English ways and English character. Most obviously of all, both were wits, who

used irony and ridicule for the destruction of what they believed to be superstition and folly.

But there was this enormous difference between them—Erasmus never attacked the foundations of Christianity. On the contrary, he tried to strengthen them by freeing both them and the superstructure from worthless or even dangerous additions and corruptions. Still less did he ever suggest any other system as a possible substitute for Christianity. Voltaire did both. He flouted the Christian faith, and is reported to have said that he was tired of hearing that twelve men had planted the Gospel; he would show that one man could uproot it. And he advocated a creed that was to be not merely a substitute but an improvement. He was no agnostic. Belief in a just and beneficent God is his creed, and the duty of general benevolence is his decalogue; and this religion he teaches to others in words which always have lucidity and sometimes beauty: "Adorons Dieu sans vouloir percer ses mystères. Il y a un Être nécessaire, éternel, source de tous les êtres; existera-t-il moins parce que nous souffrons? existera-t-il moins parce que je suis incapable d'expliquer pourquoi nous souffrons? Un Dieu adoré de cœur et de bouche et tous les devoirs remplis, font de l'univers un temple et des frères de tous les hommes. Pardonnons aux hommes et qu'on nous pardonne. Je finis par ce souhait unique que Dieu veuille exaucer."

Nevertheless, in spite of this fundamental difference between Erasmus and Voltaire as regards their attitude to Christianity, in that Erasmus defended it and was patient with it even in its medieval form, while Voltaire tried to destroy it and would have substituted Deism for it, yet there is a large amount of real resemblance between the two. Would not this be true of Erasmus? "In the sympathies which appeal to the deepest feelings in human nature he was very deficient. But never, perhaps, was there an intellect at once so luminous, versatile, and flexible; which produced so much; which could deal with such a vast range of difficult subjects, without being ever

obscure, tangled, or dull." It is what Lecky says of Voltaire.[1] And would not this also be true of him? He knew "how to abide, with an all but purely critical reserve, leaving reconstruction, its form, its modes, its epoch, for the fulness of time to disclose." It is what Morley says of Voltaire.[2]

Erasmus would have effected even more than he did accomplish if he had not underrated the solidity and permanent power of the evils which he assailed, and which he hoped would in time be banished from the Church and the world. The jealous conservatism of corporations is proverbial, as is also the conservatism of ecclesiastics and of lawyers. A corporation, therefore, which consisted largely of ecclesiastical lawyers, and of ecclesiastics who knew more about canon law than about the Bible, and whose interpretations of the Bible were those of long established tradition, was certain to be conservative in the very highest degree. And to all this we must add the fact that the most influential members of the corporation with which the Reformers had to deal were men whose pecuniary interests strongly supported their prejudices in favour of keeping things as they were. The ecclesiastics of the Roman Church stood rigidly on their defence against the first mention of innovations, and denounced those who hinted at opposition to the existing system as rank rebels against the voice of God, who spoke now, they said, as of old, from Rome. The Roman Church was the source and guardian of all Christian truth, and to dissent from its decisions must be heresy. They were never weary of insisting upon the duty of "avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called." In such a corporation, the power of resistance to all attempts at reform was almost boundless. Erasmus seems never to have appreciated the real force of this.

He continued working almost to his death, which took place in the night on July 12, 1536. No priest attended him; but he died saying frequent prayers for mercy and deliverance. In the Protestant city of Basle it might have been difficult to find

[1] "History of the Eighteenth Century," iv., pp. 315 *f.*
[2] "Essay on Voltaire."

a priest, even if Erasmus had desired to have one. His monkish enemies, with characteristic ignorance of grammar as of the man whom they abused, said that he died *sine crux, sine lux, sine Deus.*

Erasmus was one of those teachers who "outrun their generation in thought, but lag behind it in action." He was a Reformer, until (as a severe critic might say) reform became a thing of deadly earnest. It would, perhaps, be more just to say that he was a Reformer until it was evident that the leaders of reform were hurrying on towards extreme measures which Erasmus could not see his way to adopt, and were insisting upon theological distinctions with which he had no sympathy. And we may add that he seems to have been a little too sensitive about his own intellectual supremacy to be quite whole-hearted in working for the good of mankind. But he did work hard, and he has benefited mankind by his hard work. He had a zeal for truth according to the best knowledge of the day, and he laboured strenuously to make the truth more widely known. Yet he always insisted that the truths which are necessary to salvation are few; and that, although we have a right to make additional beliefs for ourselves, we have no right to enforce them upon others. No man in that generation did more to prepare the way for the movement, which he lacked the moral fibre to lead or to control.

St. Paul's Conception of Christ.

By the Rev. H. T. DIXON, M.A., D.D.,
Vicar of St. James's, Taunton.

I.

CHRIST was to St. Paul the centre of his life and the supreme object of his thoughts—"for him to live was Christ." It was this devotion and self-surrender to Christ that made him one of the chief thinkers as well as one of the chief founders of Christianity. It enabled him to tell men what Christ in His real nature was, and what was the significance of His life and death for mankind. He does not interpret Christ's words for us; he does not record His wonderful deeds. He is an interpreter of Christ Himself and of the relation of His death and risen life to the religious needs of men. For the most part he is concerned with Christ in His relation to men, but later, when time and circumstances develop his theology, he shows to us as well Christ in His relation to the Universe and to God.

The origin of St. Paul's gospel is to be found in his conversion. The vision of the Risen and Exalted Christ on the road near Damascus effected a profound crisis in his life. It meant the destruction of his cherished hopes and plans, a decisive break with the past and the complete surrender of his life to Christ whom he was persecuting. No wonder that he afterwards wrote, "No man can say that Jesus is Lord but by the Holy Spirit." From this time he became conscious of a new mysterious power within himself. Christ was the principle of his life, and from the strange and marvellous life of Christ infused into his own, we have the genesis of his conception of Christ. It is the Christ of his experience whom the Apostle preaches: he feels Christ's life within, and this mysterious life he endeavours to interpret.

The Christ of St. Paul is, however, no mere abstraction or vision which simply existed in his own mind. He connects the Christ of his experience with the historic Christ. The appear-

ance of Christ was more than the birth of Christ in his soul: it was also the illumination of his mind. His eyes were opened, and in Christ, the Victim of Calvary, he perceived the long promised Messiah whom his nation was anxiously expecting, and the cross which previously was a stumbling-block became the object of his veneration and his love. "It is God . . . who shined into our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." At once he transfers to Christ all the ideas of lordship and sovereignty which the Jews associated with the Messiah: immediately he accepts as true the accounts of Christ's life which he had heard from his contemporaries and from the Christian Martyrs: henceforth Christ was to him the Messiah and his great exemplar whose life he strove to imitate. "Be ye imitators of me as I of Christ": and though he does not narrate much of Christ's work and His teaching, the frequent references to Christ's commands, the similarity of his teaching, and the complete harmony of the picture of Christ which is found in his Epistles, with that of the Gospel narrative, sufficiently prove that he regarded the historic Christ as the Christ of his own inner life.

St. Paul's Christology begins with his doctrine of redemption. Jesus was for him the Lord because he found in Him his Saviour; and this Saviour he identifies with Jesus Christ of the Gospels and the Messiah of the Old Testament. "The inward revelation, while it irradiated his soul, lighted up at the same time the historic life of Christ: so far from being contradictory, the revelation and the external knowledge of Christ lent mutual confirmation: each was necessary": and, from this identification of the Christ of his experience with the Christ of history and its effect upon St. Paul's own nature, his conception of Christ is largely shaped and moulded.

It might be said that St. Paul works up from man to God. It was as risen man that he first became personally acquainted with Christ—"Last of all He appeared to me": to him, His humanity was of supreme importance, because he felt that Christ could only save humanity by partaking of its nature, and

becoming a member thereof; and that only by virtue of His manhood could He be our Mediator and our Intercessor with the Father, "for there is one God, one Mediator also between God and men, Himself man, Christ Jesus, who gave Himself a ransom for all." Never, therefore, does St. Paul lose sight of Christ's humanity, and even in his metaphysical form of teaching it is never set aside: in His full Godhead He still retains the features of His glorified humanity. He is the God-man. St. Paul does not attempt to teach how the two natures were blended: he is content to say that Christ laid aside His glory, and took upon Himself the form of servant: so that while He does not cease to be Son of God, He was truly man.

To St. Paul, then, Christ was man. "He was manifest in the flesh and seen of angels." "He was sent into the world made of a woman": "He was born according to the flesh": concerning flesh He was of the Israelites, and "born of the seed of David." "God sent His Son in the likeness of the flesh of sin": He was "found in fashion as a man." He was truly man, not apparently man. There is no room for a docetic Christ in Paul's theology, for *μορφὴν δούλου λαβὼν* asserts the reality of Christ's human nature: and St. Paul is careful not to write *ἐν ὁμοιώματι σάρκος* which might have proved the conception of a docetic Christ, but *ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων*—notifying that though He was really man, yet in some respects He was not like man. "We are soul and body, but He is God, soul and man." And in his Epistle to the Colossians he writes: "The fulness of the Godhead dwelt in Him in bodily wise"—*σωματικῶς* can only mean Christ's human body, and is almost equivalent to St. John's statement "the Word became flesh." There are, moreover, other expressions which leave no doubt of his firm conviction of the true manhood of Christ. He writes of Christ that He lived under the law and conformed to its restrictions; He suffered as other men—"in patient enduring of the sufferings which we also suffer"; He was betrayed—"who in the same night that He was betrayed"; He was crucified—"for our Passover also hath been sacrificed, even Christ." He died and also

was buried—"I have received how that Christ died for our sins, that He was buried."

Further, St. Paul's scheme of salvation demanded that Christ should not only be man, but that He should be man without sin; otherwise His death would not have been vicarious but for Himself alone: for had He not been sinless He could not have been the sacrifice sufficient for the sins of the whole world. Christ conforms to this demand. His death, St. Paul was fully convinced, was not for His own sins. It must, then, have been for others: and so Christ was the righteous One, human but sinless; even though as man He shared with us the weakness and frailty of human nature, "He knew no sin." He was crucified; through weakness He was exposed to temptation. "Christ," he says, "obeyed the law of God"; there was the temptation to transgress it, yet "He was obedient unto death." In all points tempted like we are, only without the inborn tendency to sin: His flesh was like ours except that it was not sinful, "ostendit nos quidem habuere carnem peccati, filium vero Dei similitudinem habuisse carnis peccati, non carnem peccati"; he does not say that Christ was born *ἐν σαρκί ἁμαρτίας*, which would have asserted complete identity between Christ's humanity and man, but only *ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτιας*. Directly, then, Christ was without sin. "Is Christ a servant of sin? God forbid. He knew not sin." And yet, though sinless, He was made sin for us—"He that knew no sin was made sin for us that we might be the righteousness of God in Him." God saw in Him our sin, and in us His righteousness. And so He was treated as a sinner, being made sin for us, even though He Himself was as a Paschal Lamb, without spot and blemish.

And because of His sinlessness St. Paul traces a higher and more mysterious origin to Christ; in his Epistle to the Romans, he writes: "Concerning His Son, who was born of the seed of David according to the flesh, who was declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection of the dead, even Jesus Christ our Lord." Here

he describes Christ in His twofold nature: in His outward form of flesh He was a Jew and Son of David; in His inward spiritual nature He was of Divine descent. The flesh formed the substance of His body; the spirit of holiness, which was the very essence of the personality of the Messiah, formed the substance of His moral being. "He was the Son of God from the first, even in His weakness, because the spirit that ruled His life was the spirit of holiness, and because His life was a holy one."

And what His character declared Him to be, His resurrection showed with greater clearness—"declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection of the dead." Whilst in the flesh He was Son of God in weakness; after His resurrection He entered upon His glory, and was Son of God in power. Not only, then, was the resurrection a victory over sin and death, it was also a declaration, or rather a definition, of what Christ really in respect of His superhuman nature was and is—no less than the Son of God.

That Christ, as Son of God, was a revelation of the Father, St. Paul teaches, but not so fully as St. John. He does, however, assert that His life was a manifestation of God's love—"when the kindness of God our Saviour and His love appeared"; also that it was a revelation of His eternal wisdom—"the manifold wisdom of God according to the eternal purpose which He purposed in Christ Jesus before time eternal." God's scheme of redemption was only fulfilled by degrees, and until Christ appeared it was almost concealed: it was a mystery which Christ's life unfolded and revealed. "In Christo suam justitiam bonitatem, sapientiam, virtutem as denique totum Deus exhibet," is Calvin's comment on the verse "For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ."

But it is the Risen and Exalted Christ in His relation to man that chiefly occupies St. Paul's mind: it was then He became perfect and His real work began. In the flesh He was

restricted, hindered, and subject to temptation and death. At His death He left behind all that impaired His activity as Son of God. This is partly why St. Paul does not refer so much to Christ's actual deeds or words. He knows Christ in His fuller and more perfect nature. "I determined to know nothing among you save Christ and Him crucified." He was now spiritual, and so able to communicate His life to others; now His reign as Redeemer begins, and He becomes by virtue of His death and resurrection the founder of a new humanity of which He is the Life and the Lord.

