Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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

https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb

PayPal https://paypal.me/robbradshaw

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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

April, 1912.

The Month.

The Coal Strike.

THE coal strike is laying, as we write these paragraphs, a cold and devastating hand on the whole of England. We can only hope and pray that before our words appear in print a settlement will have been reached on lines that are fair and equitable to all. Into the rights and wrongs of the question at issue we cannot enter here. We neither have the requisite data at our disposal, nor have we the training and experience which would enable us to estimate the data rightly. We acknowledge, as all fair-minded men must, that the work of a miner is so arduous and so dangerous that it should meet with very adequate remuneration. On the other hand, it may fairly be questioned whether it should be possible for one group of workers to paralyze—if they choose to do so—the whole life of the country. In France, Germany, America, even in our own Colonies, no such thing would be permitted. The machinery exists for preventing it in States that are republican as well as under less popular forms of government. In a sense trades unionism is on its trial. So far as it exists to maintain the rights of the worker and to better his lot it performs a useful work. If it essays the more ambitious rôle of controlling the destinies of the country by the exercise of autocratic power, then society will have no option but to check the power of the unions and confine them within more reasonable limits.

Democracy.

Our contemporary, the *British Weekly*, contained an article in its issue of March 17, in which the miners' strike gives occasion to a general discussion of the view and aims of modern democracy. The writer regards the extension of the franchise in 1884 as the means whereby "Democracy marched bravely forward to its seat, the unquestioned and irresistible master of the Empire." At the bottom of the present unrest lies the determination of the people "to have a fuller, a better, an easier, a happier life." Many things have combined to stimulate the determination—the spread of education, the decay of deference, the ostentatious luxury of the rich, the general emancipation of the mind from merely traditional views of things. Its accomplishment has been hindered by lack of unity. Now the unity is coming about. The railway strike and the miners' strike, particularly the latter, are significant illustrations. Then the article proceeds to comfort the disquieted by showing that there are limits to the power of labour, and the people cannot fight for ever against economic facts, and closes by indicating the duty and the privilege of the Christian Church. "The only hope for Demos is that Demos should be Christian." There is something of politics in the article, but in the main it is helpful, and we have ventured to refer to it because of that helpfulness, and because we would add something to it.

The great need is to remember that Demos means the whole people, or ought to. *Senatus populusque Romanus* is a better way of speaking of a nation than to talk of plebeians or patricians, much better than to divide into "the idle rich" and "the wastrel poor." There are idle rich and there are wastrel poor; but we are optimists enough to believe that the majority in the one case are not idle and in the other not wastrel. There is too great a tendency to speak of the classes as if they were separate entities, sometimes to set class against class, and to inflame the passions of the one by exaggerating the faults of the other. We cannot altogether acquit some of our great politicians in this matter. It will do harm, it must do harm,

and we must set ourselves by word and by example to prove that the interests of one class are the interests of the other, the interests of each the interests of the whole.

The Decay of Deference.

We presume the *British Weekly* means something more than the decay of old-fashioned courtesy—a decay in some ways to be greatly deplored. It is, however, but one symptom of the general decay. Authority, it matters not of what kind, stands for little with some folk. The suffragette smashing windows, the passive resister refusing his rates, the motorist heedlessly rushing through villages at forty miles an hour, the ritualist treating rubrics, laws, and vows with lofty disdain, the trades union repudiating a bargain, are all instances of this tendency to sit loose to the claims of authority, whatever the authority be. "The powers that be are ordained of God" is old-fashioned and early Victorian, but it is Pauline and Scriptural. To ignore it is to desert the Christian standpoint; and if we are going to bring the democracy to that Christian standpoint, the Church and the Churches must put their own house in order. Is it not time to appeal for a general review of the position from the plainly Christian point of view? The Church must carry its message to Demos with clean hands, and few hands are quite clean just now.

Sunday.

Here is another and a significant illustration of the decay of deference. We are faced by the fact that the very Government of the land, in the person of the War Minister, finds itself compelled to make an apology for the desecration of Sunday in the interests of efficiency in war. The *Times*, of March 4, contains an official paragraph making public what was evidently said to the Bishops and representatives of the Free Churches, who interviewed the War Office. The Army Council do not wish us to encourage lack of deference to Sunday. The paragraph runs:

"The Army Council have no wish to do anything to increase a tendency to regard Sunday as other than a day of rest, or to interfere with the general

desire in any district to preserve the quiet and peacefulness of the Sabbath Careful instructions are being given on this subject."

They add that they are giving orders that those attending for musketry on that day shall be able, if they desire it, to be present at a Church parade or other religious service. But we do not feel quite happy about it. If our social conditions do not admit of proper facilities for military training on other days than Sunday, our social conditions need overhauling. Religion is being crushed out by the exigencies of secular things, but the real moral welfare of the people will go with it. We venture to believe that the religious life of the nation is as valuable as its military efficiency. Britain will become a decadent power only if she be untrue to God. Accurate marksmanship is a good thing; but true religion is a better. In some minds the "big battalions" theory seems to loom large. Woe to Britain if either nation or Government adopt it!

Convent Schools.

The Archbishop of Canterbury never allows himself to be suspected of being a scaremonger. His words are always sane, considered, and unexaggerated. In his recent charge he took occasion to speak a timely warning against the use of convent schools by members of the Church of England. These schools are always cheap, the education is generally excellent, and—the danger considerable. The Archbishop writes, and his words are entirely worthy of reproduction:

"What is not very comprehensible and by no means admirable is the unwisdom, to use no stronger word, of the English parent who, either from mere indifference—or more probably in reliance on the promise given, and doubtless kept, that his daughter will in the school receive no direct religious instruction from those good sisters—places a little girl, at the most susceptible age, under influences and amid surroundings which must a few years later bear the fruit which is to be expected from what she has unconsciously imbibed from companions as well as teachers in schooldays spent under those conditions. If that parental apathy or thoughtlessness seems to us not very comprehensible, may one explanation perhaps be that our own Church has not given the attention it requires to the duty of making adequate provision for this particular need on terms which are within the reach of such parents? I commend the matter earnestly to the consideration of all who

care (and who is there that does not care ?) that our Church should take its proper part in thus shaping the mind and character of those who will in a few years' time hold a large place in the young motherhood of England."

New Testament Revision.

The fact that an influential deputation has approached the Archbishop of Canterbury in connection with a proposed further revision of the New Testament is to be welcomed as an indication, not only of great zeal for and interest in God's Word, but also of the desire that Englishmen should possess it in the most faultless form possible in their mother tongue. When we come to the question of the best way to effect this, the Archbishop's wise cautions may well serve to check over-hasty action. There is this much to be said for revision. The researches and discoveries of the last thirty years have undoubtedly thrown a flood of light on the vernacular Greek in which the New Testament books are for the most part, written ; and any translation that might be made now ought naturally to profit by that additional information. But it is, perhaps, early to attempt a further revision, and attempts made by separate scholars may be welcomed as preliminaries to work on a larger scale. If anyone wishes to see the Epistle to the Romans rendered by a scholar who not only entered into the mind of St. Paul, but had a most sympathetic appreciation of St. Paul's use of language, let him read the translation of the Epistle by the late Head Master of Westminster, W. G. Rutherford. He will find that familiar passages glow with new life and added meaning.

Divinity Degrees at Cambridge.

We have heard with the greatest delight of the memorial addressed by the Cambridge Professor of Divinity to the Vice-Chancellor of the University. It is a petition that the condition restricting Divinity degrees to "clerks in Holy Orders in the Church of England" may be removed. The Bishop of Durham, when placing a veto on a similar proposal advocated by the Senate of the University of Durham, said : "I did not feel justified in taking a line which would have allowed Durham to lead the way where it is fitter,

as I think, that the older Universities should first show their mind and take action." A request that is backed by Professors Swete, Bethune-Baker, Burkett, Emery Barnes, and Stanton, cannot lightly be disregarded, and it is gratifying to know that the Council of the Senate has lost no time in giving a favourable and sympathetic answer. The proposal may have many obstacles to encounter before it can be carried into effect, but it is a matter of the greatest significance that it should have been made at all, and made under such powerful auspices. For ourselves, we hold that whatever may be said for "unhappy divisions" in things ecclesiastical, they should not be allowed to persist in academic circles. Co-operation in religious study may prove to be a long step towards the wished-for reunion of separated Churches.

Divinity Degrees at Oxford.

Oxford, too, is not to lag behindhand in this movement for reform. What is taking place there may be best ascertained from a passage in the *Oxford Magazine* of March 7, which we transcribe as it stands :

"For some little time there have been whispers that important reforms were contemplated in the Theological Faculty. But as the secret (in the first instance an Oxford secret) has been divulged at Cambridge to the Press, we may confirm the truth of the rumours. Reforms of an interesting and far-reaching kind are likely to be introduced soon, prompted and outlined by the professors and the other members of the Faculty. The principles of the changes are two, viz.—(1) That the University can no longer undertake to act on behalf of the Church of England in the character of its official representative; and (2) that as there are at present a number of its students who are not members of the Church of England, but who can nevertheless justly claim access to its highest degrees, such restrictions as exist should be removed, and it should be clearly understood that the examinations and degrees are only tests of knowledge, and are entirely independent of membership in any particular religious body. It is unnecessary to take in detail here the specific applications of these principles. In themselves they appear to us to be justly and reasonably conceived. The measures which will be proposed are sure, we think, of a good welcome from the University, for there is little doubt but that they will greatly strengthen the position of theological learning in Oxford and in England."

Those who are resident in Oxford and engaged in tutorial work there will doubtless welcome such a change. It is not so

certain, however, that they will be received with equal warmth by Oxford clerical graduates scattered throughout the country. We can only trust that in this case counsels of wisdom and justice will prevail, and that there may be no organized opposition to this most necessary reform.

Professor Lock's Article.

The forecast of the *Oxford Magazine* is confirmed and amplified by Professor Lock's article in the *Guardian* of March 8. We learn from it that events at Cambridge are exactly paralleled by events at Oxford. Here, too, every one of the Divinity Professors has joined in the petition to the Hebdomadal Council that the existing restrictions on Divinity degrees may be removed. Professor Lock has not only signed the petition, but goes on to support it by a most able and convincing *apologia*. Coming from him—one of the last men to be suspected of disloyalty either to the Church of England or the University of Oxford—the *apologia* can hardly fail to carry very great weight. He speaks of three positive gains that may be expected to flow from the change: (1) The University will have taken the initiative in "the recognition of a just claim"; (2) the possibility will be secured for raising the standard required for degrees in Divinity; (3) inasmuch as the University is no longer qualified to act as the representative of the Church and confer degrees in her name, legislation might be passed in the University which would seriously compromise the Church. By the present separation any such compromising action would be made impossible. We hope Professor Lock's able plea will receive all the attention it so well merits.

Training of Ordination Candidates.

One of the convincing signs that the Church of England is determined to set its house in order is the prominence being given in both the Southern and the Northern Houses of Convocation to the subject of training candidates for Holy Orders. Few people would deny that the proper training—when it can be secured—consists in

graduation at a University, followed by more specific training in theology and preparation for pastoral work. This, in an ordinary way, would mean a five years', or at the least a four years', course. The Bishops on the whole are clear that this is the ideal; the practical problem is: Can it be realized? Many who have had long experience in these matters gravely doubt it. And if each Bishop reserves to himself the right to make exceptions in exceptional cases, there is every probability that these will prove to be very numerous. A practical way of advancing towards the ideal is either to plant hostels for Churchmen in cities where Universities are already established, or to enter into connection, as many of the theological colleges have done, with the University of Durham in such a way that the student receives his special training for the ministry at his own college, and graduates in Arts after a year's further residence at Durham. This system is, perhaps, not ideal, but it contains the germ of still better possibilities.

The Psalm of the Crucifixion.

By Lieut.-Col. W. H. TURTON, D.S.O.

IT is proposed in this paper to consider what is called the Messianic interpretation of Psalm xxii. The subject is, of course, an old one, having been discussed from the time of Justin Martyr onwards; but still (so far as I am aware) the points of agreement do not seem to have been all brought together before in a plain and simple manner. What we shall do, then, is to take the Psalm as it stands, verse by verse, in the Revised Version, and see how remarkably it agrees with the events at the close of Christ's life.

1. *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?*
Why art thou so far from helping me, and from the words of my roaring?