St. Paul looked upon Christ as the second Adam, for He was the founder of a new creation. As the first Adam's descendants inherited his fallen nature, so those in Christ share His spiritual nature. "If any man is in Christ, there is a new creation"; of this new humanity Christ Himself is the first: He is the first-born among many brethren, the foremost and the leader: the first-fruits of them that sleep, the representative and pledge of those who, like Him, should afterwards be raised to a life of glory, honour and immortality, the One in whom all Christ's people shall be made alive at His coming. "Christ the first-fruits, afterward they that are Christ's at His coming," and into whose image they shall ultimately be conformed: "As we have borne the image of the earthly, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly." The change from the old creation into the new, which takes place in those who are in Christ, St. Paul regards as a gradual process: that he was being conformed into the image of Christ he had no doubt, but that he had attained to the lofty ideal he never for a moment imagined. He had put off the old man, which is corrupt, and had put on the new man, which, after God, is created in righteousness and true holiness. And slowly he was being transformed into Christ's likeness, but only when he had laid aside his mortal body could he win the full glory which awaited those who were in Christ.

The creation of this new humanity was the result of Christ's death and resurrection. Adam's race was at enmity with God and under condemnation because of sin. Christ died instead of

the race. He became a curse for it, and was the propitiation for the sins of the whole world. "By one man's disobedience death came to all; by one man's obedience many shall be made righteous." God accepted Christ's death—"one died for all, therefore all died." And God now treats as righteous those who by faith make Christ's death their own. Thus mankind in Christ is brought into a new relation to God. "All things are of God, who hath reconciled us to Himself through Jesus Christ," and, "God sent forth His Son . . . that we might receive the adoption of sons."

But Christ's death is more than a death for sin, which secures our reconciliation: it is also a death to sin which is in us, a conquest over sin. "There is a work done for us and a work done in us." With Christ, the Christian dies to sin: with Christ, he rises into newness of life—"in that He died, He died unto sin once; in that He liveth, He liveth unto God, so likewise reckon ye yourselves dead unto sin and alive unto God." All who by faith make Christ's death and resurrection their own are born again, and receive a power which enables them to overcome sin. "It is in the fire of love to Christ that the soul of man is separated from sin as thoroughly as though it were dead to it, and made alive to God and righteousness in the power of a supernatural life of which the Risen Christ is the Source and Pattern." Such is the new creation of which Christ is the founder. He brings its members into living union with God, who becomes their Father in a richer and fuller sense, and He regenerates their nature and makes it capable of being transformed into His own image and likeness.

And because Christ supplies the power which produces this moral transformation, St. Paul regards Him as its life. To Him he attributes, as did the other Apostles, the various *χαρίσματα* which were bestowed upon the infant Church, but he also considers the Christian graces of love, humility, gentleness and the like, as His special gifts. St. Paul was the first who placed more importance upon the Christian life than upon special individual gifts; and this moral goodness was to him the best result of Christ's spirit working in the heart. Everything which

was good in his own life he imputed to Him. It was as one in Christ, and as one under His influence, that he accomplished his life's work: "I can do all things through Christ, who strengtheneth me"; it was as if the very personality of Christ had entered into his own life and used him as an organ of its expression: "It is no more I who live, but Christ who liveth in me." He does not cease to be Paul, only he finds in Christ his true self. It has been said of St. Paul that he was the most signal instance of a character that reached the very top of human greatness through the influence of Jesus Christ upon his inner life, and because of the perfect sympathy of mind and feeling with his Lord that flowed from his fellowship with Him.

In teaching Christ's presence imminent in himself, St. Paul identifies the spirit of God with the spirit of Christ: "As many as are led by the spirit of God, they are the sons of God: because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the spirit of His Son into your hearts crying, Abba, Father"; and sometimes he identifies the spirit of God with the Person of Christ: "The Lord is the Spirit"; "we are changed into the same image by the Lord the Spirit." He is led to do this because he perceives that Christ acts on men's souls with the power of God's Holy Spirit, and because he feels Christ to be the fountain of his own life of holiness and grace as well as the source of his inspiration and strength. "I can do all things through Christ who strengtheneth me."

Christ incorporating Himself into the human race, and distributing to its members His own perfected life, was the most prominent thought in his mind. "In Christ," which expresses this favourite doctrine of oneness with Him, is an oft repeated phrase. But whilst the Divine presence of Christ within was so much to him, he never forgets Christ's separate personality. Christ was always Lord and he was His slave. Κυριος was his special name for Christ, because it expressed so clearly the ideas of dominion and supremacy which he associated with Christ as the Messiah; in his greeting Christ is Lord. God is θεὸς, and in the passage "To us there is but one God, the Father, of whom

are all things and we in Him, and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things . . .," he applies Fatherhood to God and sovereignty to Christ.

Christ is Lord, because of His life's work upon earth—"He died and rose again that He might be the Lord of the living and the dead"; also because of His self-abasement—"Wherefore God hath highly exalted Him and given Him a name which is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee shall bow." And as Lord He is enabled to carry the work which He had begun on earth to its final issue. He completes the work of redemption: He intercedes for His followers—"Christ . . . maketh intercession for us": He influences and controls their hearts—"The Lord direct your hearts into the love of God." He cares for them and protects them. "I am persuaded that neither death nor life can separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord," exclaims St. Paul at the thought of Christ's lordship; and as Lord, He will come as Judge, before whom all must appear, "that each may receive the things done in the body according to what he hath done, whether it be good or bad." Then when all things are put in subjection under His feet, Christ's lordship will cease and God will be all in all.

(*To be concluded.*)

On Teaching Children.

By J. W. ADAMSON, B.A.,
Professor of Education in the University of London.

I. The Child's Point of View.

A MORE discriminating study of children has wrought many beneficial changes in educational practice since Rousseau published "Émile" a century and a half ago. Paradoxical as it seems, much of the salutary change has been brought about through the writings of a father who successively abandoned his own five children to the care of a foundling hospital. "We never know how to put ourselves in the child's place," he complains in "Émile"; "instead of entering into his ideas, we lend him our own," and the consequence is that what is truth, in our minds, becomes the support of error and extravagance in theirs.

The world has never been without women and men who, in virtue of a sympathetic insight into the childish nature, have escaped Rousseau's condemnation; but their number at any time has never been so great as to render his criticism superfluous. After a generation or two of "child-study," there are still some mothers, many professional teachers, and very many whose profession is not the schoolmaster's, who, in Rousseau's phrase, "are ever seeking the man in the child." Exceptions being duly allowed for, it may be said that amateur and inefficient teaching of children is distinguished from the efficient kind by the teacher's preliminary attitude in this particular. The inexperienced teacher is disposed to see a difference only in degree between the intelligence of the child and his own; the experienced teacher knows that the differences between his own mental processes and his young pupil's are so many, so varied, and so considerable that failure awaits the teacher who ignores them by treating the child as a miniature of himself. "Nature wills that children be children before they be men; if we would

pervert this order, we shall produce precocious fruit, unripe, flavourless, and hastening to decay. Childhood has ways of seeing, thinking, and feeling which are peculiar to itself; nothing is less sensible than wishing to substitute our ways for theirs. I should as soon require a child of ten to be five feet high as expect him to be a person of judgment."

In so far as their thinking is valid, children and men *formally* think alike; the rules of syllogism and of all other modes of inference are binding on both, although their appreciation of the obligation may differ. But children and men do not in all cases apprehend the same matter in precisely the same manner, nor do they attend with equal closeness to the same things, their interests and power of withstanding fatigue being different. Fatigue and attention are, of course, questions of degree, but apprehension and interests give differences of kind.

A comparison between the minds of the adult and of the child must of necessity be superficial in character and somewhat abstract, since there are adults and adults, as well as children and children. The "average child," like the discredited "economic man," is a denizen of Cloud-Cuckoo Land only; and even the stress of professional experience cannot make all teachers identical. But, by hypothesis, the teacher possesses a mind which is both well-informed and mature, and for the present purpose we may recognize the adult type by those two marks. Such a mind grows impatient with detail unless detail is plainly required; the picture-making mind of the little child and the similar mind of the uneducated person delight in detail for its own sake. The truth of this statement may be verified by anyone who will try to please a child by presenting to him the salient facts only ("the statistics," as Mark Twain called them) of "Jack and the Beanstalk" or of "Puss in Boots." The chattering inconsequence of Shakespeare's clowns and of George Eliot's rustics makes excellent reading, but it is another story in actual life, when the first object is to get at the clown's meaning. Some years ago the Post-office journal, *St. Martin's-le-Grand*, printed the following from a letter of explanation

written by a telegraphic messenger, who had been mobbed by other boys and rendered unfit for duty: "One of them threw the core of an apple at me, which hit me in the ear. I took no notice of that and walked on, and they then threw their hats at me. I turned round and was about to say, 'Who are you throwing at?' when I took my own part and hit him back, and a crowd gathered. I stopped to pick up my hat, when he kicked me, which proved fatal, and ran away."

The person of mature intelligence greatly appreciates the economy of general terms and general propositions; and, forgetting the long and toilsome journey by which he reached the notions for which these words stand, he is often tempted, on the plea of saving time, to force generalities prematurely upon the child. The readiness with which the latter picks up words and mere sounds often deludes the instructor into believing that the child has attained the general truths or general ideas because he can repeat the words correctly. Only the educated mind can freely and intelligently make use of that shorthand of thought, an abstract term, and it does so in consequence of a somewhat lengthy experience, to which no child can pretend, and which teachers can but very partially abridge. It is notorious that amongst adults the speculative philosophers, the great mathematicians, and the men who frame large and sound generalizations concerning nature or human life are in a decided minority. So, too, are those whose attitude towards knowledge is quite disinterested, who pursue truth purely for its own sake. How, then, can we expect to find these exceptional attributes in all children as a matter of course?

The typical childish traits offer a great contrast to these characteristics of the educated adult intelligence. The immature mind finds difficulty in conceiving the abstract, and fights shy of it in consequence; it is much more at ease in the concrete world of its tangible, sensible surroundings. True, the immature mind *is* a mind, and therefore spontaneously generalizes concerning these surroundings, and to that extent takes a tentative hold of the abstract; but its generalizations are frequently rash

and ill-founded. For "knowledge" as such, and for abstract truth, the child's interest is usually weak; but his curiosity as to the use or function of most things which he encounters is insatiable.

The contrast might be elaborated at length, but it will perhaps be sufficient to consider it in its relation to the familiar instrument of teaching—the textbook. A manual of this kind, when skilfully written, presents a compact body of knowledge arranged conveniently for reference and in accordance with the demands of logic. The old-fashioned "Euclid" is an excellent illustration. Before we can discuss ideas we must conceive them, and from the logician's point of view the sign that ideas are conceived is the ability to define them. Euclid therefore begins each of his books by defining all the terms used in the book; next come the axioms and postulates relied upon in the text; then, and not till then, the pupil is confronted by examples of geometrical processes. The whole is arranged with an eye to logical requirements, to meet the needs of an assumed average mature intelligence, but irrespective of individual idiosyncrasies. It is not primarily addressed to the immature mind, which has yet to grow to the logical standpoint. The book is meant to be a presentation to a mature, instructed mind of a body of knowledge, clear, formal, complete; and in the light of its own purpose it is justified.

The teacher who thinks of himself as being, first and foremost, a teacher of this or that branch of knowledge is tempted to accept the textbook, not only in this sense, but also to fall into the error of thinking that the sequence of topics in the textbook is an exact indication of the order in which those topics should be introduced to the immature minds of children. This is an instance of the kind of error which Rousseau denounced in "Émile"; it is to disregard the child's spontaneous mode of acquiring knowledge. Outside the schoolroom and away from tutors of all sorts, the child's learning does not begin with clear-cut, well-defined ideas such as the textbook puts before him at the outset, presenting him with an analysis ready-made. The child learns by making his own analysis, starting from an

experience which is entirely concrete, complex, without definite boundaries; from this vague welter his mind moves towards order, consistency, definition. The movement is not at all assisted by a premature halting before abstractions and generalities, which are beyond his understanding, however economical and helpful they may be to his grown-up instructor.

To-day, the school does not begin its teaching about the world in which the child lives by offering him rudimentary scraps of botany, chemistry, physics, or by trying to teach him any one branch of science. Under the name Nature-Study, it endeavours to bring his mind to the observation of his surroundings as these may be noted by eye, hand, ear, and the other organs of sense. The analysis of those surroundings, which he thus begins, may at one moment be botanical, at another physical or chemical, to the understanding of students of those sciences; but it is only at a later stage, as the analysis develops in his own mind, that the child realizes this, or that knowledge is thus separated into federations and kingdoms.

The differences which divide Scot and Englishman are portrayed by the magic of genius in Stevenson's essay, "The Foreigner at Home," wherein the writer reminds us that "two divergent systems" are embodied in the two first questions of the English Church Catechism and of that Shorter Catechism which possibly is Scottish only by adoption. The English question, "What is your name?" Stevenson thinks "trite," while the other strikes "at the very roots of life" with "What is the chief end of man?" But the teacher of children is not free to dismiss matter of instruction because it is trite, and little children (and big ones too) are more likely to be induced, by a question which starts on their own plane of thought, to work their minds into the subject, till *at length* they dimly discern that man's chief end is "to glorify God and to enjoy Him for ever." For this purpose, another sequence than the strictly logical is required when introducing a study to a pupil. The Westminster Assembly of Divines or the Scottish Commissioners, in their collective capacity, were less discerning in-

structors of children than the sometime Westminster master, Dean Nowell, "author of the Catechism and inventor of bottled beer."

But it is seldom that the teacher of children finds the matter of his instruction predigested as in a catechism; nor, indeed, would the man who experiences an intellectual zest in such teaching desire help of that kind. As a rule, the material must be recast in order to be presented successfully to the immature minds who are to receive it. It is impossible, however, to make the necessary changes apart from fulness of knowledge of the subject and that sense of proportion which comes from mastery. The teacher's most obvious duty is, therefore, to "know his subject," as they say in the schoolroom; and this duty is a direct consequence of that other which bids him know his pupil. The good student is often confused with the good teacher, so that the ideas become interchangeable. The difference between them is, that while the student knows his subject, the teacher knows both that and his pupil also; and this is a cardinal difference.

One of the ways by which the teacher effects the necessary adjustment of material is that which is known technically as exposition; that is, expounding a passage at large. The need for this kind of instruction is much more general amongst young children than their instructors often realize. Books, catechisms, hymns, and the like, which have been written expressly for children, are often taken at their face-value by the teachers, who pass them on to their pupils. The consequence is, that the contents of these books is misunderstood by their young readers, sometimes ludicrously so. An unfamiliar word, or turn of phrase, disconcerts the child. If he is lazy, or indifferent, he merely memorizes the words or sounds which approximate to the words, and leaves it there. If he is disposed to exercise his intelligence upon the novelty (and in all probability that is the case with the greater number of children), he misinterprets it through supposing analogy where it does not exist. Then, having given the passage a nonsensical meaning,

he accepts the nonsense, and may even fail to reconsider it in the light of fresh information. There are at this moment, no doubt, large numbers of children who are puzzled when they hear of that "green hill far away without a city wall." Why, they ask themselves, should a green hill require a city wall? Surely, they think, it was needless to say that the hill had no city wall. The writer knows one child, at least, who for years used to connect the words "pity my simplicity" with the thought of mice in captivity.

Here, however, we must not get out of one error to fall into another. The tyro at teaching supposes that unfamiliar or difficult passages are not understood, because the meaning of a word here or there is not known. More frequently it is the thought, or the whole of its expression, which proves to be the obstacle. A single word usually has its meaning stamped upon it by the context. A reader with a little experience sees that "without" in Mrs. Alexander's hymn *must* mean "outside," "beyond." But if the whole frame of the sentence, or the thought which it renders, be external to the child's range, he is helped little or not at all by being told synonyms for the "hard words."

What he needs is to get at the heart of the passage, to realize its drift, to see "what it is about." In this case the teacher may do much for him by reading the passage aloud sympathetically. When that is done, the pupil may be invited to say what he thinks is the gist of the whole. The questioning and discussion which ensue will sufficiently deal with phrases not understood, after which comes the time for explaining "hard words."

The Kirk of Scotland and the Experiment of 1610.

By the Rev. ALEXANDER HENDERSON,
Assistant Curate of St. John's, Oulton, Leeds.

THE consecration of Spottiswoode, Lamb, and Hamilton is an incident that throws considerable light upon the relations then existing between the Churches of England and Scotland, and the manner in which Presbyterian ordinations were actually regarded by the former. To enter into the causes which led to the institution of "The First Episcopacy," or the very questionable methods by which it was effected, would be a needless digression. What is of real importance is that the experiment proved that there is no inherent incompatibility between the two systems of Church government, for, as Dr. McAdam Muir observed, "had it not been for lack of toleration and forbearance, they might have been working together yet."[1] As early as 1566, the thirteenth General Assembly had "ordainit ane letter to be directit to the Bischops of Ingland . . . and requiests Mr. Knox to putt the heids in wryte quhilkis he thinks necessar to be wrytin to the said Bischops, the tenour whereof followes: 'The Superintendents, Ministers, and Commissioners of Kirks within the Realme of Scotland, to their brethren the Bishops and Pastours of Ingland.'" Here follows a remonstrance against the too rigorous treatment of "'diverse of our dearest brethren, among whom are some of the best lernit within that Realme,'" because of their conscientious objections to the wearing of "'sick garments as idolaters in the tyme of blyndnes have usit in the tyme of idolatrie,'" and a request is made "'that our brethren who among zou refuse the Romish ragges, may find of zou, the Prelates, sick favour as our heid and maister commands every ane of His members to schew to another.'" The letter con-

[1] See his closing address, as Moderator, to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, 1910.

cludes, "'Zour loving brethren and fellow-preachers in Chryst Jesus.'"[1]

That the Church of England herself did not claim for episcopacy an exclusive Divine right is clear from the 55th Canon—one of those drawn up in 1604 (and still in force!), which acknowledges the Church of Scotland as a sister Church, and decrees that the clergy "shall pray for Christ's Holy Catholic Church, that is for the whole congregation of Christian people dispersed throughout the whole world, and especially for the Churches of England, Scotland, and Ireland." It is sometimes argued that this Canon has reference to the Church of Scotland as under the government of Bishops, but such a contention is unhistorical, for, whatever designs as to its future may have been simmering in the minds of King James and his Bishops, the Kirk of Scotland was, at the time of the Hampton Court Conference, actually passing through what was, perhaps, its most uncompromising phase of Presbyterianism under the leadership of Melville, who, in direct opposition to the opinions of Knox, declared not the Divine right of Presbytery merely (for this Knox allowed), but the positive unlawfulness of Episcopacy, the so-called "Bishops" in Scotland being nothing more than a Titular or Nominal Episcopate—only a degree less disreputable than that of the "Tulchans" of 1572. It is, indeed, noteworthy that in the controversies of the time the *absolute* necessity of Episcopal succession is not urged by those very writers whom we would naturally expect to make the best use of it, as, for instance, Jewel, Whitgift, Hall, Andrewes, and Ussher. Even Hooker is constrained to admit that, though imperfect, non-Episcopal forms of government may, nevertheless, be lawful: "For mine own part, although I see that certain reformed churches, the Scottish especially and French, have not that which best agreeth with the sacred Scripture, I mean the government that is by Bishops, inasmuch as both those churches are fallen under a different kind of regiment; which to remedy

[1] Bishop Keith's "Affairs of Church and State in Scotland," vol. iii., pp. 149-151.

it is for the one altogether too late, and too soon for the other during present affliction and trouble"—he means the civil war in France—"this their defect and imperfection I had rather lament in such case than exagitate, considering that men oftentimes without any fault of their own may be driven to want that kind of polity or regiment which is best, and to content themselves with that which either the irremediable error of former times or the necessity of the present hath cast upon them."[1] The fact is that, whatever may have been the attitude of the Church of England under Laud and thenceforward towards Presbyterian systems, up to the time under consideration numbers had been admitted into her ministry with no other than Presbyterian ordination. It is this uncomfortable fact that Keble urges as an explanation why Hooker and some others of those mentioned contented themselves with showing "that the government by Archbishops and Bishops is ancient and allowable."[2] Add to this the fact that Anglican divines were present as official representatives of their Church at the Synod of Dort in 1618, and it will be clear enough that, until then at least, the differences which marked the reformed Churches of England, Scotland, and the Continent were not regarded as sufficiently grave to form barriers to their mutual recognition. It is important to keep these facts in mind if we would estimate the full significance of the act of 1610, for when the three Presbyterian ministers were consecrated in London, the objection raised by Andrewes, Bishop of Ely, that they had not received episcopal ordination to the priesthood was overruled by Archbishop Bancroft on two grounds: (*a*) That to require them to submit to ordination to the priesthood would be, in effect, to discredit the orders of the reformed Churches on the Continent with which the Church of England was on terms of communion; and (*b*) that, as the less is included in the greater, it was possible validly to consecrate to the episcopate *per saltum*—*i.e.*, without previous admission to the inferior order. As,

[1] Hooker, "Ecclesiastical Polity," book iii., xi., 16.

[2] See Keble's "Preface to Hooker's Eccl. Pol.," p. lxvii. Seventh edition, revised by Church and Paget. Oxford, 1888.

however, this custom had long fallen into disuse, there is every possible reason to believe that in alluding to it at all Bancroft was prompted by a desire to quiet the scruples of a somewhat sensitive theologian like Andrewes, for it is obvious from his reference to the Continental Churches that he had no intention of throwing doubts upon the validity of the orders of the Scottish candidates. Moreover, the contention that the consecration of the three "titulars" was *per saltum* is not borne out by facts; for if the General Assembly of Glasgow, which consented to receive the restored episcopate, had really felt that the Church in Scotland had lost the Catholic heritage of the Apostolic Succession, it would be natural that we should expect to find the hundred or more ministers who had composed it flocking to the newly consecrated Bishops, and anxious to receive true priestly ordination. But no, the very contrary is the case, and, apart from the fact that within a year the King "received the welcome intelligence that all the Bishops of Scotland, including the Primate of St. Andrews, had been duly consecrated," and that he "had put into their hands full episcopal jurisdiction,"[1] there is not the slightest evidence to show that they ever attempted to reordain a single minister who was already in possession of Presbyterian ordination.[2] Their functions were, indeed, confined to matters of jurisdiction derived from their having been accepted by the Kirk as perpetual Moderators of Provincial or "diocesan" Synods in place of Moderators elected annually as heretofore, but the Bishops themselves were still subject to the authority of the General Assembly. Under this new constitution the Church of Scotland was in full communion with that of England, but her national peculiarities were retained and respected: General Assemblies, Synods, Presbyteries, and Kirk Sessions, continued to be held; no change was made even

[1] Dean Luckock, "The Church in Scotland," p. 173.

[2] It is well to remember, also, that although the Bishops consecrated in London in 1661 were, owing to the change in Anglican opinion and notwithstanding Sharp's protest, obliged to pass through the orders of deacon and priest, they themselves did not insist on the same process when they consecrated the others at Edinburgh and St. Andrews.

in the services of the Church, the "Book of Common Order" still being in use.[1] Thus it was that in the very year in which Melville was released from the Tower of London, only to go into the banishment from which he never returned, the pious intention of King James was carried into effect. He had entered upon his work of restoration with the full conviction that "a Scottish Presbytery as well agreeth with a monarchy as God with the Devil," and perhaps it is not too much to say that therein may be found the true motive of his zeal for episcopacy. So the Bishops returned to Scotland; but all went on as before, and it had been well for British Christianity—as for his own comfort—had Charles I. respected the pledge that his father had given to the Assembly at Perth through his Commissioner, Lord Hamilton, that "if they would accept the Perth Articles,[2] no further innovations would be made"—a pledge, be it said, that King James scrupulously kept.[3]

But a change had come over the spirit of the Church of England; the Bishops who presided over her destinies were no longer of the men who, in the bitter times of the Marian persecution, had sought and found refuge among the Presbyterians abroad, and had consorted on terms of brotherly intimacy with the reformers of Geneva and Zurich, of whose influence many a trace is still visible in the formularies of the Book of Common Prayer. It is strictly true to say that while in England "a John-Bull-Theology had arisen which rejoiced not only in defending the peculiarities of the Anglican Reformation—for

[1] Dr. McAdam Muir, "The Church of Scotland," p. 39.

[2] By the five Articles of Perth:

1. Kneeling at the Lord's Table was approved.

2. Ministers were to dispense that Sacrament in private houses to those suffering from infirmity or from long or deadly sickness.

3. Ministers were to baptize children in private houses in cases of great need.

4. Ministers were, under pain of the Bishop's censure, to catechize all children of eight years of age, and the children were to be presented to the Bishop for his blessing.

5. Ministers were ordered to commemorate Christ's birth, passion, resurrection, ascension, and the sending down of the Holy Ghost.

These Articles were ratified by Parliament in 1621.

[3] Dean Luckock, "The Church in Scotland," pp. 174, 180.

this might have been reasonable enough—but in extolling them as the most essential criterions of the Christian Church;"[1] in Scotland the Church, ripened in experience, had widened its outlook and adopted a more tolerant attitude towards other communions, and there can be no doubt that the original demands of the Covenanters came short of the total abolition of episcopacy.[2] It was only after Charles, at the instigation of Laud, had "so insisted on the acceptance of Anglican customs as to render them utterly hateful,"[3] that the eyes of Scotsmen were opened to the real cause of the evils under which they suffered, and it needs no special brief for Presbyterianism to justify the assertion that the act of the General Assembly of 1638 in deposing and excommunicating a fanatical and time-serving prelacy was one of the noblest examples in history of a Christian Church asserting its independence and seeking to purify itself from Erastianism. Then, if ever, was one of those occasions when it is lawful for a National Church to fall back upon its rights of self-organization and government.[4] The

[1] The late Duke of Argyll, "Presbytery Examined," p. 150.
[2] McCrie, "Sketches of Scottish Church History," vol. i., p. 238.
[3] McAdam Muir, "The Church of Scotland," p. 40.
[4] *Cf.* Hooker, "Eccl. Pol.," book vii., chap. xiv., 11: "Where some do infer that no ordination can stand but only such as is made by Bishops which have had their own ordination likewise by other Bishops before them, till we come to the very Apostles of Christ themselves; in which respect it was demanded of Beza at Poissie, 'By what authority he could administer the holy Sacraments, being not thereunto ordained by any other than Calvin, or by such as to whom the power of ordination did not belong, according to the ancient orders and customs of the Church; sith Calvin and they who joined with him in that action were no Bishops'; and Athanasius maintaineth the fact of Macarius a presbyter, which overthrew the holy table whereat one Ischyras would have ministered the Blessed Sacrament, having not been consecrated thereunto by laying on of some bishop's hands, according to the ecclesiastical canons; as also Epiphanius inveigheth sharply against divers for doing the like, when they had not episcopal ordination: to this we answer, that there may be sometimes very just and sufficient reason to allow ordination made without a bishop. The whole Church visible being the true original subject of all power, it hath not ordinarily allowed any other than bishops to ordain: howbeit, as the ordinary course is ordinarily in all things to be observed, so it may be in some cases not unnecessary that we decline from the ordinary ways. Men may extraordinarily, yet allowably, two ways be admitted into spiritual functions in the Church. One is, when God himself doth of himself raise up any, whose labour he useth without requiring that men should authorize them. . . . Another extraordinary kind of vocation is, when the exigence

question uppermost in the minds of the Covenanters was, however, one that concerned not the Divine right of Presbytery as opposed to Episcopacy, but the freedom of the Church from secular control. This was the great principle which Andrew Melville affirmed when he admonished James VI. that "there are two kings and two kingdoms in Scotland: King James, the head of the Commonwealth, and Christ Jesus, the King of the Church, whose subject James the Sixth is, and of whose kingdom he is not a king, nor a lord, nor a head, but a member"; and it was in defence of the same principle that Alexander Henderson, as Moderator in 1638, set aside the mandate of the Royal Commissioner dissolving the General Assembly, and claimed for that body the right of freedom of session and power to judge even the prelates themselves.