To begin with, the *Sufferer*, as we may call the subject of this Psalm, shortly before he died (ver. 15), felt forsaken by God. And not only was this the case with Christ when He was crucified, but He used these actual words—"My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" And when doing so, we are told, He *cried with a loud voice*,[1] which is a very similar expression to *roaring*.

2. *O my God, I cry in the day-time, but thou answerest not;*
And in the night season, and am not silent.

But for a time God seemed to abandon him. The words *in the night season* must evidently refer to the *previous* night, as it was now daytime (ver. 7), and the Sufferer died soon afterwards. And they are thus very applicable to Christ's praying during the previous night in Gethsemane.

3. *But thou art holy,*
O thou that inhabitest the praises of Israel.

And yet the Sufferer, in spite of his troubles, casts no reproach upon God; whoever else was to blame, it was not

[1] Matt. xxvii. 46.

God's fault. While the reference to the *praises of Israel* shows that he belonged to God's chosen people, the Jews; which also, of course, agrees with the case of Christ.

4. *Our fathers trusted in thee;*
They trusted, and thou didst deliver them.

This also shows that the Sufferer was a Jew, by his speaking of *our* fathers. And though the expression, if it stood alone, would imply that he was speaking in the name of others as well as himself, this cannot be its meaning here. For in the rest of the Psalm the words *I*, *my*, and *me* are used over and over again, and in such a way as to make it clear that they refer to a single person.

5. *They cried unto thee, and were delivered;*
They trusted in thee, and were not ashamed.

And the Jews had often been helped by God before, which seems contrasted with His apparent indifference in the present case. For it is plain that the Sufferer, like his fathers, trusted in God, only he was *not* delivered.

6. *But I am a worm, and no man;*
A reproach of men, and despised of the people.

And now the Sufferer describes his pitiable condition. The term *worm* suggests something that was thought utterly weak and helpless; and in this state he was subjected to the reproach of men, and despised by the people.

And how well it agrees with the case of Christ must be obvious to all. For when He was crucified, He was in the most weak and helpless condition possible; and in this state He was both *reproached* by the chief priests and others, for His supposed claim to destroy the temple; and *despised* by the common people, who had just chosen a murderer instead.

7. *All they that see me laugh me to scorn;*
They shoot out the lip, they shake the head, saying,

Moreover, he was lifted up to die in public, so that those who passed by could see him; and they mocked him, shaking their heads, etc. All of which implies that it was a lingering death like *crucifixion*, where the person is exposed for hours to

the ridicule of his enemies; and would not be suitable for other kinds of death, such as stoning or beheading.

And the words "they laugh me *to scorn*" imply that the Sufferer had made some claims or pretensions which had (apparently) been proved to be untrue. Such an expression could scarcely be used of an ordinary criminal, who had never made any claims at all; but would be most suitable for a false prophet, or a pretended Messiah.

And again every detail exactly agrees with the case of Christ. He was crucified near a public road, so that those who passed by could see Him; He had made tremendous claims; He was laughed to scorn by the people for the apparent failure of these claims; and the way they did this was by shaking their heads at Him, and saying, etc.[1]

8. *Commit thyself unto the Lord; let him deliver him:*
Let him deliver him, seeing he delighteth in him.

Or as it is in the margin,

He trusted on the Lord that he would deliver him:
Let him deliver him, seeing he delighteth in him.

And here we have the actual words they used. The second reading seems preferable, since inserting *thyself*, which does not occur in the Hebrew, introduces needless confusion into the verse. For if it begins "Commit *thyself* unto the Lord," it ought to continue "let Him deliver *thee*."

And the last clause can, of course, only be meant ironically, in the sense that the Sufferer *claimed* that God delighted in him—claimed, that is, in some special sense to be beloved by God. And it was apparently because of this claim that the people *laughed him to scorn.*

And then as to the fulfilment. The words used by the chief priests when mocking Christ on the Cross are thus given by St. Matthew: *He trusteth on God; let him deliver him now, if he desireth him; for he said, I am the Son of God.*[2] The agreement is practically complete; and yet it is difficult to deny its fulfilment, as a more probable incident under the circumstances can scarcely be imagined. Christ, it will be remembered, had

[1] John xix. 20; Mark xv. 29. [2] Matt. xxvii. 43.

just claimed, at His trial, to be the Son of God, and the chief priests, knowing this, naturally quoted the familiar, and, as they thought, most appropriate, language (just as men sometimes quote the Bible now), without thinking of its real significance.

Moreover, supposing the words were never uttered, is it conceivable that the Evangelist, or anyone else, would have invented them, merely to get a pretended fulfilment of this Psalm; and yet have never pointed out the agreement himself, but have trusted to the chance of his readers discovering it?

It should also be noticed that the reference to the *Lord* (Jehovah) shows that the speakers themselves were Jews. And as they were the ordinary passers-by (*all they that see me*), it follows that the Sufferer was put to death among his own nation; which also agrees with the case of Christ.

9. *But thou art he that took me out of the womb;*
Thou didst make me trust when I was upon my mother's breasts.

And now the Sufferer implies that the taunt of his enemies, as to God's delighting in him, was really true. The opening words cannot, of course, be pressed literally; but they certainly show that the Sufferer was in some very special sense beloved by God, and that God had (if we may so express it) taken an interest in him when he was still in the womb. This is the natural meaning of the words, just as to go and release a man from prison would imply taking an interest in him when he was still in prison. While the second clause, though perhaps of general significance, is anyhow very appropriate to some signal act of deliverance, which God had vouchsafed to him when he was quite young.

And again, it is needless to point out how entirely all this agrees with the case of Christ. He was in a very special sense beloved by God; God had taken an interest in Him when He was still in the womb, sending an angel to announce His name and work;[1] and God had saved Him in His infancy from being slain by Herod. This last was a signal act of deliverance, that might well make Him *trust* in God from His earliest years.

[1] Matt. i. 21; *cf.* Isa. xlix. 1, 5.

10. *I was cast upon thee from the womb:*
Thou art my God from my mother's belly.

This again implies that God had watched over him from his infancy, and that the Sufferer in return had dedicated his whole life to God; so that he could say that God had been *his* God, even from his birth. It, of course, exactly agrees with the case of Christ.

11. *Be not far from me; for trouble is near;*
For there is none to help.

This also agrees with Christ's having been forsaken by all His disciples just before His Crucifixion; so that when trouble was near, there was none to help.

12. *Many bulls have compassed me:*
Strong bulls of Bashan have beset me round.

But though the Sufferer was abandoned by his friends, he was surrounded by his enemies, described as *bulls of Bashan.* This curious term is used elsewhere for the unjust rulers of the people, the *mighty*, the *princes*, those *which oppress the poor*, etc.[1] And as it is never used for anyone else, we must give it this meaning here. It is therefore very appropriate to the chief priests and rulers, who had so unjustly procured Christ's condemnation, and who now stood round the Cross reviling Him.[2] Of course there were many others with them, but this is also implied in the verse.

The custom of thus speaking of men as if they were animals, which seems to us so extraordinary, was thoroughly Eastern, and occurs repeatedly in the Bible. And it does not cause as much confusion as we might have expected, since the meaning of the words can generally be ascertained from other passages.

13. *They gape upon me with their mouth,*
As a ravening and a roaring lion.

This verse again implies that the Sufferer was exposed to die in the presence of his enemies, who stood round mocking him, *gaping with the mouth* being a common expression of

[1] Ezek. xxxix. 18; Amos iv. 1.
[2] Matt. xxvii. 41; Luke xxiii. 35.

contempt.[1] It is therefore specially suitable for a death by *crucifixion*. And it exactly agrees with the case of Christ, whose enemies did, as a matter of fact, stand round the Cross mocking Him.

While as to the other details, *ravening* was appropriate to the way in which the chief priests and people had thirsted for His blood, when they kept demanding His death from Pilate, and *roaring* to the great noise and tumult they made when doing so.[2]

14. *I am poured out like water.*
And all my bones are out of joint:
My heart is like wax;
It is melted in the midst of my bowels.

Three points have to be noticed here. First, the Sufferer was "poured out like water," which, though a curious expression, quite suits the case of Christ, whose side was pierced, so that there poured out a quantity of watery fluid mixed with clots of blood. And this is the more remarkable, as it was not a usual accompaniment of crucifixion; and it evidently made a great impression on the Evangelist who saw it. The agreement, however, would (probably) have been more exact if this detail had been placed just after, instead of just before the death.

Secondly, the Sufferer's bones were out of joint. And this, on the other hand, might easily occur in *crucifixion*, through the weight of the suspended body (in spite of its having some kind of support), but would be most unlikely in other forms of death.

Lastly, there is the puzzling reference to the heart. But it has been recently shown by doctors that the immediate cause of Christ's death was probably rupture of the heart, due to excessive strain; and this provides an unexpected fulfilment.[3]

And here, as in other cases, the applicability of the verse to Christ is rendered all the more striking by its being so hopelessly inapplicable to anyone else. David, for instance (as far

[1] *E.g.*, Job xvi. 10; Lam. ii. 16. [2] Matt. xxvii. 23, 24.
[3] See "The Physical Cause of the Death of Christ," by Dr. Symes Thompson. 1904.

as we know), was never in any sense poured out like water, nor was he ever in any position likely to put his bones out of joint, and still less did he rupture his heart.

15. *My strength is dried up like a potsherd;*
And my tongue cleaveth to my jaws;
And thou hast brought me into the dust of death.

And now we come to his final sufferings. His *strength being dried up* was evidently a sign of extreme *weakness*. This would have been quite natural in the closing stages of *crucifixion*, but would scarcely have occurred in other forms of capital punishment, such as beheading, hanging, drowning, or stoning. And it must have been specially true in the case of Christ, considering all He had gone through the previous night, without, apparently, either food or rest.

And the *tongue cleaving to the jaws* was evidently (from the way in which the term is used elsewhere[1]) a sign of extreme *thirst*. This is another well-known accompaniment of *crucifixion*, though not of other kinds of death. And how well it agrees with the case of Christ scarcely needs pointing out, for of all His sufferings it was the only one that drew from Him a single word. And, in exact agreement with the Psalm, this occurred immediately before His death.[2]

The Sufferer's *death*, it will be noticed, is not ascribed, like the rest of his sufferings, to any human agent, but directly to God, as if to show that it had some special significance.[3] The only other instance in the whole Psalm in which such language is used refers to his *birth* (ver. 9, "*Thou* art he," etc.), and it is certainly curious that both the birth and death should be thus ascribed to God. The Sufferer seems to have felt that his whole life was one of supreme interest in the sight of God.

16. *For dogs have compassed me;*
The assembly of evil-doers have inclosed me;
They pierced my hands and my feet.

Having now described his various sufferings up to the moment of death, the cause of this (which had only been hinted at before) is here definitely stated. He was brought into the

[1] Lam. iv. 4. [2] John xix. 28-30. [3] *Cf.* Isa. liii. 10.

dust of death, *for* (or *because*) the evil-doers had pierced his hands and feet. His death was thus due to *crucifixion*. And this is the more remarkable, as it was not a *Jewish* punishment, though dead bodies were sometimes hung on trees.[1]

And yet, as we have seen, verse 8 clearly shows that the Sufferer was put to death among his own countrymen. This strange anomaly of a Jew being put to death among Jews, and yet not in the Jewish manner by stoning, but by crucifixion, exactly suits the time of Christ, when Judæa was a Roman province, and crucifixion a Roman punishment.

It must also be noted that the men who crucified Him—the assembly of evil-doers—are here called *dogs*. They were apparently a distinct set of men, and different from the Jews, who had before been mocking Him. And, curiously enough, this was the very term used by Christ Himself for the *Gentiles*, in distinction to the Jews, since, in reply to a Gentile woman, He said He was only sent to the House of Israel; and that it was not meet to take the children's bread and cast it to *dogs*.[2] The term was thus peculiarly appropriate to the Gentile (Roman) soldiers who crucified Him.

17. *I may tell all my bones;*
They look and stare upon me.

They also exposed and stretched out his body, so that the bones (ankles, knees, elbows, etc.) stood out in relief, and could thus be counted. And once more it is *crucifixion*, rather than any other kind of death, for which the words seem appropriate.

And then they stayed to watch him, which also implies that it was a lingering death like *crucifixion*, and that the executioners remained as a sort of guard. Such language would be quite unsuitable for the death of St. John the Baptist, or of St. James, or of many other martyrs.