It has been said that the history of a Church is the best exponent of its dogmas. "We do well to remember," says the late Duke of Argyll, "what it was that Presbytery had principally to defend, to see what it was that was very likely to become its *idée dominante*. Its theology had not been the object of attack. . . . It had not been its doctrine, but its liberty—not the tenets of its divines, but the power of its Assemblies—which had been continually exposed to hostility and attack. Yet on the liberty and power of those bodies depended the liberty and power of the Church to exercise the right of self-government. But the right was a natural right, and like all such, claimed first by instinct—then defended on principle—at last on doctrine."[1] It is behind this principle—this doctrine—that the Kirk of Scotland is entrenched. She has asserted her right to revive the presbyterial form of Church

of necessity doth constrain to leave the usual ways of the Church, which otherwise we would willingly keep; where the Church must needs have some ordained, and neither hath nor can have possibly a bishop to ordain; in case of such necessity, the ordinary institution of God hath given oftentimes, and may give, place. And therefore we are not simply and without exception to urge a lineal descent of power from the Apostles by continued succession of bishops in every effectual ordination."

[1] "Presbytery Examined," pp. 156, 157.

government, and she maintains that what was valid in the first century was valid in the sixteenth and seventeenth, and is equally so to-day. Her principle is Catholic—it is also Apostolic—and so demands the respect of all who look back to the age of the Apostles as that in which true Evangelical liberty was best understood. She does not claim for her own system an exclusive Divine right, or deny that Episcopacy is an ancient and godly order, for she feels that her position is not weakened by acknowledging in others what they are often inclined, too readily, to deny to herself.

It is considerations such as these that tend to raise the hope that the day is not far distant when intercommunion between the English and Scottish Churches may, without the surrender of any essential principle on either side, be once more established. Efforts made in the past by Episcopalians such as Dean Ramsay and Bishop Wordsworth of St. Andrews, and by Presbyterians like Drs. Lee, Bisset, Norman McLeod, and Principal Tulloch have at least had the effect of bringing the matter within the field of amicable discussion; while the official reopening of the question by the Pan-Anglican Congress in 1908, by the General Assembly, and by the Church Congress in 1910, indicates that, in the words of the Lambeth Encyclical, "we have now reached a period in which, in view of the possibilities of the future, we must enter upon a stage of preparation." A dead uniformity is neither possible nor desirable, and for this reason it is not too much to hope that the very "varieties of opinion and practice within the Church of England are a distinct advantage to the cause of reunion," and that "her comprehensiveness and reasoned liberty mark her out as the rallying-ground of future unity."[1]

[1] See the Paper on "Christian Unity," by the Right Rev. J. A. Kempthorne, Bishop of Hull, read at the Church Congress of 1910.

Robert Stephen Hawker.

By F. SMITH, B.A., B.Sc.

THE traveller who goes on foot down the enchanting coast of North Cornwall will not go far without meeting many memories of the Rev. R. S. Hawker, formerly Vicar of Morwenstow, the most northerly of Cornish parishes. "All down the thundering shores of Bude and Boss" the man is still remembered both for his faithful "care of souls" and for a wonderful personality of which all his words and acts were eloquent proof. In the literary world he is still remembered, and claims the devoted allegiance of a few who love his strong ballads and enchanting legends of Cornwall; but to many of the present day his name has little meaning.

Yet Morwenstow, the most isolated parish of Cornwall, is a place of singular beauty. There is the wildest of shores, which low tide shows to be studded with sharp-pointed rocks that would tear all shipping to pieces; and then dark cliffs rising to a height of over 400 feet, proudly challenging the mighty Atlantic, whose billows have been engaged in ceaseless conflict there since the dawn of life. On the land side the cliffs are clad in heather—big, clean, and joyous—where multi-coloured butterflies flit contentedly from place to place, and the gay grasshoppers leap about as though all life were a game of leap-frog. Down below, in response to sun and cloud above, the sea is a mosaic of blues, greens, and purples—the whole forming a picture of incomparable loveliness.

But there is nothing in the sacred associations of Morwenstow, or in its literature, that can replace the actual sight of this wonderful man as he tramped about his parish in the indescribable brown cassock, fisherman's jersey, brimless hat, and wading-boots; for the love of his admirers is built on the man himself—the strange and wonderful personality who was content to live amid those lonely rocks, weaving strange fancies, seeing wonderful sights, speaking unaccountable things. If one

word may be used in its fullest significance, we may say his charm lies in his humanity. In all his acts we see proofs of it. Sent to be Vicar of Morwenstow in the days when wrecking was a common pursuit and smuggling an honourable means of livelihood, he denounced those who followed such callings—though at considerable risk to himself. Working amongst parishioners who refused help to the shipwrecked sailors, lest they brought disaster on the house which sheltered them, Hawker's care of the unfortunates who were washed ashore alive was something to be remembered. His anxiety for the ships driven within reach of the greedy cliffs was such as to send him off at all hours to Bude or Clovelly for the lifeboat. He often urged them forth when the dangers were such as to make brave men hesitate, and his noble desire to help the helpless often made him too impatient of delay. Many a sailor owed his life directly or indirectly to the Vicar's assistance. If Hawker had not been there, many a wreck would have been added to that long list recorded at Morwenstow, the most dangerous part of the coast. To the unfortunates who came ashore dead he gave decent Christian burial. To sorrowing relatives he sent letters of consolation, repeating where he could the last brave deeds of the noble dead. But all this work was done at tremendous cost to his nervous strength. In one of the most pathetically tragic letters ever written he describes the awful days following a wreck, when the corpses were being washed ashore slowly on his cruel coast. He concludes: "You will understand the nervous, wretched state in which we listen all day and all night for those thrilling knocks at the door which announce the advent of the dead." There is no doubt that much untold suffering in his last sad years came from the memory of the harrowing scenes he had witnessed on the shore.

The same humanity which marked such quiet heroism is also the keynote of his whole life. He hated dissent fiercely, but he lived on friendly terms with Dissenters. He denounced the devilish trade of wrecking, but he probably enjoyed the company of a wrecker. He condemned smuggling, but his

accounts of the smuggler, Tristram Pentire, show that his heart warmed to the man himself. He abhorred the sin utterly, but the sinner had generally some redeeming feature to love and esteem.

It was his humanity which showed him the humour of the world. Nobody enjoyed a tale better than "the parson," as his parishioners knew, and few ever told better ones. Humour broke into most of his activities, and we feel that his laugh often rang out on those silent cliffs. He is said to have asked a Dissenter once about his reluctance in coming to the Vicarage to arrange about the funeral of a relative. "Well, sir," was the answer, "we thought you might object to burying a Dissenter." "Not at all," returned the Vicar, "I should be pleased to bury you all." To reach his pulpit he had to scramble through a small aperture in the rood screen. It was a difficult process, so he called it "the camel going through the needle's eye." Leaving the pulpit was more difficult, because it was necessary to go backwards. This often embarrassed stranger-clergymen, to whose rescue Hawker came with the words: "It is the strait and narrow way, and few there be that find it." He held daily service in his church, and his wife was frequently the only other person present. The Vicar would therefore begin the service: "Dearly beloved Charlotte, the Scripture moveth us," etc. He visited London in his old age, and was remonstrated with on account of his dress. "Would you have me dress like a waiter?" was his retort.

Hawker and Morwenstow are still strangely united, for it was the one spot in all England which was suited to him. He loved solitude, and this sea-washed parish is solitude materialized. He was eccentric and superstitious, and the place found room for his eccentricities, and gave support to his strange beliefs. He lived in the past, and here was a church with associations dating back to the dim beginnings of Christianity in England. He drew no distinction between legend and fact; he saw in realities the symbols of eternal truths, and here was a church whose riches could never be exhausted for such a mind. He

loved his fellow-men, and here was a neglected parish which had known no resident clergyman for a century. He had a true affection for children, and here was a school that required building. He had a special tenderness for all animals, and here was a valley that required a bridge over the dangerous stream. He was brave, strong, pure, and tender-hearted, and Morwenstow provided him the occasion for the practice of all these qualities, like a wise mother developing her child. What wonder, then, that Hawker's admirers, when they visit the place, feel more than a thrill of emotion when the church spires, backed by his beloved Hennacliff, first come into view? For to them, at least, it is holy ground.

It is the most difficult of places to reach, for Bude, the nearest station, is about eight miles away. The few shrubs by the road are stunted and miserable-looking—a silent witness to the strength of the winter wind that ravages these lonely shores. On the way is Coombe Valley, where Hawker wrote the famous Trelawney Ballad, and where he bade farewell to Tennyson after the one memorable day the two poets spent together. At length the Bush Inn is reached—a dilapidated-looking hostelry, the very centre of Morwenstow. There is nothing to be called a village. The inn and an ugly farm or two cluster together in an unpicturesque group, the ground sloping away to hide all other views. A small descent towards the coast suddenly brings us into view of the church, with the heather-clad cliff beyond. A hundred memories start into being! There is the lych-gate, and, near by, the shed where the poor mangled corpses of the drowned awaited burial. Inside the churchyard stands the tall, white figure-head of the wrecked *Caledonia*, and around it are the unnamed mounds which cover the remains of the unknown dead, interred reverently by the warm-hearted Vicar.

Standing on these high cliffs and overlooking the far-reaching Atlantic stands the church in proud solitude:

> "The storm—the blast—the tempest shock,
> Have beat upon those walls in vain."

Both inside and outside, the church seems a symbol of strength. Old oak pews, dating from the sixteenth century, five or six inches in thickness and beautifully carved, agree well with the strong Norman pillars on the north side. Beams of oak support the roof. The font is a misshapen block of stone, dating from the tenth century, and carrying little ornamentation. The chancel is dark, but, alas! the old screen has given place to a modern one.

Near the church stands the vicarage, built by Hawker himself, with his inscription over the door:

> "A House, a Glebe, a Pound a Day,
> A pleasant Church to watch and pray;
> Be true to Church, be kind to Poor
> O Minister, for evermore!"

Out on the cliffs is something which seems to give a closer touch of the man than either church or vicarage—it is a small hut, which he built of the wreckwood which came ashore there. It looks over the mighty sea, and, sitting inside, one can see naught but the limitless ocean and the edge of the cliff in front. It was here he wrote much of his later poetry, and where he spent much of the sorrowful year following his wife's death, when he composed his mightiest poem, "The Quest of the Sangraal." In this hut he spent many hours, not alone, for he spoke with the angels.

Morwenstow has still the same air of loneliness and repose that Hawker knew. It may be that his spirit still haunts the place, for one feels strangely near him while there. And fortunately it is only visited by the few who seek the charm of its sacred associations.

Of his literary work we may say that it is small in bulk and unequal in quality. In a volume of prose he gathers up much of Cornish legend and folklore that would otherwise have been lost—writing with remarkable skill and in excellent style. His poems fill a companion volume, and vary from the early and mediocre "Tendrils" to the wonderful fragment, "The Quest of the Sangraal." In ballads he is very often successful; and

one of his earliest, "And shall Trelawny Die?" has achieved a unique reputation. His religious poems have a mystical atmosphere and symbolical suggestiveness almost unique. But our final judgment of his poetry must be given on his greatest work, "The Quest of the Sangraal." He was strangely suited in temperament and belief to the theme. To him legend was more significant than fact. He distrusted the scientific and commercial growth of his century, and knew nothing of the new social conscience. His mind was steeped in the distant lore of symbolism and ritual. His poetical temperament and religious aspirations alike were satisfied by the creed and ceremonies of the Anglican Church. Christianity was for him a great epic which his imagination coloured into new life.

Living as he did on the Cornish coast, with the grey heights of "wild Dundagel" in sight, it is no wonder that he meditated on Arthurian days, and at length began to write "The Quest of the Sangraal." He was unable to finish the work, but the fragment compares more than favourably with Tennyson's better known "Holy Grail." The latter is an excellent piece of finished art: it is musical, and like the ripple of wavelets wafted shorewards by a scented breeze; whilst Hawker's poem is unfinished, broken, and rugged, but it has the strength of the great Atlantic waves as they break on the place of its birth.