This is, indeed, the *eighth* detail, in these *five* verses, which suits crucifixion rather than other kinds of death. While, as we have seen, they contain two others (being poured out like water, and rupturing the heart), which, though they do not as a

[1] Deut. xxi. 22.

[2] Matt. xv. 26.

rule occur in crucifixion, yet did so in the case of Christ. Anything more precise than all this can scarcely be desired.

18. *They part my garments among them,*
And upon my vesture do they cast lots.

The men who crucified him also divided his garments among them, casting lots for one of them. And this, though only a trifle, is interesting for several reasons. In the first place, it was *not* (as far as we know) the custom among the Jews for the executioners of anyone to divide his clothes among them, and no instance of it occurs in the Old Testament. On the other hand, it *was* the custom among the Romans; the clothes of a prisoner being often taken as the perquisites of the guards who executed him. This difference was probably due to the fact that the Jews did not strip a prisoner before execution, while the Romans (at all events in the case of crucifixion) generally did. It thus forms another point in which the Psalm suits *crucifixion* rather than other kinds of death.

And then as to the method of dividing the clothes. The expressions used in the Psalm, like many of the parallel clauses in Hebrew poetry, are not mere repetitions. They indicate two distinct, though somewhat similar acts—parting the *garments* (plural) and casting lots for the *vesture* (singular). And not only does St. John say that all this actually occurred in the case of Christ,[1] but it is extremely probable that it should have done so. For Edersheim has shown that the usual dress of the Jews at the time consisted of four articles of about equal value (the turban, cloak, girdle, and sandals), and one (the inner coat or tunic) of greater value.[2] And therefore that the four soldiers, who were usually employed for such work, should each take one of the less valuable articles, and then cast lots for the more valuable one, is exactly what we should expect.

These last few details, it will be noticed, *and these only* (piercing the hands and feet, exposing the body so that the bones stood out, keeping watch over the Sufferer, dividing his

[1] John xix. 23, 24.
[2] Edersheim, "Life and Times of the Messiah," vol. ii., p. 590. 1883.

clothes among them, and casting lots for one of them), are ascribed to the *dogs*, or *assembly of evil-doers* of verse 16. It is implied (as said before) that they were a distinct set of men, apparently Gentiles, and different from the passers-by and mockers of verses 6-8, who were evidently Jews. And as a matter of fact, these were the very things that were done by the Gentile soldiers who crucified Christ. So here is another complete series of agreements.

19. *But be not thou far off, O Lord;*
O thou my succour, haste thee to help me.

Then follows a short prayer. It is, however, only a prayer for *deliverance*, and not in any sense for forgiveness, still less for vengeance on his enemies. Indeed, all through the Psalm the Sufferer never hints that he has any need of forgiveness. He appears to have no consciousness of *sin*, and never laments his own wickedness, as the Psalmists so frequently do when writing about themselves. Nor, in spite of the cruel way in which he has been treated, does he ever show the slightest resentment against his enemies.

And once more it is needless to point out how entirely this agrees with the case of Christ. For His unconsciousness of sin was (as is well known) one of the most striking features in His character; and He never showed the slightest resentment against His enemies.

20. *Deliver my soul from the sword;*
My darling from the power of the dog.

The term *sword*, as it occurs in connection with the *dog*, the *lion's mouth*, and the *wild oxen* (ver. 21), need not be pressed literally, but may be used here, as in other cases, for any violent death. Thus, we are told that Uriah was shot at and killed by arrows, which is afterwards described as his being slain by the *sword*.[1] And in the New Testament the term seems used for all punishments inflicted by the Roman authorities, as we are told that the magistrate *beareth not the sword in vain;* and *they that take the sword shall perish with the sword*, this latter very likely referring to a death by crucifixion (St. Peter's).[2]

[1] 2 Sam. xi. 24, xii. 9. [2] Rom. xiii 4; Matt. xxvi. 52.

With regard to the expression *my darling*, or *my only one* (margin), the sense seems to require that it should be *thy* darling, as the Sufferer is speaking of himself all through. This was evidently the view taken by Justin Martyr;[1] and it would make it agree with the earlier part of the Psalm (ver. 9); but there is, unfortunately, no authority for changing *my* to *thy*.

21. *Save me from the lion's mouth;*
Yea, from the horns of the wild oxen thou hast answered me.

The sense is made clearer by putting a full-stop after oxen. And the last words, *Thou hast answered me*, are very remarkable, since to all appearances the Sufferer's prayer had *not* been answered, and he had been allowed to die. In Christ alone we have the explanation; for His death was not the end of His work: it was followed by His Resurrection, when He was completely delivered from all His enemies. This finishes what we may call the first part of the Psalm.

22. *I will declare thy name unto my brethren;*
In the midst of the congregation will I praise thee.

And now the strain suddenly changes; and the Sufferer, in spite of his having been brought into the dust of death, is somehow restored to life and freedom. This implies his Resurrection; and he now declares God's name unto his brethren. And yet, as they were Jews, they must have known God's name before, so it probably means telling them something further about it; which shows that the Sufferer was in some sense a religious teacher.

But though everything else in the Psalm changes at this verse, its application to Christ still remains. He was essentially a religious Teacher; His Death was followed by His Resurrection; this was followed by His declaring for the first time what was God's complete *Name*, of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and this declaration was made unto those whom He now for the first time (in this definite manner) calls His *brethren*, the Apostles. While if we identify this appearance with that to the five hundred (as is commonly done), it was literally *in the midst*

[1] Dial. 105.

of the congregation—in the presence, that is, of the first large Christian assembly.[1]

After this we come to the results which follow from the Sufferer's deliverance; for the event, as we shall see, is of world-wide significance, and has the most far-reaching effects. And, once more, how suitable this is to the case of Christ, and how unsuitable to that of anyone else, scarcely needs pointing out.

23. *Ye that fear the Lord, praise him;*
All ye the seed of Jacob, glorify him;
And stand in awe of him, all ye the seed of Israel.

At first, however, the results are limited to the Jews. The people were to *praise* and *glorify* God; though, mingled with their rejoicings, there was to be a strange feeling of *awe* and dread. This is not what we should have expected, but it was exactly fulfilled. For Christianity was first preached among the Jews; and two of its immediate effects were that the people *praised* God, and *fear* came upon every soul.[2]

24. *For he hath not despised nor abhorred the affliction of the afflicted;*
Neither hath he hid his face from him;
But when he cried unto him, he heard.

The rejoicings, moreover, are all due to God's not having *despised* (but having accepted) the sufferings of the Sufferer. The verse is not very clear, but this seems its most probable meaning. For two acts are indicated. God did not despise his sufferings, neither did He refuse to hear his prayer. The latter is, of course, quite plain, and is merely an echo of the previous *Thou hast answered me;* but what about the former?

In common language, to *despise* anything (*e.g.*, a child's present to his father) means either to refuse it, or to accept it and treat it as worthless. While *not* to despise it, means to accept it, and value it, if not for its own sake, at least for the sake of him who offered it. In the same way, to *abhor* anything means to regard it with disfavour; while *not* to abhor it, means to regard it with favour.

And it is difficult to see how such language can be used of

[1] Matt. xxviii. 10, 19; John xvii. 26. [2] Acts ii. 43-47.

God's attitude towards the sufferings, unless they were in some way offered to Him for His acceptance; and (not despised) but favourably regarded by Him. And this, of course, introduces the Christian doctrine of the *Atonement.*

25. *Of thee cometh my praise in the great congregation;*
I will pay my vows before them that fear him.

This is the only verse in the whole Psalm which does not seem to be applicable to Christ, since (as far as we know) He never made any vows at all. Perhaps the best explanation is that it was the custom among the Jews, when in trouble, to vow that, if delivered, they would offer a sacrifice to the Lord as a thanksgiving, which was afterwards bestowed as a feast on the poor. And since the next verse refers to some feast of which the *meek* (or *poor*) are to eat, this is doubtless its meaning here. The expression *I will pay my vows* would then mean, I will (in accordance with the well-known Jewish custom) commemorate my deliverance by preparing a thanksgiving feast for the poor; though the following verses show that it cannot be a literal one.

26. *The meek shall eat and be satisfied;*
They shall praise the Lord that seek after him;
Let your heart live for ever.

Here is the first reference to the feast, just alluded to, of which the meek (or poor) are now to eat. And they are to be *satisfied;* because apparently (unlike an ordinary meal, which only enables anyone to live for a short time) this is in some strange way connected with their living *for ever.*

It is hence often thought to refer to the *Holy Communion,* and the language seems suitable throughout. For the Holy Communion is also a thanksgiving feast to commemorate a great deliverance; it was also at first for the *meek,* as all the earliest converts were in a humble state of life; it has always been considered, in a very special sense, a service of *praise;* and (probably referring to this service) Christ used the same remarkable expression "He that eateth this bread shall *live for ever.*"[1]

[1] John vi. 58.

27. *All the ends of the earth shall remember and turn unto the Lord:*
And all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee.

And the blessings then extend to the Gentile nations also, even to the most distant parts of the world, who are now to become worshippers of the true God, Jehovah. And though this is perhaps the strangest part of the whole prophecy, considering when it was written, its fulfilment is obvious to everyone. Christians exist in all countries, and wherever there are Christians, Jehovah is worshipped.

This *conversion of the Gentiles*, it will be noticed, forms the grand climax of the Psalm. And it both shows its Messianic character, since the other Jewish prophets always associate it with the times of the Messiah; and excludes other interpretations, since the deliverance of Old Testament saints (David, etc.) never led to the conversion of the Gentiles. In this, as in so many other respects, the Psalm is applicable to Christ, *and to Him alone.* Moreover, Christ's command to convert the Gentiles was not given till *after* His Resurrection, and was evidently in some way dependent on it—which agrees with the position the verse occupies in this Psalm.

With regard to the closing words, little stress can be laid on their being *before thee*, instead of (as we should have expected) *before him.* But they certainly *seem* to show that some other Person is to be worshipped besides Jehovah; and if so, this can only be the Sufferer himself. And we must then regard these two verses (27, 28) as a sort of response made by the people, in reply to the Sufferer's greeting in verse 26. But this (though it admirably suits the Christian interpretation by showing the divinity of the Sufferer) scarcely seems satisfactory; and it is perhaps better to keep to the Prayer Book version, which has *before him.*

28. *For the kingdom is the Lord's:*
And he is the ruler over the nations.

The universal sovereignty of Jehovah is here insisted on. Everyone is to worship Him, because the whole earth, both the

Jewish *kingdom*, and the Gentile *nations*, really belongs to Him. He is the God of all men. And though, of course, this doctrine is found in various parts of the Old Testament, it is Christianity alone which has really emphasized it, by its world-wide missions.

29. *All the fat ones of the earth shall eat and worship;*
All they that go down to the dust shall bow before him;
Even he that cannot keep his soul alive.

The opening words evidently refer to the feast before alluded to. And we are here told that it was to be a *religious* feast, as they were to eat and *worship*, and that not only the poor, but also the rich all over the earth, Gentiles as well as Jews, were to partake of it. And this shows conclusively that it cannot be a literal meal at Jerusalem, or anywhere else, but rather one that was *spiritual* and *world-wide*, intended for all people, of all nations.

And as before, this entirely agrees with the Holy Communion, which is essentially a religious feast, an act of *worship*, and which, though it was at first for the meek or poor only, has since included worldly potentates—*the fat ones of the earth*—in almost every country. Indeed, if it does not refer to the Holy Communion, it is difficult to see to what it does refer, as neither David nor anyone else ever made, or could make, a feast of this kind. And the last clause shows that the sovereignty of Jehovah was to be not only over all the living, but also over the departed, all of whom are *to bow before him*. This implies another great Christian doctrine, that of the *Future Judgment*, which is strongly insisted on in the New Testament, though not in the old.

30. *A seed shall serve him;*
It shall be told of the Lord unto the next generation.

We next read of a *seed* (or *my seed*) serving Him (Jehovah). The word is probably used here, as it sometimes is in Isaiah, for a race of people or disciples.[1] Indeed, the *seed* of any religious teacher would naturally be his followers; and Christ Himself called His Apostles His *children*.[2] The verse would

[1] Isa. i. 4, xiv. 20, liii. 10. [2] John xxi. 5.

thus mean that the Sufferer was to have a great spiritual posterity of *disciples*, each generation of whom was to tell of this wonderful deliverance to the next.