Nor is Tennyson's inferiority surprising when we remember that he was essentially modern in outlook, influenced by scientific discovery, and in full touch with the thought of his own time. Indeed, he questioned his fitness for writing on such a theme in a letter to the Duke of Argyll: "I doubt whether such a subject could be handled in these days without incurring a charge of irreverence. It would be too much like playing with sacred things. The old writers *believed* in the Sangraal." In Tennyson the zeal of the mediæval and the devotion of the mystic were alike lacking.

A few extracts will show us the excellence of the poem. In such a legend symbolism is all important, for the Holy Grail is so precious that its discovery typifies the union of the seeking

soul with Christ, and, indeed, the Symbolic Cup is not always closely distinguished from Him. Hence Hawker often speaks of it with awe :

> "That awful Vase, the Sangraal!
> The Vessel of the Pasch, Shere Thursday night,
> The selfsame Cup wherein the faithful Wine
> Heard God, and was obedient unto Blood."

Each drop of Blood contained therein is priceless :

> "Sweet Lord! what treasures! like the priceless gems,
> Hid in the tawny casket of a king,—
> A ransom for an army, one by one!"

To Tennyson, on the other hand, it is an ordinary cup with an interesting association :

> "The cup . . . from which our Lord
> Drank at the last sad supper with His own."

The Crucifixion and other sacred themes are treated in an equally distinct manner.

Metaphors of the two poets show a characteristic difference, Hawker's being more in keeping with the spirit of the poem. Thus, in describing the knights, Tennyson uses a very apt reference to a coin :

> "For good ye are and bad, and like to coins,
> Some true, some light, but every one of you
> Stamped with the image of the King."

But to Hawker the knights, by their very shape, suggest the awful mystery of the Cross—a likeness which shows completely how Hawker's mind works from the material to the spiritual, from the temporal to the eternal :

> "See! where they move a battle shouldering kind!
> Massive in mould, but graceful: thorough men;
> Built in the mystic measure of the Cross:—
> Their lifted arms the transome: and their bulk
> The Tree, where Jesu stately stood to die."

Again in the "Holy Grail" the King is unfavourable to the quest, and tries to keep back many of his knights :

> . . . "Ye follow wandering fires
> Lost in the quagmire."

But in "The Quest" Arthur is in very truth the real leader and inspirer of his men:

"Comrades in arms! Mates of the Table Round!
Fair Sirs, my fellows in the bannered ring,
Ours is a lofty tryst! this day we meet,
Not under shield, with scarf and knightly gage,
To quench our thirst of love in ladies' eyes;
We shall not mount to-day the goodly throne,
The conscious steed, with thunder in his loins,
To launch along the field the arrowy spear:
Nay, but a holier theme, a mightier Quest—
'Ho! for the Sangraal, vanished Vase of God.'"

All other glory is nothing worth if God be left out of the life:

"Ah! loathsome shame!
To hurl in battle for the pride of arms:
To ride in native tournay, foreign war:
To count the stars; to ponder pictured runes,
And grasp great knowledge, as the demons do,
If we be shorn of God."

The eulogy of Cornwall, the descriptions of north, east, south, and west, and the occasional expressions of a personal sadness, are all worthy of a great poem. The last quotation shall be the wonderful description of the mighty sea and cliffs of Tintagel, the last lines of this strong poem. No more striking figure could have been used with equal brevity:

"There stood Dundagel, throned: and the great sea
Lay, a strong vassal at his master's gate,
And, like a drunken giant, sobb'd in sleep!"

The poem is strong, beautiful, and vivid, tinged with a noble sadness which is due to the days of his mourning. It is outside all literary movements, and its author is an anachronism in literary history. But he was perfectly equipped to deal with his theme, and our only regret can be that not more than one book of the projected four was completed.

Hawker claims our affectionate remembrance by his noble humanity, his grace of humour, his faithfulness of life, and his sweetness of song.

The Missionary World.

THE New Year brings us a new factor in the serious study of missionary problems. The *International Review of Missions*—the first number of which has just issued from the office of the Continuation Committee of the World Missionary Conference, 100, Princes Street, Edinburgh—has been eagerly expected, and will be critically read. In bulk, in type, in style, and general arrangement, the first number takes its place on a level with the best of the quarterly or monthly reviews; it is worthy, so far as outward appearance goes, of the great subject which it has taken in hand. In a thoughtful statement the editor outlines the purposes and plans of the *Review*. The ideal is entirely satisfying alike on the intellectual and the spiritual side. It will, as Mr. Oldham points out, take strenuous work and long endeavour to make the *Review* what it aims to be, but judging by the contributors to the first number, and the general excellence of their work, we shall have from the outset a periodical of unique value in all the higher regions of missionary policy. The amount of mature experience, of close observation, and of reasoned thought contained in the articles before us is noteworthy.

* * * * *

Dr. Warneck's account of the growth of the Church among the Bataks is marked by wide knowledge and sane policy, and demonstrates the value of the contribution of Continental workers. Mr. Gairdner's survey of the vital forces of Christianity and of Islam is full of brilliance and depth. These papers are each the first of a series. Dr. Mott contributes a statement concerning the Continuation Committee and the various bodies it has called into being, which answers many questions now being asked. An article on the preparation of missionaries by Dr. Henry Hodgkin records the formation of the Board of Study, arising out of the work of Commission V., and gives valuable fresh information based on the investigations

of a sub-committee dealing with schools for language study on the mission-field. Dr. Harada—himself a Japanese, the first of the series of Oriental contributors to the *Review*—discusses ably the position and present problems of Christianity in Japan. Miss Agnes de Sélincourt furnishes a careful and suggestive study of the relation of women, especially in India, to the national reform movements in the East. The two remaining articles are the least satisfactory—that by Mr. Bryce, the well-known writer and diplomatist, which is slender, though not without value as a record of his impressions as a traveller among non-Christian peoples, and that by Dr. Goucher of Baltimore upon China and education. The Book Review Department is a feature upon which much care is being expended. The notes on articles of special value in missionary periodicals are designed to cover a very wide area, and by their careful grouping and close summary will provide material of moment for missionary students. The bibliography, which will be continued every quarter, is an admirable piece of work. It includes British, American, and Continental missionary publications, dealing with periodicals as well as with books. It is carefully classified, and has a good system of cross reference ; in fact, no pains have been spared to make it complete and easy to use. The annotations are based purely on the real significance of the book or article concerned, an imposing volume being perhaps only mentioned, while a small pamphlet or an article in some periodical has a special note because of the value of its contribution to missionary knowledge, policy, or thought. Enough has been said in this brief survey of the contents to show that, however highly we estimate the uses of existing missionary periodicals, the *International Review of Missions* stands alone, and provides matter which will henceforth be essential to all far-sighted and conscientious workers. The price of the *Review* is half-a-crown for each quarterly number, or 8s. a year, post free.

* * * * *

The Laymen's Missionary Movement in America, which has widened the area of missionary interest and largely increased

missionary contributions, has long stirred a holy emulation amongst British workers. It was evident from the first that the differing genius of the two countries would make a mere reproduction of the American movement ineffective, and whilst seeking to find a wise line of British action and the right man to direct it, a considerable period has slipped by. Meantime, a Laymen's Movement on parallel but distinctive lines was launched in Scotland, and through close association with the Churches has begun a remarkable work. It has already proved itself indispensable. Now the waiting period in the south is over, wise plans on broad lines have been successfully laid. A National Laymen's Missionary Movement is about to be initiated, and a man has been raised up to lead it. Captain Watson is laying down his post as lay secretary of the C.E.M.S., which owes much to his devoted service, in order to become the first secretary of the new movement. There is a general sense that he does so at the call of God. The work will be truly interdenominational, and will relate itself closely to the missionary societies. Captain Watson's welcome will be as warm as it is widespread. He comes as the answer to many prayers. Further prayers will support him as he begins his work.

* * * * *

Already there is a stirring amongst Anglican laymen which is a precursor of greater things. The Educational Department of the Church Missionary Society, by means of its laymen's week-ends and dinners, its great gathering by invitation of the Archbishop of Canterbury at Lambeth, and its remarkable appeal, *Some Educational Projects of the C.M.S. for* 1911-12,[1] has initiated a movement of great promise. Men of influence and of wealth have been impressed. The whole missionary question has been placed upon a spiritual basis, and the cause of educational missions in particular has been advanced. The leader in the Educational Supplement of *The Times* for Decem-

[1] Price 6d. Can be had from the Publication Department, C.M. House, Salisbury Square, E.C.

ber 5, based upon the C.M.S. pamphlet referred to, is of high significance in this connection.

* * * * *

The daily papers and the larger reviews at the present moment count for "missionary literature" of such compelling interest that the ordinary periodicals are almost thrust aside. The war between Italy and Turkey with its base in Tripoli, and the political complications circling round Persia, touch Islamic questions at their heart. Close behind Tripoli lie the Senussi, probably the most potent and wide-reaching influence in the world of Islam. An article in the *Contemporary Review* for December on "The Resources of Tripoli" unfolds the local situation well. The *Nineteenth Century* has an article on "Europe and the Mohammedan World" by Sir Harry H. Johnston. This vigorous and outspoken comparison between Mohammedanism and Christianity is distinctly useful, though, as we have recently had cause to mention, we do not always find ourselves in agreement with Sir H. H. Johnston's estimate of the essential features of Christianity. Religious problems are less directly raised in Persia, where two great nations, Christian at least in name, hold the future of a weaker Moslem nation largely in their hands. The cartoon in *Punch* for December 13—"As Between Friends"—has a missionary message. The whole situation calls for watchful prayer.

* * * * *

The daily record of the royal progress in India has special import as seen through missionary eyes. It is a good thing and a great one that our fellow-subjects in India should face to face meet their King and ours. It is well that they should know—for religious India will discern it—that to him and to the Queen the Christian faith is a matter, not of form, but of deep conviction. It is good to hope that the bonds of East and West may be drawn closer, and the unrest and disaffection be allayed. The work of Missions will be forwarded if the love of India for the Royal Guests grows warm. But there are

perils on the other side. Some incident might easily arise which would turn the gain of the visit into loss. India may seek some boon at the hands of her ruler—a list has already been given in an article in the *Nineteenth Century* for December of those which would be welcome—which might have for weighty reasons to be denied. Therefore the Royal Visit, both during its duration and in its after-results, is again a call to prayer.

* * * * *

Once more there is China, filling the newspapers, the reviews, the missionary magazines. "Will China break up?" asks the *Nineteenth Century*. "China—a Republic?" queries the *Fortnightly Review*. A Chinese student in Harvard University contributes an article, "China's Revolution Spells Progress," to the *Missionary Review of the World*. The *Church Missionary Review* has, besides editorial notes, two statements on "The Crisis in China," one being by Archdeacon Moule. The *Church Missionary Gleaner* has a short, illuminating paper by a missionary from Szchwan. The Wesleyan *Foreign Field* gives striking portraits of some of the reform leaders; the *Chronicle* of the L.M.S., under the general heading of "The Revolution in China," deals with "The Rebel Patriots," "Chinese Growing Pains," and "Personalities in Changing China"; *China's Millions* is full of striking pictures of revolutionary scenes, and has many letters of living interest; the S.P.G. *Mission Field* gives a portrait of Yuan-Shih-Kai, and a paper on "The Outlook in China." The eyes of the missionary and of the political world are directed towards that land. The issues change from day to day with bewildering rapidity. But in the very heart of China there is now a living Christian Church. It is small compared with the mass of the people; it is weak compared with the magnitude of the task. But with the little living Church in China there is the great and living God. Let us pray with one heart that at this great national crisis the Chinese Church may be enabled to serve its own generation according to the will of God.

G.

Prayer is asked for the Quadrennial Conference of the Student Christian Movement which will be in session at Liverpool from January 2 to 8. The chairman, the speakers, and the audience, with its vast possibilities, alike claim our aid. Prayer is also asked that the C.M.S. Thankoffering Week, from January 21 to 28, may be widely observed. Many hearts are rejoicing at the tide of new life filling the old channels our fathers made. It is announced in the *Church Missionary Gazette* that henceforth the four o'clock "Thursday" prayer-meeting will be held at four o'clock on *Wednesdays* in the committee-room at the Church Missionary Society's House, to allow country and suburban friends to avail themselves of the cheap tickets usually issued on that day.

For 1912.

"So teach us to number our days, that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom."—Ps. xc. 12.

"The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom."—Prov. ix. 10.

I AM not skilled in reckoning sums like these—
I miss full many a day—but have no power
To add to life's length e'en a single hour;
My products thus are 'minus quantities'!
And yet there is an answer, found with ease
By all who humbly seek Thy Spirit's dower,
Giv'n for the heart's enlightenment, like shower
Which falls to re-enverdure sun-scorch'd leas.
And Thou dost teach so wonderfully, Lord,
Bearing my stubbornness with patient might,
Giv'st me a Book of Answers in Thy Word,
And bidst me solve Life's problems by its light.
By that—subtract or add—my days should be
Summed up as Wisdom—which is, Fear of Thee!

A. J. Santer.

Discussions.

[*The contributions contained under this heading are comments on articles in the previous number of the* CHURCHMAN. *The writer of the article criticized may reply in the next issue of the magazine; then the discussion in each case terminates. Contributions to the "Discussions"* must *reach the Editors before the 12th of the month.*]

"REORDINATION AND REUNION."