And, once more, there is nothing in the Jewish religion which in any way corresponds to this. For though the Jews might be spoken of as a *seed* serving Jehovah, this was the case long before the Psalmist wrote, whereas he implies that it was to be in the future, and in some way dependent on his own deliverance.

On the other hand, how well it suits the Christian interpretation must be obvious to everyone. For in the Christian Church we have precisely such a *seed*, or spiritual posterity of Christ's disciples. And for eighteen centuries they have been (nominally, at least) serving Jehovah, and telling the wonderful story of their Master's death and Resurrection, from one generation to the next.

31. *They shall come and shall declare his righteousness*
Unto a people that shall be born, that he hath done it.

And so they will continue doing to generations that are yet unborn. The last few verses, it will be noticed, contain references (more or less distinct) to as many as *six* great Christian doctrines. These are the Atonement, the Spiritual Feast, the conversion of the Gentiles, the universal sovereignty of Jehovah, the Future Judgment, and the Christian Church. They are all represented as being proclaimed by the Sufferer, and they were all, as a matter of fact, proclaimed by Christ. So here we have another interesting group of agreements.

And then as to the closing words. In the Revised Version they are hardly grammatical, and it seems better (with many critics) to place a full-stop after *born*, and omit the following *that*. The words *He had done it* would then be a separate sentence, probably referring to the whole Psalm, and meaning *It is done*, in the sense that the great work of suffering and atonement was now complete.[1] They would thus correspond to Christ's closing words on the Cross, *It is finished;* and they form a remarkable ending for a remarkable Psalm.

[1] Hengstenberg, "Commentary on the Psalms," vol. i., pp. 364, 396. 1867.

Astronomical Evidence for the Date of the Crucifixion.

By the Rev. D. R. FOTHERINGHAM, M.A., F.R.A.S.

COLONEL MACKINLAY'S article in last July's Churchman may be taken as proof of the tenacity with which chronologers who have accepted the year 29, for the date of the Crucifixion, will endeavour to maintain their position. Bluntly and briefly, the date is impossible. It is hardly to be expected, however, that a chronology so ably and persistently advocated will be abandoned at once by scholars, of whatever eminence and distinction, who are unable to appreciate the full weight of the astronomical evidence against it. Even so, if the witness of astronomy were merely negative and destructive, I would be content to let the matter rest. There is, however, a positive value in the results of astronomical research. The uncertainty of the year of our Lord's Crucifixion is narrowed down to a choice between the two years 30 and 33; and what is even more important, the long-standing dispute as to whether the Passion occurred on the fourteenth or on the fifteenth day of Nisan is definitely settled—to the relief of all who look to the Gospel story for the fulfilment of the symbolism of Mosaic ritual and law.

In the year 29 there fell a conjunction of the sun and moon—just such a conjunction as occurs every month—on March 4. At Jerusalem the dawn was then coming on, though it was still night. Throughout the whole day following, the moon would certainly be lost in the rays of the sun. When next the thin crescent of the moon could be detected in the evening sky, a new month would begin. Colonel Mackinlay thinks it might be seen on the evening of the same day. To this we may reply that, if it were so, there was a sight seen that evening to which no parallel can be produced among all the records of ancient or modern astronomy. And, further, from a series of observations made for the special purpose of determining the limits of the moon's visibility, as well as from the empiric rules deduced by ancient astronomers accustomed to the working of

the Jewish Calendar, and from the calendar dates of the Babylonians and other nations wherever we have had the opportunity of testing them, we are bound to conclude that the moon was still absorbed in the radiance of the sun's glory, and would not be seen by the human eye till the evening following. At the next sunset, on March 5, the moon would be thirty-seven hours old, and standing sixteen degrees above the western horizon, and of its easy visibility then there can be no question.

So a new month began early in March, A.D. 29. It cannot have been Adar, the twelfth month of the Mosaic year. Colonel Mackinlay, and other supporters of his Crucifixion-date, take it for granted that the new month was Nisan, the month of the Passover. It seems almost unkind to suggest that in all probability it was Veadar, the intercalary month inserted seven times in nineteen years. Under ordinary circumstances, indeed, no one would have doubted that it was Veadar. However, for the purpose of their chronology, it is necessary for Colonel Mackinlay, and those who think with him, to assume an unusually early date for Nisan ; and since I believe their chronology can be shown to be false on other and quite unmistakable grounds, it is hardly necessary to express any difference of opinion or judgment yet. None the less, I compliment Mr. Bothamley on the determination shown, in his useful little comment,[1] to maintain, in spite of all pleading, the natural date for the Mosaic New Year.

Granting therefore that this month may have been Nisan, and assuming for the present that it was so, let us see what becomes of Colonel Mackinlay's chronology. And first of all it must be definitely insisted that the commencement of the month was determined by actual observation of the moon, and by no artificial rule. On this point the Mishna is perfectly clear. The evidence of two independent witnesses, each of whom had actually seen the crescent, was required. Messengers hastened with the tidings to Jerusalem, and refreshment was provided for them on their arrival. On important occasions, such as the

[1] CHURCHMAN, May, 1911, p. 394.

first and seventh months, they were allowed even to profane the Sabbath, if need were, in order to make their tidings known. The supposition that the Jews may have used an arbitrary and sometimes inaccurate calendar, as different Christian Churches do for Easter, is but a desperate expedient of chronologers anxious to defend an impossible date. It is vain to cite artificial calendar rules invented centuries after the Jews had ceased to be a nation. Timid chronologers are afraid, however, that if the calendar depended on observation, and if observation were ever in doubt, discrepancies might sometimes result. They need have no fear! Such discrepancies actually occurred. Thus, on one occasion the famous Gamaliel, believing the messengers, cut the month Elul short with twenty-nine days; while the other Rabbis thought the message false, and wished to add a thirtieth day. Yet neither Gamaliel nor his opponents either knew or imagined any other rule than that dependent on direct observation, though the great Day of Atonement was at stake. Similarly, on another occasion it is reported of the zealous Rabbi Isaac that, being in doubt as to the true date of this Day of Atonement, he fasted two whole days instead of one, and died in consequence: and other instances of such doublings of fasts or festivals are on record. In this artificial age we live by artificial rules. We depend on calendars printed in books and on watches worked by a spring. The great clock of Divine workmanship, whose dial is on the firmament of heaven, and the infallible almanack that is graven on the spheres, are things of no account to us. Our month has long been divorced from the moon, and can by no means be reconciled to her. The men of the East were neither so mechanical nor so dull. When they celebrated the new moon, they saw God's signal for the feast in the western sky, and rejoiced to think He had lighted the first lamp at their festival.

The commencement of a month therefore depends on direct visual observation of the new moon. Mr. C. H. Turner has no authority for suggesting[1] the existence, in the time of

[1] "Dictionary of the Bible," i., p. 412.

Christ, of any rule limiting the month before Nisan to twenty-nine days. There seems to be some misapprehension, too, as to the method of observation employed. Thus, Colonel Mackinlay speaks of Jewish observers specially trained to search for the new moon with the naked eye. "Probably," he adds,[1] "they were among the most skilful of such observers who have ever lived," and then he goes on to speak of their "constant practice for hundreds of years from a fixed position"—all which would undoubtedly be a very great advantage to them, if the picture drawn were not the very opposite of the actual facts of the case. The Jews had no specially trained observers appointed for the purpose. Casual watchers of the sky they were, whose evidence was desired. Nor did they make use of a fixed point. The records speak, instead, of messengers of the common folk, shepherds and the like, coming in with their tidings from miscellaneous directions, out of all the country round. Am I right in suspecting the mind and inspiration of Mr. Maunder behind the pen of Colonel Mackinlay here? At all events, Mr. Maunder, in a letter to me on the subject, speaks of the thousand years' experience of the priests in looking for the moon from the tops of the Temple towers. Alas! this is but a vivid imagination, fired by too intimate acquaintance with the ways of Greenwich Observatory. The priests were not the astronomers, and the Temple towers were not the points of observation. The plain and simple testimony of the country folk to a common and familiar object in the sky was what the Rabbis and the priests desired. Best of all it was when the moon was clearly visible to everyone who looked. Occasionally, as we know, but only very rarely, a little doubtfulness might arise; but, as a rule, when anybody saw the moon everybody might see it. And certainly there could be no opportunity for doubt on March 4, A.D. 29; and there would be no room for doubt on March 5.

Is it possible for us to determine the circumstances under which the moon could be seen? I think it is, within very narrow

[1] CHURCHMAN, July, 1911, p. 512.

limits. The crude rule dependent only on the moon's age has been found a broken reed; yet, as a matter of fact, even that elementary rule is not very far from the truth in the case of the month Nisan. At the spring equinox the ecliptic approaches very nearly to the prime vertical of Jerusalem, at sunset, and cuts the horizon at an angle of eighty-two degrees. This accounts for the good results obtained by Salmon's rule, to which Mr. Bothamley has already drawn attention. And though the efficiency of the rule is somewhat in the nature of a fortunate accident (for it might be very misleading at any other season of the year), yet it is right to acknowledge once more the credit that is due to Salmon. A much better rule is obtained by calculating the distance between the sun and moon at sunset. Roughly speaking, there should be twelve degrees of arc between the luminaries. If more, the moon should certainly be visible; if less, we should not expect to see her. Mr. Maunder has kindly illustrated the effect of the rule by a diagram.[1] When the new moon is directly, or almost directly, above the setting sun—as is always the case at Jerusalem in March—the line of limiting visibility is clear and distinct. When the moon stands far to the south (a circumstance that does not affect the present inquiry) the line may be a little less easy to define. For a "line," taking the strict Euclidian definition, Colonel Mackinlay suggests there should be a "band," across which the visibility is doubtful. The correction, of course, is just, though hardly important. It is gratifying to notice how narrow the band will be. The chronologer need not fear any disturbance of his reckoning by the introduction of a large element of uncertainty.

It is worth remarking, perhaps, that my brother's calculation has resulted less in the discovery of a new law (though it appears to have been unknown to any living chronologer) than in the rediscovery and independent confirmation of a very ancient rule. My brother's line is practically identical with that drawn by the almost forgotten Maimonides, in illustration of this very problem of the commencement of the Jewish month. According to

[1] See the *Journal of the British Astronomical Association*, June, 1911, p. 361.

Pliny, indeed, the moon becomes visible when *fourteen* degrees distant from the sun. Possibly Pliny may not have had the opportunity of observing it closer, and he certainly had not the same practical interest in the lunar calendar; but the fact that he gives a higher number than the rule requires, suggests that watchfulness was needed to catch the moon even at twelve degrees' distance. It is more important to notice that Theon, Alphraganus, and Albategnius all make a distance of twelve degrees the limit of visibility. From the two last at least we have every reason to expect accurate knowledge; because of their interest in, and personal experience of, the Arabian Calendar. This was framed on the same principles as the Jewish, and was governed, like it, by direct observation of the crescent moon. In my previous paper I referred only to modern observations that may easily be verified; but the rule is supported by the verdict of the centuries, and by the astronomers of those very nations amongst whom the calendar was in use.

My brother's investigation was the subject of some criticism by Mr. Maunder in a paper read before the British Astronomical Association last May. It is necessary to remark, however, that my brother and Mr. Maunder had different objects in view. The former was aiming at a working rule for the guidance of chronologers. Mr. Maunder appeared to be more interested in the optical question of the smallest phase under which the moon had ever been seen by the best observer on the clearest evening. Hence, he naturally objected (and in this Colonel Mackinlay somewhat unreasonably follows him) to the citation of instances where, from its altitude, the visibility of the moon could be in no manner of doubt. From a purely optical point of view, of course, such cases are unimportant, and they may even be dismissed as irrelevant to the inquiry. But to the chronologer such instances are very important indeed; they illustrate how late the moon sometimes was in making its appearance, and how many hours might have to elapse before the crescent could be seen. Similarly, Mr. Maunder esteemed negative instances as less important than positive. But again the chronologer must

differ. It is just as important to know how long the old month might be expected to last, as to discuss how soon the new month might begin. But in spite of all differences, as soon as I saw Mr. Maunder's diagram on the screen[1] I felt it would be asking too much of Providence to seek any stronger confirmation of the rediscovered law.