("*The Churchman*," *December*, 1911, *p.* 910.)

THE loyalty to ancient practice, combined with true "breadth" of view, which characterizes this article, will appeal strongly to such as are open to conviction respecting the value of Canonical ordination and are not unduly held by preconceived theories. For this reason, the criticism which I venture to offer is not based on disagreement with a suggestion which must, in the main, be recognized as tending to lead us a long way towards the solution of a grave difficulty, but is rather by way of supplementing it in the one particular in which it appears to me, at least, to be defective. This defect seems to lie in the use of the rather curious term "extended ordination." Since there can be no such thing as *restricted* ordination, Nonconformist ministers (I do not include Scottish Presbyterians) are either "ordained" or "not ordained." That they are not ordained in the *Catholic* sense is, of course, obvious, but, as the writer suggests, it does not inevitably follow that their ministry has no validity for Nonconformists—which amounts to this, that validity of orders is not, under all circumstances, inseparable from the observance of traditional usage. God *does* work outside ordinances—even those of his own appointment (*cf.* Acts x. 44-48), and it is difficult indeed to believe that He does not "supply" what, owing to a variety of circumstances, may be wanting, or that a mere defect of ritual observance can be responsible for the severance of millions from the ministry of grace.[1] May we not say that the Nonconformist minister has, in the sense of St. Paul's words (1 Cor. ix. 1, 2), the "seal" of his ministry in the manifest presence of God's Holy Spirit with himself and in the results of his labours? We cannot call upon such men to deny their Divine commission; we *dare* not question work which bears evidence of Divine acceptance. But we can plead the desire for unity manifested in the Lord's great intercessory prayer, and we can justly point to the Catholic heritage of ministerial succession—whether maintained by Episcopal or Presbyteral ordination. They themselves will understand us when we uphold the common practice of Christendom which for centuries has distinguished the Catholic Church as a lover of order in Divine things. I would suggest,

[1] See Hooker, "Ecclesiastical Polity," book vii., chap. xiv. 11.

therefore, that *conditional*—not a vague "extended"—ordination is what is wanted to meet the difficulty. Conditional ordination involves no *denial* of orders, but it admits a doubt which may exist on either side—or on both. This doubt concerns the validity of the *form*. We baptize conditionally when there is uncertainty as to the validity of a previous baptism, and conditional ordination is not unknown in the practice of the Church. We dare not say of Nonconformist ministers that God has not consecrated them, even though the Catholic rite may not have been fully performed. Nor need it be felt by them to be derogatory were they to admit the possibility—even the probability—of a defect in the form of their outward commission and, therefore, to submit, in the interests of Christian unity, to a venerable, ancient, and universal ordinance. Cornelius and his companions willingly submitted to the outward and visible form of baptism even though the inward and spiritual grace had been already granted.

ALEXANDER HENDERSON.

"THE SCRIPTURAL ARGUMENT FOR THE TIME OF COMMUNION."

("*The Churchman*," *December*, 1911, *p.* 903.)

CANON PAIGE COX is so courteous and so considerate in his tone towards the benighted believers in evening Communion that I shrink from controversial argument, always unpleasant, and specially so in matters concerning our Divine Faith. I must leave to others more competent than myself a careful answer (which is surely not far to seek) to the Canon's elaborate paper. I attempt no more here than to draw attention, without exposition, to two or three of the assumptions, omissions, and misconceptions which seem to me to underlie, or rather to undermine, his argument.

First, we are told that the only Communion service described in the Acts of the Apostles (xx. 7) was held after midnight—that is, in the early morning. But this was quite contrary to the intention of the Apostle and of the Church at Troas. The service (as Dr. Lumby reminds us) was protracted beyond the intended time. It was to have been an evening *agape* with the Holy Communion. The length of St. Paul's discourse pushed the Holy Communion service on to a much later and (by my supposition) unscriptural hour. It is constantly overlooked that the directions and usage prescribed in our Prayer-Book (which, and not even other long usage in Christendom, is the guide for Churchmen) presuppose always a sermon before Communion. If, therefore, the Prayer-Book is supposed tacitly to take sides, and lean in permission to early or evening Communion, it is obviously in favour of evening Communion, for in the case of evening Communion a

sermon is both possible and the rule. At early Communion, even as an exception, it is, I imagine, unknown.

Secondly, in the Article which I am considering, there is no allusion to the first administration of the Holy Communion after the Resurrection. St. Luke describes it. Our Lord was the celebrant, and it took place on Easter evening at Emmaus. St. Paul's words, further, are significantly explicit, and are quoted in the words of consecration: "Our Lord Jesus Christ, the same *night* in which He was betrayed, took bread." Scriptural teaching, therefore, in the Gospels, the Acts, and the Epistles, is all for the evening hour.

Thirdly, it is assumed, and Canon Cox seems to adopt the view, that our Lord instituted the sacred Supper at the beginning of the day deliberately, and in the evening, not because it was evening, but because the Jewish day began in the evening. This is pure assumption. It was evening, and not early morning; and the evening because He was betrayed and sorrowful unto death in the evening, and because the Passover hour was evening and in haste, and not emphasizing the quiet beginning of a new day. No subsequent change of the dawn for the gloaming, as the beginning of the day, at all alters the hour of the institution and observance of the Holy Communion to the dawn.

In immediate connection with this, What Scriptural sanction is there for the view that the Passover feast was designed in any sense to prepare and strengthen the Jews for their long pilgrimage? And who can conceive so feeble an application of this fancy as to teach that early Communion refreshes the half-awakened early riser, not for the rest of the Sabbath, but for the weary toil of prayer and praise, and hearing God's word read and preached, at 11, 3.30, or 6.30 (those "other services," as they are called nowadays on service-boards and in parish magazines).

Further, we are told that this early consecration of the Lord's Day by early Communion sanctifies and consecrates the rest of the day, and ensures its observance. One can only reply in brief. It does not do so for multitudes of priests and people. It is notorious that early Mass absolves from the duty of attending later services. In the Far East, a clergyman, fresh from the teaching of advanced leaders, tells the members of his congregation that naturally enough they like the fresh air of the country after the fatigues of the week, and that if they will only be with him at seven in the morning to break the bread at Christ's own hour and in Christ's own way, and endure a slightly longer service by the addition of the Litany, they may go where they please for the rest of the day. Early Communions and early services for golf and lawn-tennis players are fashionable now, and the Lord's Day is thus broken and despised, instead of being sanctioned and revered, by such early celebrations. This, I know, is (thank God) not the rule, but it is the very frequent exception.

The contrary plea is treated, I fear, with too much scorn, yet it is

a true one—namely, that instead of receiving the Lord's Supper very early for tired clergy and tired worshippers, often only half awake and without preparation, the benefit and the help to faith and the spiritual life are much greater if the services of the morning and afternoon have preceded an evening celebration, lifting the heart into a higher atmosphere. It is a simple matter of experience that for very many, whatever physical weariness there may be at the end of a long Sunday, the mind is clearer and the spiritual sense in every way more awake and more ready for spiritual exercise than in the early morning. At any rate, the claim that it is a sacred and holy duty to yield to God the freshest hours of morning, and to receive the spiritual food into bodies untainted as yet by natural food, is really preposterous in its assumptions. The Jews, surely, were as tired as we are at the end of a day. They were affected as much as we can be by the natural food of the body. Yet our Lord chose the evening hour, and while supper was going on, for the administration and institution of the Supper.

Surely the change of hour in early times from evening to early Communion is sufficiently accounted for by the suspense of the *agape* for a time, to avoid misrepresentation and possible scandal. Evening Communion continued for a long time in the great Egyptian Church; and it is mentioned by St. Cyprian. If long-continued observance of a habit is considered a sure mark of Divine guidance, this plea is urged (we must remember) by the Roman Church for the inception and continuance of some of her greatest errors—Mariolatry, for instance, enjoined and observed now for nine centuries and more; and more recently, the Immaculate Conception, Papal Infallibility, and the adoration and deliberate worship of the Blessed Sacrament, so Catholic, so ancient.

I do not write these paragraphs as one who is prejudiced by having acquired the habit of which Canon Paige Cox speaks so strongly—the habit of evening Communion. My experience is otherwise. I have been otherwise accustomed all my life long, and in my ministry I have generally observed other hours, early or midday. The late Bishop of Salisbury told me once that he believed nine o'clock in the morning was the very early canonical hour. When I have had the opportunity, I have always welcomed evening Communion; but what moves me now, and has always moved me, to indignation and deepest sorrow is to hear the hour and time prescribed by our Lord Himself and so early followed, denounced either as a crime or as a hindrance to Christian unity.

A. E. M.

"REORDINATION AND REUNION."

(*The Churchman, December*, 1911, *p.* 910.)

MR. MALAHER'S interesting suggestion towards the solution of the problem of Home Reunion is based entirely on his conception of the Catholic Church, which may be briefly summed up as follows: "The sign of membership in the Church of God, or body of Christ is baptism, but the Catholic Church (apparently with Mr. Malahar a more exclusive society) was intended to possess, in addition, a corporate life preserved by a definite form of organization. This organization in the New Testament implies the possession of Episcopal Orders, and therefore the members of non-Episcopal Churches are not Catholics." This hypothesis is certainly ingenious, but it starts with a fallacious *petitio principii* method of argument, for it begs the main question of what constitutes the true notes of the Catholic Church, by assuming that in the New Testament its definite organization, necessary, as Mr. Malaher rightly states, for the preservation of its corporate life, included of necessity the existence of Bishops possessing the exclusive functions of transmitting the grace of valid Orders. It is, however, scarcely a matter of dispute that in Apostolic times the office and functions of Bishops and presbysters were interchangeable, and that only after a considerable time they became distinct, and monarchical Episcopacy universally established in the Catholic Church.

Where is there any Scriptural warrant for Mr. Malaher's assumption that Nonconformists are "self-deprived of the fulness of covenant blessings" simply because of their lack of Episcopal Orders? Mr. Malaher's whole conception of the Catholic Church as consisting in "continuity with the original society founded by Christ" *solely by means of Episcopal succession* is fundamentally wrong. The notes of a true branch of Christ's Catholic Church in the New Testament are stated simply as "One Lord, one faith, one baptism" (Eph. iv. 4-6), while in the Early Church the true profession of the Nicene Faith was the sole guarantee of orthodoxy, the Council of Ephesus even anathematizing all who should presume to add to this requirement. Thus all sections of Christians who hold the unity of this Faith form essential parts of the true Catholic or Universal Church, which in the language of our Prayer-Book consists of "all who profess and call themselves Christians." Accordingly, our Church has never regarded Episcopacy as "the principle of Catholic unity," and is, therefore, silent as to the precise office of those who have "authority given them in the congregation to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard" (Art. xiii).

The teaching of our Reformers also makes it abundantly clear that Apostolical Succession is not, as Mr. Malaher affirms, "an essential part of the Catholic side of our heritage." Bishop Hooper declared that "the true Church is known by these two marks—the pure preaching of

the Gospel, and the right use of the Sacraments. Such as teach people to know the Church by the traditions of men and the succession of bishops teach wrong," while Cranmer condemned as "gross ignorance" the Romish theory that "no Church could be the true Church of God, but that which standeth by ordinary succession of Bishops in such pompous and glorious sort as now is seen." Mr. Malaher also implies a false antithesis of terms in stating that "the heritage of the Church of England has both a *Catholic and a Reformed* side," as the main object of all the changes effected by the Reformers was to reassert and restore a pure and primitive Catholicity. As Dr. Jackson (whom Dr. Pusey eulogized as "one of the best and greatest minds our Church has nurtured") said in 1627, "We Protestants of Reformed *Churches* are the truest Christians and *the most conspicuous members of the holy Catholic Church.*"

Mr. Malaher's proposal of "extended ordination" for "non-Catholics," as he terms Nonconformists, involves a specious distinction between "Catholic" and "non-Catholic" Orders not likely to be acceptable to any sincere Dissenter, for if his previous ordination was not "Catholic" or orthodox, the only logical conclusion is that it was invalid. He is right, however, in his main contention that in any successful scheme of Reunion it is essential to retain historic Episcopal Ordination, for it would be impossible to surrender what so large a part of the Catholic Church regards as, at least, the most Scriptural, ancient, and divinely blessed form of government. But this does not involve the obligation of reordination, at least, of those Churches possessing a "regular" ministry, as it is impossible to prove Episcopal Orders to be the sole guarantee of Catholicity. There is a certain irony in the fact that just as Mr. Malaher calls the Nonconformist a "non-Catholic" because of his want of Episcopal Ordination, so the Romanist terms him a "non-Catholic" because of his refusal to accept the Papal Supremacy.

C. SYDNEY CARTER.

"SPADE AND BIBLE."

("*The Churchman*," *November*, 1911, *p.* 819.)

MR. TREMLETT'S courteous, if drastic, criticism of the first portion of my article raises a good many points on which I should be tempted to follow him did space and time allow; in fact, it covers most of the debatable ground between the traditional and the critical schools of thought; but I must confine myself to the issue raised by the article, the bearing of archæological research upon the question.