Among the seventy-six observations recorded by Mommsen there are only two nominal exceptions. One of them is a case of extreme southern elongation, amounting to more than twenty degrees; the other is a morning observation. Now, morning and evening observations differ in many remarkable ways. The evening air has been warmed by many hours of continuous sunshine, and is in a disturbed condition; the morning air is cold and still. Astronomers always find the morning the best time for lunar observation, and the evening the worst. And if astronomers be deemed to be men of little worth, let Colonel Mackinlay take the testimony of Mr. Graham White, or some other Dædalus of this flying age, to the same effect. The fact is that Schmidt's observations provide no real exception at all, that could in any way shake the conclusion we have formed as to the commencement of Nisan. But though the general accuracy of the rule has been established, even beyond expectation, it is not very wonderful that some exceptions should somewhere be found. Mr. Maunder himself cited nine further instances of the appearance of the thin crescent of the young moon. The attendant circumstances, of course, were favourable for observation; and that the appearance of the moon was surprising or unexpected is sufficiently proved by the record of the case. In eight of these instances the moon lay immediately below the line designed by my brother, or just within the extremely thin "band" that Colonel Mackinlay would substitute for a line; but in none of these eight cases was the moon more than three-fifths of a degree below the line, which itself is never less than twelve degrees from the sun. Thus, the exceptions occurred exactly where the line indicated that they might be expected, and their tendency is to

[1] *Journal of the British Astronomical Association*, June, 1911, pp. 346, 355.

confirm the rule rather than refute it. The rule of Maimonides, which allows an approach to within eleven degrees of the sun under favourable circumstances, would actually include these cases.

The ninth case cited by Mr. Maunder is more remarkable. After long waiting, an instance of visibility has been found, when visibility was not to be expected. Colonel Mackinlay is entitled to make the most of it; though not even so can he make so much of it as would justify us in accepting a theory dependent on any supposed visibility of the moon on March 4, A.D. 29. The case in point is that of Mr. Horner's observation of the moon at Tunbridge Wells on February 10, 1910. To cautious critics it might seem precarious to base a chronology on the possible repetition of an instance so completely unique. But we have more to say than that. Not even Mr. Horner's observation, remarkable though it is, will serve Colonel Mackinlay's purpose. Let us compare the two cases:

	1910, Feb. 10.		29, March 4.
Age of the moon ...	16 hours	...	13½ hours
Distance from the sun ...	9·7°	...	8·2°

Two hours and a half in age is a very material difference in the case of a moon so young. A degree and a half (three moon's-breadths) nearer the sun is a long distance indeed to overstep the limit of all recorded observation. And, further, what Colonel Mackinlay does not tell, Mr. Horner found his moon through a telescope! I hasten to add that, having once found the moon with the telescope, he was subsequently able to see it with the naked eye—pale, thin, and white against the twilight. But that is an experience to which any coastguard could find plenty of parallels every day.[1] The analogy between the two instances breaks down in every particular, save where it adds to the difficulty or impossibility of accepting the Crucifixion-date of 29. The records of the centuries have been searched diligently for

[1] Similarly, the planet Uranus, though within the power of the naked eye, escaped discovery for six thousand years till Herschel's telescope revealed it.

any instance in ancient or modern astronomy that will justify the date, but hitherto they have been searched in vain.

The other questions raised by Colonel Mackinlay are equally beside the point: "The atmosphere of Palestine is much clearer than that of England."[1] As a rule, I suppose it is so. That is to say, an ideal atmosphere for observing is more often obtained in Palestine than in England. But how often can more favourable circumstances have been found than in Tunbridge Wells when Mr. Horner saw the thin crescent of February, 1910? And in any case the comparison should not be with England, but with Athens, with Babylon, and with Arabia. It is from the countries immediately surrounding Palestine that this "rule of the twelve degrees" is taken, and we need have no hesitation whatever in applying it to Judea in the time of Christ. Or again: "In the latitude of Jerusalem darkness comes on after sunset more rapidly than in England, or even in Athens; consequently, the new moon can be seen more easily in Palestine than in the other two countries."[2] But surely this is a slip, or else Mr. Maunder's assistance must have failed his friend for once. The same cause that hastens the fall of night, will also hasten the descent of the moon from a given altitude to the horizon. The law has been expressed in terms independent of latitude and longitude; and where the sun sinks swiftly, so also does the moon. Nor is there any advantage gained by emphasizing, even with italics, the fact that the Jews "must certainly have known, very approximately, *where* to search for the new moon in the heavens."[3] One would almost imagine Colonel Mackinlay intends to accuse Schmidt of *not* knowing where to look. As a matter of fact, in cases likely to be difficult, Schmidt calculated the position of the moon in advance, and thus he knew, not "very approximately," but "exactly" where to search for it; and in doubtful cases he turned his telescope upon the calculated spot. As with Mr. Horner, so also with Schmidt, the advantage lay wholly with the modern astronomer. But not even so can

[1] CHURCHMAN, April, 1911, p. 511.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 511, 512.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 512.

evidence be found that will justify our acceptance of a Crucifixion-date of 29.

Though somewhat outside the scope of astronomical investigation, I am bound to take up briefly Colonel Mackinlay's challenge with regard to the external historical evidence for the date of the Crucifixion. Evidence, in the strict sense of the word, is hardly to be found. Accurate knowledge seems to have perished with the last of the Apostles. Even in the second century the date was doubtful. The early Christians depended, like ourselves, on the scanty chronological references in the Gospels.

Still, there are some few authorities that we may cite. The earliest is Phlegon, who assigns the darkness and the earthquake (in terms that seem to leave no doubt the Crucifixion is meant) to the fourth year of the two hundred and second Olympiad. As the season was spring, the year indicated would be A.D. 33. Similarly, Eusebius, the first and greatest of Church historians, assigns the ministry of St. John the Baptist to A.D. 29, the Baptism of our Lord to A.D. 30, and the Crucifixion to A.D. 33. These are the very dates suggested by myself in the CHURCHMAN last April. On the present occasion, however, since my object is purely astronomical, I must be content to leave a free choice between the Crucifixion-dates of 30 and 33. Now for those other Fathers who led Clinton astray, and in whose wake Mr. Turner and Colonel Mackinlay still follow. The Western Fathers generally give as their date March 25, A.D. 29. This date is unquestionably wrong. For if the Passover fell in March (and not April) in 29, it would be over before the 25th of the month. The full moon was past, the firstfruits had been offered, and the harvesters were busy in the field. Accordingly, chronologers who want this year can do no other than accept half their witnesses' evidence and reject the rest. But in reality the date (March 25) is the key to the position and the cause of the error. It was quite common to date important ecclesiastical festivals on the octave before the kalends of a month. Three of our four quarter days (Christmas, Lady Day, and Mid-

summer) are so dated still, together with other of our principal Holy Days. Similarly, the Crucifixion came to be dated, quite erroneously, on March 25. But if the Latin Fathers were ill-acquainted with the phases of the moon, the Julian Calendar made it an easy matter for them to calculate the days of the week. "Under Pontius Pilate" March 25 fell twice on a Friday—in 29 and again in 35. And hence, I suppose, the erroneous tradition arose. The Greek and Oriental Fathers were hardly affected by it.

I will not at present deal with the question of our Lord's Birth, for I am not without hope that it may still be possible to approach it on a new side, when our knowledge of Eastern astrology enables us to deal to better effect with the Star of Bethlehem. It must be enough to say that the preponderant opinion hitherto has been, and apparently still is, in favour of 4 or 5 B.C. rather than 8. I am certainly inclined to favour 5 B.C. myself. Confining ourselves, however, to the Crucifixion, astronomy leaves us only three Fridays for the fourteenth of Nisan, and excludes the fifteenth of Nisan altogether. We may reject as too early the Friday that fell on April 11, A.D. 27. The two dates between which we have to decide are April 7, A.D. 30, and April 3, A.D. 33. Of the two, my personal preference is for the latter. There is no third choice.

The Meaning of Christ's Charge to Mary Magdalene in St. John xx. 17.

By the Rev. A. C. DOWNER, D.D.

FEW passages in the New Testament have given occasion to more divergent interpretations or wilder suggestions than this. The view put forth in the present article is simple, and it may almost be affirmed that no one would have thought of any other but for some ulterior object, either to find support for unbelief in our Lord's Resurrection, or to make the language fit some theory, whether a true or a false one. The interpretation offered is not new, but it is one which has not had justice done to it,[1] as those who have put it forth have not done so in a manner so carefully reasoned as to give it a fair chance to emerge from the mass of verbiage with which the interpretation of the passage has been encumbered. Some of this latter is misleading owing to the very truth and beauty of the ideas which inspired it. But an idea may be both beautiful and true in itself, and yet not applicable in a particular reference; and an attempt will here be made to disentangle the passage from the webs which commentators have spun over it, and to let the words speak for themselves.

The reading in the original does not present any difficulty. It runs: *Λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Μή μου ἅπτου, οὔπω γὰρ ἀναβέβηκα πρὸς τὸν πατέρα· πορεύου δὲ πρὸς τοὺς ἀδελφούς μου, καὶ εἰπὲ αὐτοῖς, Ἀναβαίνω πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου καὶ πατέρα ὑμῶν καὶ Θεόν μου καὶ Θεὸν ὑμῶν.* "Jesus saith to her: Touch Me not; for I am not yet ascended unto the Father: but go unto My brethren, and say to them, I ascend unto My Father and your Father, and My God and your God" (R.V.).

1. In the first place, there is no authority at all for altering

[1] For the purposes of this article I have relied upon Godet, Tholuck, and Luthardt, and especially upon Stier, who has accumulated a great wealth of material for the statement of the views of the German commentators cited on this passage.

the reading, Μή μου ἅπτου, in any of the ways that have been suggested, as we shall see later, all which readings are bad Greek and none of which make any sense.

2. Again, ἅπτου, it is commonly agreed by scholars, means, not "touch," but "hold." The force of the saying is not *noli me tangere*, but *noli mihi adhaerere*; the idea being not that of mere physical contact with our Lord, but of persistent clinging to Him. The present tense shows that Mary Magdalene had already fallen at His feet, and was embracing them when He spoke to her.

3. μου occupies the position of emphasis, and consequently is contrasted with τοὺς ἀδελφούς μου. To read the sentence, marking the emphasis on these words, respectively, is to obtain a clue to the meaning of the whole.

4. The γὰρ, as is usual with this word, is the pivot of the sentence. It implies that what follows is the reason for what precedes it; in other words, that the ground upon which Mary is told not to continue to cling to Jesus is that He is not yet ascended.

5. The πορεύου δὲ πρὸς τοὺς ἀδελφούς μου is plainly the latter of two alternative courses, and the one to be adopted by Mary in place of the former.

These considerations sweep a whole world of confusion out of the way of a simple and reasonable interpretation of the words before us.

The views of the passage that have been put forth by commentators may be classified under the following heads:

I. The German Sceptical View.

II. The Mystical View, largely adopted in England.

III. The View which treats the words as communicating a Special Mission to Mary.

I. The German Sceptical School has several subdivisions. The attacks of some of these upon the Greek text are simply brutal. Stier points out that, for example, Gerdroff calmly erased the μή, leaving simply μου ἅπτου, as though it were a command instead of a prohibition; Schulthess and Lucke con-

verted μή into σύ, which has a similar effect; Vogel wrote μὴ οὐ ἅπτου, that is, "Do not be afraid to touch me"; while the unconscionable Bauldri made it μή· μου ἅπτου, which, beside being intended to convey unbelief, is gross nonsense. All these alterations of the text fall to the ground for want of manuscript support, from their offence against grammar, and from their own inherent absurdity.

The manifest purpose of this school is to gather from our Lord's words some colour for their unbelief in His Resurrection. Paulus would make Him mean, "Do not touch My wounds, which still smart; you will hurt Me"; which, of course, implies that He had never died at all. In the same sense agree Venturini and Bennecke. Schleirmacher grants that He had risen from the dead, but His new life will not as yet bear to be touched, the process of glorification being not yet complete; a strange and hardly intelligible suggestion. Olshausen's view is the same, somewhat spiritualized; to touch Him would disturb the process of glorification. Wetstein understands the words as a caution not to incur defilement by touching one who has been in the tomb—a shocking suggestion, abhorrent to every devout mind. Some affirm that our Lord is forbidding Mary to touch Him as He was still incorporeal, among whom Luthardt cites Weisse and Hilgenfeld. It will be plainly seen that this view involves a denial of the Resurrection, as, if our Lord were still incorporeal, His body was not risen. Hilgenfeld says that the σάρξ is useless, which practically denies the resurrection of the body.

No less irreverent is the view of those who suggest that our Lord is repelling Mary's touch as being one of sensuous passion and contrary to decorum. Stier quoted the Berlenberg Bible and Richter's Family Bible. Hengstenberg takes the same view, which Tholuck attributes even to Chrysostom and Luther; while Krummacher, as quoted by Stier, says: "The Lord repels sentimentality," which is only a shade less bad. It is impossible to think that Mary Magdalene had one grain either of passion or of mere sentiment in her devotion to her Lord.

Another class of writers are those who represent Mary Magdalene as desiring to convince herself of the reality of our Lord, and as being put back by Him with an assurance that actual proof is unnecessary. Among these, according to Luthardt, Godet, and Tholuck, are Meyer, Baumgarten, Crusius, Neander (probably) and Fikenscher. It is as much as to say, "There is no need to put Me to the test of touch: I have not yet left the earth and become glorified; I am still really corporeal." This, it will be noticed, is the precise opposite to the statement that He was not to be touched because He was incorporeal. It is a *non sequitur*, since, if our Lord were not pure spirit, He would be proved corporeal by touch, as He, in fact, invited His disciples to test on a later occasion. The argument He actually employed to them was, "Handle Me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see Me have," which is the very opposite of the reason He is supposed by these writers to be giving to Mary.

Others, again, say that Christ here forbids Mary to worship Him, because He was not yet ascended. Godet, Stier, and Tholuck, refer to the following as representatives of this view: Lucke, Hingenfeld, Kypke, Herder, Less, Kühnöl, Tholuck, Meyer, Hass, Sepp, Pfaff, Camero. But, beside the fact that the passage contains no interdict against *worship* at all, our Lord had accepted worship previous to His passion, and therefore, *a fortiori*, He would not refuse it after His Resurrection, and, as a matter of fact, He did accept it after His Resurrection, from the women first and later from the eleven disciples in Galilee (Matt. xxviii. 9, 17). Moreover, worship was offered to and accepted by Him, not on the ground of His Ascension, but on that of His Divinity. Hence this view falls to the ground.

There are those, again, who suppose that our Lord means that He is in haste to ascend to His Father, and cannot brook delay. For this opinion Godet and Luthardt cite Kinkel, Baur, Köstlin, Lutterbeck, and Neander. It, at least, does not absolutely contradict and stultify the language of the context as other views do. But one consideration is fatal to it, namely,

that, so far as we are informed, He did not ascend for forty days. Still less does the passage afford any support to the idea that He had already, on the Resurrection morning, effected a preliminary Ascension and returned to earth again. The words *οὔπω ἀναβέβηκα πρὸς τὸν πατέρα* would seem enough to negative this view, which is devoid of any positive support.

II. We now come to the Mystical View. This may be stated thus: At the moment of speaking our Lord, not being yet ascended, was corporeal, and not spiritual; hence, Mary Magdalene must be content to wait for His Ascension, and not to think of clinging to Him till then, when she would be able to do so spiritually. This view is supported by so many and such eminent and devout expositors that it deserves a most respectful as well as a most careful consideration. If we may trust our authorities, Tholuck, Godet, and Stier, it is the view taken by Augustine and Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theophylact, and Euthymius; by Calvin, Melanchthon, and Grotius; by Lampe, Olshausen (?), Neander, Godet, De Wette, Gerlach, Justin, Stier, Photius, Pfenningen, Kniewel, Krummacher, and Steinmayer; and, in our own country, by Bishops C. Wordsworth, Ellicott, and Westcott, by Dean Alford and Dr. Swete. Such an array of names may well give us pause in questioning any interpretation of a passage of Holy Scripture.

Let us first state this view in the language of its advocates. Westcott says: "The Ascension" is "presented as the beginning and condition of a new union. . . . Quod vides hoc solum me esse putas (Aug. in Joh. xxvi. 3). She thought that she could now enjoy His restored presence as she then apprehended it. She assumed that the return to the old life exhausted the extent of her Master's victory over death. Therefore . . . Christ said: 'Do not cling to Me, as if in that which falls under the senses you can know Me as I am; for there is yet something beyond the outward restoration to earth which must be realized before that fellowship towards which you reach can be established as abiding. *I am not yet ascended to the Father.* When that last triumph is accomplished, then you will be enabled

to enjoy the communion which is as yet impossible. . . . Meanwhile this is the reward of thy love, that thou shalt bear the message of the coming and more glorious change to those to whom thou didst bear the tidings of what seemed to be thy loss and theirs.'"

Luthardt again quoted Grotius: "Vis omnino frui amicitiâ meâ. . . . At ubi ad patrem ascendero, veniet tempus, quum frui meâ amicitiâ perfectissime poteris non terrestri contactu sed . . . spirituali." In other words: "This is merely an intermediate time, during which they must content themselves with His spiritual society." Godet says: "His appearances as the Risen One were not . . . intended to establish the new state of communion between them and Him, but to prepare for it, to render it possible by laying the foundation of faith in the hearts of His own. This thought explains the words, 'Touch me not.'" Krummacher: "She must no longer reckon upon any such intercourse with Him as had hitherto been accorded; she must now exchange the life and touch of sight for the higher and more spiritual relation of faith, that which no longer knows Christ after the flesh." Stier: "Thou shalt possess Me again, but not as before; it shall be from this time and for ever *in the Spirit*." Dr. Swete: "It was necessary to make it clear at once that old relations were not to be restored, as Mary evidently hoped; that the Resurrection was the beginning of a new order. . . . The words that follow imply that the intimacy of the life in Galilee is to be exchanged for a new fellowship of a closer kind. . . . The Resurrection must, however, first be consummated by the Ascension: the visible presence must be finally withdrawn before the presence of Jesus in the Spirit can be realized." Steinmayer: "He has come, but not to revive the former intercourse, but to close it." Alford: "'Do not thus —for I am not yet restored to you finally in the body—I have yet to ascend to the Father.'"

This mystical interpretation, supported by so many revered names, is based upon a great truth—the truth that Christ is better known to His people by the Spirit, through whom He is

ever and everywhere present with them, than He was, or could have been, in the days of His flesh. As an independent statement, it is without doubt deeply true. Its beauty and preciousness make it dear to us.

Yet we venture to say it is not the interpretation of these words of our Lord.

1. In the first place, as Luthardt points out, it is not permissible to change the meaning of ἅπτεσθαι to suit a preconceived interpretation. The word, as Westcott shows, means a "'holding,' in the desire to retain." He adds: "The exact form (μὴ ἅπτου) implies further that she was already clinging to Him when He spoke." If, then, our Lord is referring to a physical grasp of His feet or clothing, we cannot alter the meaning to a spiritual apprehension by faith; we cannot make our Lord say: "You may not hold me physically (ἅπτεσθαι) now, but after my Ascension you may hold me spiritually (ἅπτεσθαι)."

2. Again, as said above, πορεύου δέ, in the second part of the sentence, is plainly contrasted with μή μου ἅπτου. Two alternatives are contemplated—(*a*) remaining with our Lord to hold and clasp His feet, and (*b*) going to His disciples with a definite message from Him as to His Resurrection and Ascension. It is a choice between the two, since both at once are plainly impossible; and He bids Mary choose the latter and forego the former.

3. Another consideration making strongly against the mystical view is the fact that, on several other occasions, our Lord not only did not discourage, but permitted and even enjoined, His disciples, male and female, to touch His Resurrection body. Thus (*a*) the women, who, at the command of the angel, had quitted the sepulchre to announce to the disciples our Lord's Resurrection, are said to have been met by Him and to have "held Him by the feet" (Matt. xxviii. 9); (*b*) on the occasion of His appearance to the ten disciples (Luke xxiv. 39, 40), our Lord bids them "handle" Him, in order to assure themselves that He has flesh and bones, as a spirit has not;

(*c*) He invites Thomas to touch His wounds (St. John xx. 27). These three passages entirely disprove the statement that His people were not to associate with Him on the old terms, or that they must now "exchange the life and touch of sight for the higher and more spiritual relation of faith." On the contrary, their faith is to be supported and strengthened by the sight and touch of Him, in order that they may be the better able to bear witness of Him to others (compare 1 St. John i. 1-3).

III. The view which appears to avoid all the foregoing difficulties, to agree with the language of the passage and with every part of it, and to provide the only adequate, harmonious, and consistent interpretation of this utterance of our Lord, is that which Tholuck, Godet, etc., attribute to Beza, Bengel, Hofmann, Piscator, Gerhard, Maldonatus, Heumann, and Mosheim, and the clearest statement of which seems to be that of Ebrard: "Thou needest not to hold Me so firmly, because My appearance is not a momentary one; I shall yet remain awhile upon the earth." "Do not delay with Me; thou wilt have time enough for intercourse with Me, for I will remain several weeks with you." "Go rather to My brethren and tell them that I am ascending." In this view *μή μου ἅπτου* is not taken *ἁπλῶς*, as an absolute prohibition, as though He were not to be held by her under any circumstances, now that He is risen from the dead; but only relatively, as a prohibition for the present moment, because He has other work for her to do. "Do not cling to Me, but go," is like, "I will have mercy and not sacrifice." Under the circumstances, Mary is to go to the disciples rather than stay with Him. She may enjoy intercourse with Him later, when that is done, since He will remain on earth some time yet previous to His Ascension. The *γὰρ* has a full and adequate force attributed to it, as it gives a good reason why she should relinquish for the moment her present happiness—namely, that she shall soon resume it again; while the *πορεύου* gives the present duty to be performed in lieu of following the impulse to remain with Him.

Stier objects to Ebrard's view: "But if this is made the sole

sense of the 'for,' then all that deeper meaning which we found in the 'Touch me not' is confused and weakened away." Let us say at once that this deeper meaning, however true it may be in itself, is better left out of the passage altogether. It does not properly belong to it by any requirements of grammar or logic; it causes the words of Christ here to be in conflict with those spoken by Him to disciples on three other occasions, when He invited them to touch Him, thus making Him contradict Himself; and it makes Him needlessly change the meaning of His own word ἅπτεσθαι. It is not the spiritual truth contained in Stier's exposition that we deny; it is only its relevancy to the present passage.

We may therefore paraphrase our Lord's words thus: "Cling not to Me at present any longer. You see I am still here, I have not yet ascended to the Father, when My bodily presence will have passed from you for ever; there will be time for further meetings before I do so. At the present moment there is other work to be done. My poor brethren are plunged in sorrow and wellnigh in despair. Go to them and tell them that I am alive and about to ascend. Go to Peter, who denied Me, but who loves Me still. Go to John, who even now came here to seek My dead body and has gone away with his doubts unsolved. Go to them all. They need the message you will bring them, for their hearts are sore. Tell them that I am ascending to Him who is not My Father and My God only, but also their Father and their God; and it will make them glad. It is for this reason, Mary, rather than that you should linger with Me here in adoration, that I have appeared to you."

The Continental Reformation.

By the Rev. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D.

VII.—Zwingli and Calvin.

LUTHER and Zwingli belong to the first age of the Reformation. They are originators. They are the leaders who started the movement, sustained it, and to a large extent controlled it. The one founded the Lutheran or more Catholic type, the other the Reformed or more Puritan type, of Protestantism. Calvin, both in time and in development of doctrine, belongs to the next generation. He is the organizer and systematizer of what had already been started by others; but his manner of organizing is so original, and the system which he constructed is so powerful, that it may be doubted whether he has not had as much influence on religious thought in Europe as all the other Reformers put together. Melanchthon in time, though not always in development of thought, comes between the two great leaders and the great organizer; and to some extent he stands in the same relation to Luther that Calvin does to Zwingli—*i.e.*, he formulated Luther's ideas as Calvin formulated Zwingli's ideas. But there is considerable difference between the two cases.

Melanchthon was the personal disciple of Luther, constantly with him and taking counsel with him. Like not a few able disciples of able masters, he greatly influenced his teacher. In some things he was Luther's superior; he was a better scholar, and he had read more. Like Keble and Hurrell Froude, they mutually told on one another. Froude used to say that he was Keble's poker, and that Keble was his fire: he stirred Keble to action, while Keble inspired him with enthusiasm. But with Luther and Melanchthon, it was the older man who was eager for action, and the younger one who often suggested consideration and reserve. The teacher had the impulsiveness, the disciple the quietude and the thought.