May I begin by asking what evidence I have "disparaged"? Every fact that bears upon the point is of the utmost value, and I should be the last to "disparage" it; it would be foolish to do so, for facts are

stubborn things and "chiels that winna ding." For facts and evidence I have a great respect; but my respect for the conclusions which have sometimes been based upon facts is considerably less; and if Mr. Tremlett will refer to my article, he will see that my protest is made against certain conclusions which seem to be unsupported by the premises, and certain claims which are not borne out by subsequent performance. For instance, if Professor Sayce in his article had promised to tell us what the cuneiform inscriptions have revealed about the *days* of the patriarch Abraham, his subsequent contribution would have amply fulfilled what he claimed to do; and the evidence which he alleges is of real value in deciding the question whether the patriarchal narratives contain historical elements or are mere fiction; and Mr. Tremlett will have seen from the second half of my article how unjustifiable I hold the latter position to be. But the claim that the information tells us something "about the Hebrew patriarch Abraham" is one which, with one doubtful exception, has not been made good. It does not add to the strength of the traditional position to base conclusions upon evidence insufficient to support them; the claim is constantly being made that no archæological evidence has been discovered which is inconsistent with the traditional position; it might with equal truth be alleged (and here I am confining myself to the patriarchal narratives dealt with in the article) that no archæological evidence has been discovered which is inconsistent with the critical position as a whole. The evidence has been misused by partisans on either side; what is needed is the attempt dispassionately to weigh the evidence, and see what conclusions can safely be based upon it; this attempt, however imperfectly carried out, was made in the article.

I am in full agreement with Mr. Tremlett that the important question with regard to the Hexateuch is not that of authorship, but that of historicity; but I fear that I know of no evidence which would be accepted in any ordinary historical inquiry, to prove that all the contents of these books are of equal historical value. The evidence, as far as I know it, goes to show that, while they probably do contain "myths and folklore" (I use Mr. Tremlett's expression), they also still more probably contain a good deal of matter which can be relied on as historical—the broad outlines of the national movements, the chief actors in the story, and a nucleus of incidents which upon the face of them are probable, and do not appear to lend themselves to explanation as personifications of tribal relationships, or as later attempts to account for the origin of rites or customs, or the sacredness of certain shrines; but, beyond this I cannot see that the evidence will carry us at present.

I should explain that my delay in reply was due to a wish to give Mr. Tremlett an opportunity of dealing with my article as a whole, should he so have desired.

M. Linton Smith.

Notices of Books.

THE CHURCH AND THE DIVINE ORDER. By Rev. John Oman, M.A., B.D., D.Phil. *Hodder and Stoughton.* Price 6s.

This is an able and carefully written treatise dealing with the origin, history, and present position of the Christian Church. Commencing with "The Jewish Preparation," Dr. Oman follows Lightfoot in affirming that "Christianity extended itself from the synagogue, and nowhere from the Temple." Dealing with "Jesus as Founder," he declares that the Apostles were not regarded as a hierarchy in germ, but taught instead to renounce authority, and, after the example of their Master, to take the place of servants. He contends that our Lord, instead of appointing for His Church "an ecclesiastical programme and an incipient hierarchy," formed "a society organized on the sole basis of love, equality, and mutual service." Commenting on the institution of the Lord's Supper, Dr. Oman observes that "it was a rite which did not turn the officers of the Church into sacrificing priests, but sealed all His followers into a fellowship wherein the Cross, in contrast with human power and authority, is the one mighty thing through all eternity" (p. 50). He defines the apostolic view of the Church as a "unity of the spirit through the one Spirit of God working in the individual members, who, having been individually reconciled to God, are the spiritual, who can judge all things, and yet themselves be subject to no human judgment" (p. 59). While the Apostles, as the natural leaders of the Church, exercised great influence, this was merely personal, and not corporate, as their "supreme work consisted in maintaining the spirit of humility, which was the real bond of the Church" (p. 67). Their attitude was expressed by St. Paul's words in 2 Cor. i. 24. There is no trace, he maintains, in the New Testament of the restriction of the administration of the Sacraments to any class.

In his chapter on the "Catholic Church," Professor Oman traces the gradual development of episcopal authority and the decline of the prophetic office. The bishop or elder, he declares, took the place of the prophet by his right of presiding at the Eucharist; while the need for maintaining Christian fellowship in times of persecution led to the bishop obtaining a representative character as a mark of the unity of the Catholic Church. Gradually monarchical episcopacy arose, and the bishop was regarded as the special messenger of God who guaranteed the presence of Christ (p. 101). By the middle of the third century the conception of the Church as a hierarchical society was complete, although the bishop was not regarded as a sacrificing priest till some time later. "The essence of Catholicism," Dr. Oman declares, "is the reintroduction of law" (p. 107), and it was the dogmatic authority of the bishop, regarded as the successor of St. Peter, which established Catholicism "as an externally guaranteed knowledge of God, necessary for an externally conferred salvation" (p. 111). He then discusses the development of the Roman Church, the power of the Papacy, and the separation of the East and West. In reference to the latter, Dr. Oman declares that the fundamental difference between the two

Churches is that the Eastern is "primarily a hierurgical saving institution, while the Western is primarily a hierarchical" (p. 142). He has a very interesting chapter on Augustine, pointing out that he regarded the authority of the Church as subordinate to that of Scripture, and that his doctrine of election was similar to Calvin's. Dr. Oman holds that Augustine's "failure to give a due place to moral personality prepared the way for the later view of the Sacraments and for the subjection of the laity" (p. 180). One of the best chapters is that on the Reformation. The prime cause of the Reformation was, he asserts, "the problem of finding room in religion for the autonomy of the individual and the autonomy of the State" (p. 193). The true Church to Wyclif was the assembly of all the elect, and he anticipated the Reformer's differentiation between the visible and invisible Church by adopting Augustine's distinction between "the true and simulated body of Christ." Dr. Oman gives a good summary of Luther's teaching, and traces the influence of Wyclif's writings on the great German Reformer. He defines the three marks of the true Catholic Church as unity in Headship of Christ, the preaching of the Gospel, and government by the priesthood of all believers.

He has a useful chapter on "Lutheranism and Calvinism," and points out that the same principle was at stake in the English as in the Continental Reformation. "By Edward's reign," he says, "the bishop was no longer the channel of tradition, grace, and authority, but the chief minister of God's Word, and the chief organ of the priesthood of all believers" (p. 249). Dr. Oman scouts the idea that Jewel's "Apology" represents a *via media* between Protestantism and Romanism, and shows the close affinity in teaching between Jewel and Luther. It is, perhaps, to be expected that in his chapter on "Conformity and Nonconformity" Professor Oman champions the Nonconformist point of view, but we can scarcely imagine that the great Elizabethan Churchmen would have endorsed his verdict that they were not "convinced Protestants" because they did not adopt the Nonconformist or Puritan position.

He has an interesting chapter on "Rationalism and Evangelicalism," but we can scarcely agree with his estimate of Paley as "content to defend Christianity as a miraculous evidence that a purely utilitarian morality has the sanctions of God's command and everlasting happiness" (p. 291).

In his "Task of the Present," Dr. Oman pleads earnestly for the need of a Gospel for the poor, and not mainly for the wealthy and respectable; and he contends that the greatest need to-day is for a "new reverence for the sublimity and sacredness of the human soul," which will "put wealth in the second place and man in the first" (p. 323).

Dr. Oman is obsessed with the idea that the one essential for the true Christian society is the practice of the Divine rule of love. He also apparently holds strongly that, as Dr. Dale well defined it, Christ's work consisted simply in revealing God's love to us, and not that the Redemption which He accomplished for us on the Cross was itself the revelation of God's love. The Atonement, to Dr. Oman, is merely the greatest example of Divine love—"faith that the one mighty thing in the world is love" (p. 322). Thus he does not seem fully to appreciate the truth that it is the crucified Christ who is "the power of God" enabling men to overcome sin

and make "God's rule of love their whole environment," and that the Christian Church whose members are governed in conduct by this Divine rule will be the Church which holds tenaciously the true "faith once for all delivered to the saints."

Although we may not be able to accept all his conclusions, Dr. Oman has evidently read widely and studied deeply; and if his language is at times rather vague and obscure, and his style not exactly popular, yet his book is a valuable contribution to the solution of the difficulties and problems confronting the Church to-day.

C. SYDNEY CARTER.

THINGS THAT MATTER. By Prebendary Eardley-Wilmot. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 2s. 6d.

Prebendary Wilmot did a daring thing, but he has justified his daring. He was asked to give a series of addresses at a city church in the week-day dinner-hour to a congregation of business men. It was explained that the whole service must not last more than half an hour. He accepted the invitation, and the daring thing was this: He brought into his addresses, under the popular title "Things that Matter," a very clear and comparatively full discussion of the Divine purpose in man. To lecture on the doctrine of grace to business men in half-hour sessions will suggest to most people both dryness and sketchiness. But this book is neither dry nor sketchy. It is an excellent summary of the positive content of the Christian faith, viewed from the point of view of a broad-minded Evangelical Churchman. We are sometimes twitted with being nebulous and negative. Half an hour leaves no room for negative aspects, and business men will not listen to the nebulous. Now that the addresses are in print, they should be read and studied by those who want to know where we stand, those who are interested in "Things that Matter." This book and the recently published volume by the Rector of Birmingham will do much to clear the air and make our position clear. We warmly commend it, not only to the clergy, but to thoughtful laity, as an excellent and straightforward account of the things most surely believed amongst us.

THE RELIGION OF THE ANCIENT CELTS. By J. A. MacCulloch, D.D., Hon. Canon of Cumbrae Cathedral. Edinburgh: *T. and T. Clark.* Price 10s. net.

So little is known regarding the early history of the Celtic people that all attempts to give a detailed account of their origin, customs, and manner of life must, to a large extent, be a matter of conjecture, speculation, and deduction. Canon MacCulloch, however, has made full use of all the available original sources of information, as well as of the researches of modern authorities, and thus is well prepared for his difficult task. Although the attempt to discover something of the religious worship, belief, and aspirations of primitive pagan races can never be devoid of interest, yet much of Dr. MacCulloch's book is necessarily only of antiquarian, philological, and ethnological value. We suspect, for example, that few people will concern themselves much with the meaning and history, the mortality or immortality, of "The Tuatha Dé Danann," "the folk of the goddess Dann," to which Dr. MacCulloch devotes some thirty pages.

In dealing with "The Celtic People," Canon MacCulloch gives us a survey of the various theories of modern scholars concerning the early inhabitants of our islands. He admits the obscurity of the Pictish problem, but thinks that the Celts, by mingling with the aborigines of Europe, must have become a mixed race before their migration to Britain, although the earlier Goidels were far less so than the later Brythons. In mentioning some of the main Celtic characteristics as "excitability, imagination and religiosity passing over easily to superstition," we are reminded of certain aspects of the Welsh Revival on the one hand and of the ignorant credulity of many of the Irish peasantry on the other.

Dr. MacCulloch explains the different significations of the various Gallic and Celtic gods and the growth and extent of the cults in connection with them, and gives a description of the rites and ceremonies which accompanied their worship. "The names of over 400 native deities," he declares, "are known, and only in a very few cases can it be asserted that a god was worshipped over the whole Celtic area by one name, though some gods in Gaul, Britain and Ireland, with different names, have certainly similar functions" (p. 47).

Canon MacCulloch gives a careful criticism of the Irish mythical deities, and compares them with "The gods of the Brythons," and concludes that, "like the divinities of Gaul and Ireland, those of Wales were mainly local in character, and only in a few cases attained a wider popularity and cult" (p. 14). He gives an account of the Cuchulaum and Fionn Sagas, and says that the latter, although possessed of little historical fact, was far more popular than the former, probably because it was a Celticized form of a saga concerning a popular hero of the aboriginal people, many of whom must have survived, and been assimilated with, the conquering Celts. The evidence of ancestral worship amongst the Celts is shown, Dr. MacCulloch thinks, by their practice of burying grave goods with the dead, or slaying wives or slaves on the tomb. There is an account of "Primitive Nature Worship," "Tree and Plant Worship," and "River and Well Worship," and the Canon declares that medieval witchcraft was partly "the old paganism in a new guise." In treating of "Animal Worship," he thinks that the evidence points to the "existence of totemism among the early Celts."

The notion of propitiating deities by human sacrifices was common amongst the Celts, and these were offered sometimes to ward off disease or danger, sometimes vicariously for the lives of a whole town, and sometimes as a thanksgiving after victory. Dr. MacCulloch gives a good account of Celtic festivals, and declares that the legend and procession of Godiva at Coventry is the survival of a pagan cult from which men were excluded.

In an exhaustive and interesting account of the origin, functions and authority of the Druids, Canon MacCulloch combats the views of Sir John Rhys and others that the Druids were a pre-Celtic priesthood, and asserts, on the other hand, that "Druidism covered the whole ground of Celtic religion" and "belonged both to the Goidelic and Gaulish branches of the Celts." Many superstitious Christian customs are merely the survival of Druidical magic. The Druids believed fully in a bodily immortality, although

there is no real evidence that the Celts held any theory of a day of judgment after death, or any idea of moral retribution beyond the grave. Dr. MacCulloch holds that transmigration, except in the case of gods and heroes was not a Celtic belief. "The dead Celt continued to be the person he had been, and it may have been that not a new body, but the old body glorified was tenanted by his soul beyond the grave" (p. 335). With the Celts the world of the dead was an exact replica of this world, only happier.

Dr. MacCulloch concludes with an interesting account of the Celtic "Elysium" the conceptions of which, even though sensuous, are beautiful and inspiring. It is not the world of the dead, but the abode of favoured mortals, the land "where there is immortal youth and peace and every kind of delight" (p. 373).