No such relations existed between Zwingli and Calvin. Calvin was never the personal disciple of Zwingli; and it was impossible for Calvin to influence Zwingli as a Reformer, for before what Calvin calls his "sudden conversion" to Protestantism took place, Zwingli had lost his life in battle. Moreover, although the religion which Calvin systematized was Zwingli's rather than Luther's, yet it is Luther rather than Zwingli that Calvin acknowledges as his master. Of Zwingli he does not speak very respectfully. Indeed, Calvin's was from the first too powerful and independent a mind to receive great and permanent impressions from others after the one great change from Romanism to Protestantism had been made. The man who could write the "Institutes" before he was twenty-seven, and rewrite the book again and again, with modifications and amplifications, but without any important change of view, was not one who was likely to be much influenced by the conversation or writings of other teachers. He was always adding to his knowledge, but the new knowledge confirmed rather than modified his views.

If fame is a thing to be desired, it has been a misfortune for Zwingli that he had a Calvin to formulate his teaching. The formulator has eclipsed the original teacher. If there had been no Calvin, Zwingli's place in history would have been larger. As it is, most of us know something, and are generally ready to know more, about Calvin; but to not a few Zwingli is not much more than a name, and such people do not feel strongly moved to make him more. Nevertheless, in the history of the Continental Reformation Zwingli counts for a good deal. His debt to Luther was probably greater than he himself believed it to be. He had read much of Luther before he left Einsiedeln in 1519. But there is no need to doubt his declaration that he had carefully avoided corresponding with Luther, because, he says, "I desired to show to all men the uniformity of the Spirit of God, as manifested in the fact that we, who are so far apart, are in unison one with the other, yet without collusion." They did not remain in unison, as all the world knows, and it is one of

the many sad facts in the history of the Reformation that Luther declared Zwingli's violent death to be a judgment on him for his Eucharistic doctrine.

There were differences of training and of aim between them from the first. Zwingli was a Humanist, so fond of the classics that he did not see how widely different the moral standpoint of the Greek philosophers is from that of Christianity. Luther had none of this, and every student of Greek philosophy must lament the way in which Luther abuses Aristotle, not merely for his metaphysical works, but even for the "Ethics." Luther hated a philosopher whose moral system was based upon the doctrine that men are free to form habits, and do not lose their freedom until habits are fully formed. He laments that in the Universities "the blind heathen Aristotle reigns. It pains me greatly that the damnable, proud, cunning heathen has led astray so many of the best Christians with his false words." Of all the Reformers, Luther was the most mediæval, and he never quite shook himself free from scholasticism. Zwingli was much less conservative and much more modern. His father placed him in a Dominican monastery for two years for the sake of the educational advantages, but Zwingli would no more have thought of entering a monastery as the best way of saving his soul than Luther would have thought of doing the like as the best way of securing fine music. Both Reformers were very fond of music, and Zwingli said that convent music sometimes did tempt him to turn monk.

Luther's aims were always religious. He said that he had been called to preach the Gospel, as God had brought it home to him, not to mix in politics. Zwingli considered himself to have been called to save the Swiss from misgovernment quite as much as to save their souls. The evils of society, he said, came from selfishness, and the cure for that was to be found in the Word of God. Thus, for somewhat different reasons, both Zwingli and Luther regarded it as their special function to make known the Scriptures; and it was in order to do this more efficiently that Zwingli learnt Greek during the ten years (1506-1516) that

he was parish priest at Glarus. But it was during the three years that he was at Einsiedeln (1516-1519) that the great change in his views took place. It was caused partly by study of Scripture, partly by three visits to Italy as army chaplain, which taught him a good deal about the methods of the Papacy, and partly by the gross superstitions which were sanctioned at the great pilgrimage Church in Einsiedeln. In August, 1518, the Franciscan friar Samson came to Switzerland with the Pope's authority to sell pardons and indulgences; and it seems to be well established that Zwingli protested against the sale of these wares before Luther did. But he did so for a different reason. Luther enlarged upon the presumption of claiming to sell the forgiveness of God. Zwingli simply pointed out the silliness of the transaction. In this he was like Erasmus, who ridiculed the idea that purgatory has a duration which can be measured by calendars, and that so many years and months and days can be bought off by indulgences. But neither Erasmus nor Zwingli had Luther's intense sympathy and pity for the victims of these frauds. There were vicious men who thought that by means of indulgences they could cheat the devil and escape the suffering due to their sins. Such people deserved to be cheated themselves. But there were other poor souls who felt the intolerable burden of sin, and who hoped that indulgences would do something towards freeing them. Luther knew from experience that the peace of a quiet conscience was not to be obtained by any such means, and he was too sorry for those whose delusion must bring bitter disappointment to scoff at them.

But the great difference between Zwingli and Calvin was one of doctrine. Neither could accept the other's teaching with regard to the Presence in the Eucharist. To Zwingli this difference appeared to be of less importance than it did to Luther. He thought that Luther's theory was too near to the Roman doctrine, which both of them rejected as false, but he was much more tolerant of it than Luther was of Zwingli's theory. Luther said that Zwingli's doctrine was a "devilish" perversion of the Word of God. Like many other zealots,

Luther regarded zeal for his own convictions the same thing as zeal for Divine truth ; his cause was God's cause.

To the student of history the importance of this difference between the two Reformers lies in this, that it has resulted in a fatal and abiding schism in the ranks of Protestantism. It is simply tragic that, in the controversies which must arise between thoughtful Christians, it is precisely those mysteries about which the human mind can know nothing which have been made reasons for the most disastrous dissensions ; such as the single or double Procession of the Holy Spirit, and the manner of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist. It is said that the symbolical interpretation of the eucharistic rite was first suggested to Zwingli by the writings of Erasmus, and the statement is intrinsically probable. But from Pico della Mirandola[1] he had learned that a good deal of Roman doctrine was open to serious criticism ; and quite early in his life he had received similar teaching from Thomas Wyttenbach, Professor of Theology at Basle. In the Disputation at Berne in January, 1528, Zwingli formulated his position thus : " It cannot be proved from Scripture that the Body and Blood of Christ are substantially and corporeally received in the bread of the Eucharist,"[2] and this formula was commonly adopted by the first generation of Swiss Reformers. It is very moderate and wholly negative. It affirms nothing as to what does take place in the Eucharist, or what can be proved from Scripture. It merely states what can *not* be so proved. The miracle of changing the substance of the bread and wine, which the celebrating priest was believed to effect, cannot be proved from Scripture.

It may be doubted whether the common view, that Zwingli regarded the Eucharist as a mere memorial, without any special Presence of Christ, is correct. He held that it was not the repetition of a sacrifice, but the memorial of a sacrifice offered once for all ; and he seems, at any rate in his later days, to have

[1] He died (1494) when Zwingli was ten years old; but Zwingli read his works.

[2] " Essentialiter et corporaliter in pane Eucharistiæ percipiatur " (B. J. Kidd, p. 460).

taught a Presence of such a kind that it could be grasped by faith, though not pressed with the teeth. In his "Fidei Ratio,"[1] drawn up some sixteen months before his death, he says, *Credo quod in Sacra Eucharistia verum Christi corpus adsit, fidei contemplatione.* But in Geneva, if not in Zurich, there seems to have been doubt as to what he meant by this, and Calvin, who rejected both the Roman and the Lutheran view, as Zwingli did, yet regarded Zwingli's doctrine as "profane."

The Disputation at Berne in 1528 was between Zwinglians and Romanists; the more famous Conference at Marburg in 1529 was between Zwinglians and Lutherans. The two great leaders of reform, who agreed so heartily about fundamentals, and who owed so much to one another's teaching, here met for the first time. They parted, not only without agreement as to the chief subject in dispute, but to be henceforward opponents rather than allies, although, out of fifteen articles laid before the Conference, they had agreed about all but one. The Conference had been arranged by the Landgrave Philip of Hesse. Luther and Melanchthon went to it unwillingly. Luther wrote to Philip that it would be useless, for "I can expect nothing good from the devil, however fine an appearance he puts on." Zwingli went eagerly, and stole away from Zurich in order to be present. Luther began the colloquy by writing on his table, *Hoc est corpus meum*, as if those words, without interpretation, were decisive. That is too like Dr. Johnson kicking the stone to disprove the idealism of Berkeley. After no agreement had been reached on the fifteenth article, Luther declared that two parties which differed on so fundamental a question could not be regarded as brethren. As to the Zwinglians, "we may treat them with charity, but we cannot regard them as members of Christ."[2] The whole Reformation, as Ranke remarks, was concerned with convictions which admitted of no compromise. To Luther all compromise appeared to be weakness.

[1] Kidd, p. 474.

[2] See his bitter letter to Jacobus, Provost of Bremen (Jackson, p. 316), and to several others (Currie, pp. 258, 262, 274, 288, 423).

The doctrine which forms one of the strongest links between Zwingli and Calvin is that of Predestination. It was held by Luther also, but with less emphasis. Both Zwingli and Luther denied "the freedom of the will," but on different grounds. Luther denied it in order to safeguard the merit of God in effecting man's salvation. If man is free to take part in saving his soul, then his salvation is not wholly due to the grace of God. Zwingli agreed with this, but his aim was to safeguard the absolute sovereignty of God. If man is free to act as he pleases, then God has not complete control in His own universe. According to Zwingli, God is the only active Being; all activity is His activity, and what we call human activity takes place in accordance with His absolute and eternal decree. Judas and Cain were as much rejected to eternal misery before the foundation of the world as the Blessed Virgin and the crucified robber were elected to eternal bliss.

Zwingli, like Hobbes, sees clearly the conclusion to which his arguments lead, and, like Hobbes, he does not shrink from it. If man has no freedom, and God is the sole cause of human action, then He is the cause of all man's evil conduct, not merely as allowing it, but as compelling it. Men sin because God makes them sin. It is God who makes the robber murder the innocent, and the treachery of Judas is just as much God's work as the conversion of St. Paul. In order to evade the conclusion that in that case God is immoral, Zwingli says that God is superior to the moral law which He has imposed upon man. How can we tell what it is right or wrong for God to do? We know what He does, and if He does it, it cannot be wrong for Him.

This doctrine of Predestination, so terrible in its logical issues and in the practical result of making men reject or abandon Christianity, is commonly associated with the teaching of Calvin. When people talk of Calvinism, they generally mean, or especially include, Predestination. And yet it is quite certain that Calvin did not originate it, but adopted it from Zwingli and Luther. Nevertheless, history has been just in attaching this doctrine specially to the name of Calvin. More than any other teacher

he has caused this doctrine to be, until the present generation, a dominating influence among Protestants. We may reasonably conjecture that, if there had been no Calvin, one of the most blighting beliefs that has ever been supposed to be part of the Christian faith would either have fallen out of men's minds altogether or would have been confined to very few. Luther does not place it in the foreground of his teaching; and if it had been left where Zwingli left it, it would never have attained such general and lasting approval among Protestants. It was Calvin who secured this for it. He did so largely by his consummate ability, which goes for a great deal. This is nowhere more conspicuous than in the "Institutes," which Lord Acton pronounces to be "the finest work of Reformation literature." Of the doctrine therein contained he says: "By the thoroughness and definiteness of system, and its practical adaptability, Calvinism was the form in which Protestant religion could best be transplanted; and it flourished in places where Lutheranism could obtain no foothold, in the absence of a sufficient prop."[1] Secondly, after Calvin had become supreme in Geneva, he was able to preach to all the world in a way that Zwingli was never able to do at Zurich. Not a few people came to Geneva on purpose to hear Calvin; he had competent lieutenants in almost every country, and some of his numerous writings were very widely read, so that his opportunities of teaching what he believed far exceeded those of Zwingli. Again, in teaching this doctrine, Calvin dwells more upon election than upon reprobation. It is the security of the saved, rather than the doom of the lost, that interests him; and therefore those who heard or read him would be attracted by the side which he accentuated, instead of being shocked by that which makes the doctrine so repulsive to us. With regard to the repulsive side, he takes refuge in the ignorance of man. Man is utterly unable to understand, and incompetent to criticize, the will and action of God.