Those who are interested in pagan customs and superstitions and in mythological tales and legends will find a mine of wealth in these pages, but we do not anticipate that this really scholarly work will ever secure a much wider circle of readers. C. SYDNEY CARTER.

CHURCH ACCOUNTS. By Rev. W. G. Dowsley, B.A. *Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons, Ltd.* Price 6s. 6d. net.

This is not, as might be gathered from its short title, a treatise on how to keep Church accounts, but is a cash-book for use, with a short but clear description of how to keep it. In addition to this, there is a useful model page containing a treasurer's receipts and payments for one month properly entered, and a summary of them. The book may be recommended to the clergy and wardens or others having charge of accounts of this nature. The binding and printing are good.

CHRISTIAN MISSIONS IN BURMA. By W. C. B. PURSER. *S.P.G.* Price 2s. net.

We are much indebted to the S.P.G. for this volume, for literature concerning Missions in Burma is scarce. The country is one of extreme interest, and the work is varied. Besides the Burmans proper, there are hill people, such as the Chins and Karens; there are numerous Tamils and Chinese immigrants, and there are the primitive tribes on the Andaman and Nicobar Islands, to say nothing of the Europeans and the domiciled community. Mr. Purser is at his best when describing the work on the islands, and in the chapters dealing with the Roman Catholic and the Baptist Missions. His brief sketch of the life of Adoniram Judson is more living than anything else in the book. In recording the work of the S.P.G. Mission, the detail is too great for broad effects, and a strong impress is not made. In the closing chapter, "Burma for Christ," one looks for a deeper, fuller note. After such missionary surveys as "The Reproach of Islam" or "The Future of Africa," one desires more for the Burman Buddhist than this: "The hope of the missionary is that Christianity will give to the Burman the power to perform the moral code with which he is already acquainted, and will provide him with that stiffening in which his character is at present deficient." The whole trend of Mr. Purser's book shows that he realizes that the Burman needs not only Christianity, but Christ. We wish this had rung out clearly at the close; it would have evoked more response.

"YAKUSU," THE VERY HEART OF AFRICA. By H. Sutton Smith. *Marshall Brothers.* Price 6s. net.

This book is delightfully easy to read, but difficult to classify. It is, on the one hand, a fresh and simply written record of life in and around one Baptist Mission station far up the Congo, full of incidents of native life, touches of humour, and quaint sayings and tales. On the other hand, it is one of the most valuable contributions to the scientific study of Missions which has been issued since the Edinburgh Conference. The book shows clear perception of the significance of things, close and accurate observation, and a marked power of generalization from first-hand evidence. To take one illustrative extract only, in the chapter on language we read: "The longer the student is acquainted with the Bantu languages of Africa, the greater does his respect for them become. He never tires of his language work, for it is exhilarating to make an utterance and to see the gleam of interest when a thought has been idiomatically expressed. *It is the eyes of the old men that will reward him most.*" (The italics are ours.) In its delicacy of perception and its reverential appreciation this book is the "Cranford" of missionary records. Apart from that, the story of the rooting of the Christian Church in "the world of the Lokele" is of thrilling interest, and the marvellous transformation amongst these "ex-cannibals" is inspiring in the highest degree. The thoughtful student chary of overloading his library shelves, and the vicar's wife who seeks "something interesting to read at the working-party," will alike find in "Yakusu" a book worth while to possess.

THE CHURCH IN GREATER BRITAIN. By the Ven. Archdeacon Wynne. *S.P.G.* Price 1s. 6d.

This is a third edition of the "Donellan Lectures," delivered before the University of Dublin in 1900-1901. The figures have been revised and brought up to date, and some new matter added concerning recent expansion in Canada. The seven lectures deal, first, with early Missions from the British Isles, and with the Church in the American Colonies; then follows records of Anglican work in Canada, Australia, and Tasmania, the Province of New Zealand, the West Indian Province, and the South African Province. There is a supplementary chapter on the Church in the lesser colonial possessions, and a number of valuable notes. The literary style is good, and the book abounds in well-arranged facts drawn from wide sources. No revision can remove the disadvantage in a book of this sort of the ten years which have elapsed since the lectures were given; it is not only figures, but the whole line of approach to colonial questions which has changed. But, for all purposes of reference the lectures have high value, and furnish an admirable background for newer knowledge.

LITTLE TALKS ON BIG SUBJECTS. By Florence Northcroft. London: *H. R. Allenson, Ltd.* Price 1s. 6d. net.

These are a series of papers for men and women, written by "Mrs. Cheerful" for the columns of the *Church Army Gazette*, now collected into an attractive volume. They are bright and homely talks, well suited for mothers' meetings, etc.

HOLY BIBLE. Tercentenary Edition. *Oxford University Press.*

This edition of the Bible is remarkable for three things—a specially corrected text, a new system of references which concentrates at a typical passage the more important

occurrences of the word elsewhere, and at all other places refers to the central passage, and a new and useful method of paragraphing. Certainly it is one of the best editions of the Authorized Version that we have seen.

MECHANICAL INVENTIONS OF TO-DAY. By Thomas W. Corbin. London: *Seeley, Service and Co.* Price 5s. net.

Just the book to give to a mechanically minded boy, containing in simple language the story of the more important inventions of modern days, clearly illustrated.

MEDICAL SCIENCE OF TO-DAY. By Wilmott Evans, M.D. London: *Seeley, Service and Co.* Price 5s. net.

A popular account of modern medical processes, including chapters on germs, X rays, and many such-like things. It is written to inform the mind, and not to be used in place of the family doctor.

THE ROMANCE OF AERONAUTICS. By Charles C. Turner. London: *Seeley, Service and Co.* Price 5s.

A general account of the attempt to conquer the air, beginning with the many failures of the early days and tracing the history down to the triumphs of to-day. Many will be glad to read so brightly written a book.

SERMONS ON SOCIAL SUBJECTS. By Percy Dearmer, M.A. London: *Robert Scott.* Price 2s. net.

A series of sermons preached last Lent under the auspices of the Christian Social Union. The sermons are all worth reading, but the three most striking are those by the Rev. J. E. Watts Ditchfield on "The Alien and the Anarchist"; by Dr. A. J. Carlyle on "The Christian Conception of Property"; and by Canon Scott Holland on "The House at Bethany."

FORE AND AFT. By E. Keble Chatterton. London: *Seeley, Service and Co.* Price 16s. net.

A ponderous tome, excellently illustrated, telling the story of the sailing-ship of the smaller kind from the first attempts to make a boat until this century of ours, when the steam pinnace or the electric launch is beginning to drive even the small sailing-boat from the sea. A book which will be read with interest by all sea-faring folk who have caught something of the romantic spirit of the sea.

THINGS SEEN IN VENICE. By Lonsdale Ragg, B.A., and Laura M. Ragg. London: *Seeley, Service and Co.* Price 2s. net.

An excellent guide-book, without the wearisome details of Baedeker. If you can go to Venice, take it with you; if not, you will get a better idea of the place and its romantic associations in no other way than with its aid. The illustrations are excellent; the letter-press even better.

PAPERS ON THE DOCTRINE OF THE EUCHARISTIC PRESENCE. By Rev. N. Dimock. 2 vols. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 5s. net each.

This is another addition to the memorial edition of Mr. Dimock's works. It is a mine of information in these difficult days. It ought to be in the library of every clergyman and thoughtful layman. We are very thankful that it is in two volumes, for in one it was somewhat bulky, and we are particularly grateful for the excellent index, which makes its contents easily available.

LIFE AFTER DEATH. By T. A. Carmichael. London: *D. Hardwick.* Price 9d.

The Queen Mother has called this "a beautiful and comforting little book," and we feel sure that many a bereaved one will find it so.

THE ATONEMENT OF OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST. By Rev. John Cullen, D.D. Nottingham: *Sisson and Parker.* Price 1s.

Dr. Cullen is a clear thinker and a thoughtful student. His book is short, but it goes to the root of the matter, and presents a view of the Atonement which no one can ignore, and which we believe alone satisfies the claims of Scripture upon it.

THE CHRISTIAN TEACHING OF COIN MOTTOES. By Rev. W. Allan, D.D. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 3s. 6d.

A very interesting study in a neglected field. Dr. Allan is evidently an expert in the matter of coins, and he knows how to draw from these old mottoes many a useful piece of teaching.

HEROES OF MODERN AFRICA. By Edward Gilliat. London: *Seeley, Service and Co.* Price 5s.

Stories of great discoverers, great soldiers, and great administrators, told brightly and clearly. It is much better for a boy to read such stories as these, which will not only

amuse but will educate, than to give all his time to the highly coloured stories of adventure which have no basis in fact.

THE HISTORICAL GROWTH OF THE ENGLISH PARISH CHURCH. By A. H. Thompson. *Cambridge University Press.* Price 1s. net.

We have already had from the same writer a little book on "The Ground Plan of the English Parish Church." This is intended to supplement that earlier book, and we can warmly commend it to those who would know something of the buildings and furniture of the old churches, so many of which we are glad to possess.

SCRIPTURAL AND CATHOLIC TRUTH AND WORSHIP. By Rev. F. Meyrick, M.A. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 1s. net.

We are glad to think that a new edition of this book has been demanded, and we are grateful indeed that it has been possible to publish it at so small a price. We have reviewed it before, and need only say now that every loyal Churchman ought to possess it, and, possessing it, to read it.

THE CAVE OF HANUMAN. By Mrs. Hobart-Hampden. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 1s. 6d.

This book is the story of an English family who go out to India for a year. It is quite a thrilling account altogether, and the adventures of the children and their marvellous escapes make it impossible to put the book down till it is finished. The authoress is evidently quite at home in India, and as one reads one sees with her eyes the Indian village, the faithful Sambo, and the cave of Hanuman.

THE STORY OF HELEN. By M. F. Hutchinson. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 3s. 6d.

Helen's story is most romantic and interesting, and girls in their early "teens" will delight in it. After her early life spent in the country with her aunt, she goes to London, and hears on her nineteenth birthday that she is an heiress to a large fortune. Travel abroad and a London season nearly spoil her, but her early training triumphs and all ends well. A girl friend who is poor nearly loses her little all while playing bridge, and Helen realizes what it will mean to her; they both resolve to do better with their money in the future, be it little or much. Many other people come into Helen's story, and they are quite worth knowing. The moral tone is high throughout, but there is nothing distinctly religious in the tale.

Received: THE BELLS OF IS. By F. B. Meyer. THE WAY TO GOD. By D. L. Moody. PLEASURE AND PROFIT IN BIBLE STUDY. By D. L. Moody. London: *Morgan and Scott.* Price 1s. net. each. Three volumes of the Golden Treasury Series, printed in a new and cheaper form. GIFTS AND GRACES and A LITTLE GARNER OF SONNETS. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 6d. each. Two little booklets, in prose and poetry, prettily got up for gift purposes. THE HEIR OF REDCLIFFE. By Charlotte M. Yonge. London: *T. Nelson.* Price 6d. THE TABLE OF THE LORD. By the Rev. D. M. McIntyre. London: *Morgan and Scott.* Price 3d. A little manual for communicants by a well-known Nonconformist. THINGS SEEN IN NORTHERN INDIA. By T. L. Pennell. London: *Seeley and Co.* Price 2s. Another volume of this admirable series. STRENGTH FROM QUIETNESS. By M. Giles. London: *Longmans.* Price 2s. net. A book of devotion for invalids, written from a high Anglican point of view. ON GUARD. By Amy Debenham. London: *R. Scott.* A series of homely readings for soldiers and working men. OUR GIVING. By J. Forbes Moncrieff. London: *Morgan and Scott.* Price 1s. net. An exhortation to increase liberality. ILLUMINATED TEXT CARDS FOR THE NEW YEAR. London: *Morgan and Scott.* A particularly beautiful series of motto cards for 1912. THROUGH THE HEART OF PATAGONIA. By H. H. Prichard. London: *T. Nelson and Sons.* Price 1s. net. An interesting story of an almost unknown land. THE ROAD. By Frank Saville. London: *T. Nelson.* Price 7d. net. CHRIST'S MESSAGE OF THE KINGDOM. By Professor Hogg. London: *T. and T. Clark.* Price 1s. 6d. net. A series of simple Bible studies for intelligent readers. A LITTLE BOOK OF EFFORT. By F. J. Cross. London: *Simpkin, Marshall.* Price 1s. net. Fifty-two virtues to be acquired a week at a time in a year, and a method of dating success or failure. THE SONG OF THE SHEPHERD KING. By R. C. Burr. London: *C. J. Thynne.* Price 1s. net. A happily written and devotional study of the twenty-third Psalm. CAROLS. Ancient and Modern. Books I. and II. London: *Morgan and Scott.* Price 6d. each. Two simple books of sensible carols. THE BOOK WE ALL WRITE. By Rev. W. Muir. London: *Morgan and Scott.* Price 1s. net. A devotional booklet dealing with memory, conscience, acquirement, character. THE HERALD OF MERCY ANNUAL. For 1911. London: *Morgan and Scott.* Price 1s. net. The annual volume of the well-known Evangelistic Monthly. PICTURES OF PALESTINE. By Rev. G. Robinson Lees. London: *Longmans.* Price 4d. net per set. A set of separate pictures for teaching stories of Bible life to children.