But perhaps the chief reason for Calvin's attaining a success far beyond that which Zwingli attained is the fact that the latter gave

[1] "Lectures," pp. 131, 136.

Predestination a philosophical basis, while Calvin gave it a theological one. From his conception of the nature of God, which Zwingli believed to be dictated by reason, he inferred that man could not be free, but must be predestined to act as he does act. Calvin professed to pay no attention to human reason, but to derive this doctrine simply from Scripture. The Word of God was his authority for it. This gave him an enormous advantage. The appeal to Scripture is still very popular, and it was specially so in Calvin's day. Moreover, to those who believe in the inerrancy of Scripture, the appeal seems to be decisive. The appeal to philosophy has neither of these advantages. Not many of us claim to be philosophers, whereas all of us believe that we are theologians. Calvin's constant calling the Bible as a witness has had an immense effect in popularizing the doctrine of Predestination; and, no doubt, if one may regard all passages of Scripture as equally binding, and if one may pick one's texts, and ignore all that tells on the other side, one can prove this doctrine, and a great many others besides.

When Francis I., in 1525, came back from his captivity in Madrid, he helped the reform party, and the frequency with which he changed his policy towards the Reformation is one of many illustrations of the way in which politics, in all countries, influenced the course of the movement. After one or two fluctuations there came, on October 18, 1534, the incident of the Placards against the Mass, and thirty-five Lutherans were burned. A little later Francis wanted the help of the German Lutheran Princes; so he instructed his ambassador in Germany to tell the Princes that the persons whom he had put to death were turbulent Anabaptists who had rebelled against civil authority. Calvin was indignant that peaceable reformers should be stigmatized as rebels, and he at once published the "Institutes," with a dedication to Francis I.[1] In this he says that his object in addressing the King is "to vindicate from insulting accusation his brethren, whose deaths are precious in God's sight," and to let him know the real tenets of the men who are

[1] Kidd, pp. 528-532.

being so monstrously maltreated. He hopes that "some sorrow and anxiety may move foreign peoples, for the same sufferings threaten many." This prefatory letter to the King is dated August 23, 1535. It is called "a master-piece of apologetic literature."[1] Cardinal Newman used to date the birth of the Oxford Movement from Keble's Assize sermon on National Apostacy, July 14, 1833. If we want a definite date for the birth of Calvinism, we may take the dedicatory Preface to the first edition of the "Institutes," August 23, 1535. The work which it dedicates to Francis is the outline of the Calvinistic system—a system of iron, cast, like the author of it, all in one mould, admitting of no flexibility, and receiving afterwards no important modification.

[1] "Enc. Brit.," eleventh edition; art. "Calvin," p. 72.

(*To be concluded.*)

The Prayer-Book and the Needs of the Day.

By the Rev. W. H. POLAND.

I.

IT is, of course, a mere platitude to say "this is an age of progress." We are all convinced of it. The very solar system, to which we belong, is, we are told, moving on to some unknown part of the universe. It follows that no single moment can be exactly like the last. Words must change, people must change, opinions must change. Yet, it is hardly too much to say that the Church of England scarcely seems to realize this sufficiently. True, we have had a valuable Revised Version of the Holy Scriptures, which has cast much light on some obscure passages, and at the same time widened our ideas of truth. But the machinery of the Church remains much the same as it was some three or four hundred years ago. And, in many respects, we may be said to be fighting the battle of the twentieth century in sixteenth-century armour. The motto of many of its sons seems to be that of the great Georgian statesman, Walpole, "Quieta non movere," or, in more common parlance, "Let sleeping dogs lie." A timidity and nervousness, as of the aged or the weak, seems to have crept over the Church in some respects, though her activity in other respects shows emphatically that there is no need for this. Why is there such a dread in many quarters of touching the Prayer-Book? The rank and file of the Church, the congregations, are practically demanding some changes to suit the needs of the day. If the Prayer-Book is perfect, why then, of course, it would be sheer madness to interfere with it. If, however, it is imperfect and does not altogether suit our times, then it is little better than cowardice not to attempt wise, cautious and well-considered changes. In the time of Puritan despotism it was an offence to use the Prayer-Book. In the reign of James I. it was a crime to find fault with it.[1] "Cambridge passed a grace forbidding all persons

[1] *Vide* W. Page Roberts, "Conformity and Conscience," p. 109.

within the University from publicly finding fault with the doctrine or discipline of the Church of England, either by word or writing, upon pain of being suspended from their degrees." "And the Convocation of 1604 declared every man to be excommunicated who questioned the complete accordance of the Prayer-Book with the word of God." We live in more enlightened times now, or it would not be safe to issue this little brochure, for in it some criticism will appear.

But before proceeding to criticize it is a positive duty, and an act of justice, to commence with praise. If the first great gift of the Reformation to us was the Bible in English, surely the second was the Book of Common Prayer, a book of "unrivalled literary nobleness."[1] Baron Bunsen said: "We may with justice affirm that since the Canon of Scripture was closed, humanity has produced nothing which for the solid worth of its contents in relation to the religious apprehension, whether of the individual human heart or of the Church at large, can be compared either with the hymn-book of the German Church, including the prayers for special occasions, or the Common Prayer-Book of the English Church. Both are the joyful Amen of humanity to the glad message of the Bible; both are the work of the Spirit of God operating through the Church,"[2] while a recent historian calls it "the most wonderful achievement of any age—the greatest, next the Bible, of any human production."[3]

To begin with, it is strictly Biblical, and, it being so, Christians who conform to it may well consider themselves the best entitled to the name of "Bible Christians." It is hardly too much to say that almost every word of it comes from, or can be proved out of, Holy Scripture. Next, it is exceedingly ancient in origin. If the early Christian Church was modelled, to a great extent, on the Jewish Synagogue,[4] the earliest Christian services were modelled also on its services.[5] The eighteen set

[1] W. Page Roberts, "Conformity and Conscience," p. 13.
[2] "God in History," iii. 205. [3] Brewer, "Henry VIII.," ii. 472.
[4] Smith's Dictionary, "Synagogue." [5] Freeman, p. 64.

forms of prayer in use in the Synagogue, the practice of reciting the Psalms, the reading of lessons, and the delivery of a sermon or discourse, formed a groundwork on which the earliest Christian services were built up. The earliest forms of prayer naturally centred round the celebration of the Holy Communion, and so early were these forms, called liturgies, introduced, that certain of them are mentioned under the names of St. Mark, St. Peter, St. James and St. John, though they may not have been committed to writing until the third century.[1]

The oldest post-Apostolic prayer is found in a portion of the first Epistle of St. Clement of Rome,[2] and is evidently a prayer which he was accustomed to offer in church as a Pastor.[3] The date of this would be about A.D. 95 to 98. Justin Martyr gives an interesting account of the usual Christian services about fifty years later. It is well known that a great many of our Collects are taken from the most ancient service-books, dating from A.D. 400 to 600, so that they are about 1,400 years old, while the *Venite* has been in use in Church services for about 1,550 years.[4] Next, in praise of the Prayer-Book, one would like to remark on the non-controversial character of the prayers. They are not arguments or sermons. In this they are far superior to most extempore prayers by which the hearers are often, it is to be feared, handed over to what has been quaintly called "the unhandsome issues of a sudden tongue."[5] Nevertheless, though the Prayer-Book is Biblical; though it is linked to the greatest antiquity, to the Jewish form of worship which our Lord Himself must have joined in, and to the earliest forms of Christian prayer; though it is excellent in simplicity, dignity, and spirituality; yet it is not altogether above criticism, for it was *arranged* in comparatively modern times from various Cathedral uses in our land (such as those of Salisbury, Hereford, Bangor, York, and Lincoln), which were themselves derived from primitive liturgies, and from certain early books of devotion.

[1] W. Trollope. [2] Schaff, Hertzog, Encycl., "Liturgy."
[3] Bishop Lightfoot. [4] Campion.
[5] Bishop Taylor, quoted by Page Roberts.

The first Prayer-Book was issued in 1549 (the second year of the reign of Edward VI.), the second in 1552, which was much the same as the book we now use. But it was revised in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, again in the reign of James I. (1604), and again in 1661, the reign of Charles II. This brings us down fairly near to our own times; and at this time—viz., 1661[1]—were introduced the second prayer for Fair Weather, the two prayers for Ember seasons, the prayer for Parliament, the prayer for All Conditions of Men, and the General Thanksgiving. There were also some further alterations made at the same time, including the introduction of some new Collects. Now, the points for consideration are these: Can the Church not as safely revise the Prayer-Book now as in the reign of Charles II.? Is the Holy Spirit no longer coming into the world and acting through the Church? Are our divines less scholarly than those of 1661? Is our knowledge of Christian liturgies and antiquities less than theirs? Are the men of to-day less likely to be charitable, wide-minded, and discreet than the men of that day? Surely all these questions must be answered in the negative. And, if so, a case for revision is made out.

The Prayer-Book is a wonderful book; but "we have no duty towards its *framers*."[2] They were men like ourselves; in some respects we may say inferior, for it was an age when Christians of all schools of thought were too apt to persecute and even destroy each other.

Any revision undertaken would, we feel sure, considering the great desire happily prevalent in these days for unity and concord, be designed not to cast members out of the Church, but to retain as many of different views as possible, and even to draw others outside the Church within its pale again. In fact, we feel sure it would be designed not to be more exclusive, but to be more inclusive even than it is at present. In this it would follow the spirit of the simplest, and in its inception the

[1] Procter. [2] Newman, "Tract XC."

most ancient of the Church's rules of faith[1]—the Creed commonly called the Apostles' Creed.

Next, we imagine such a revision would have as a leading principle to alter as little as possible, to exclude as little as possible, in fact would take the line of enrichment rather than of impoverishment. And lastly, we imagine, it would very carefully consider the needs of the day, so that there might be greater elasticity *allowed*, needless repetition avoided, and rubrics appointed permitting a wise and cautious curtailment of too long and wearisome services.

I will now proceed to give a few examples of what some would like to see by way of illustration.

II.

1. In the Order for Morning and Evening Prayer some addition to the opening sentences would be welcome, especially if arranged to suit the greater seasons of the Church, as in the American Prayer-Book;[2] also an *alternative* short exhortation, as found in that book, as follows: "Let us humbly confess our sins unto Almighty God." This would be convenient, especially for use on week-days when only "two or three are gathered together." It would be convenient, too, if the prayer for All Conditions of Men were printed *in* the offices for Morning and Evening Prayer, and a clause might well be introduced before the word "finally" such as "We beseech thee to bless and preserve our King, and all the Royal Family, and to give grace and wisdom to all in authority that they may minister true justice to the people, and that we may live a peaceable life in all godliness and honesty." Such words to be used in the place of the State prayers, but to be omitted when such State prayers are used. It was, in the opinion of many, the original intention to include some such clause, as the word "finally," indeed, seems to suggest, it being somewhat needlessly introduced.[3]

It would be a great advantage if, when there is an Ante-

[1] Lumby, 112; Campion. [2] Issued 1790. [3] Procter, p. 262.

Communion Service or a celebration of the Holy Communion, Morning Prayer should cease at the end of the third Collect, as in the first Prayer-Book of Edward VI., for in the Collect for the King's Majesty, and the prayer for the Church Militant, we have practically all the State prayers over again.

As regards the Lessons, many think a new lectionary most desirable, and that some mere historical lessons now read on Sundays might well be omitted, and some very desirable ones from the prophets substituted. And it would be a great gain if at the Morning Service, when there is no Communion or Ante-Communion Service, the Epistle and Gospel might be read at the lectern in the place of the Second Lesson. This would not be without ancient precedent.

2. The Litany ought surely to be said sometimes at afternoon and evening services. There are some people who can rarely attend church in the morning, and who, therefore, seldom join in this wonderful and comprehensive Congregational Prayer, in which no one is forgotten, from the King upon his throne to the child in its cradle, from the traveller by land or sea to the captive languishing in the dungeon. The richest of our prayers is the Litany—the great Supplication—and in every respect the most inclusive, since in it we entreat that it may please God to have mercy upon all men.

3. We are, I hope, all good and loyal subjects of King George. But we may pray even for a good King too much. A little anecdote will serve to explain. A concert was once being given in a country parish, and a poor woman invited to attend it, one of the incentives being that she would hear "God save the Queen" sung; to which she replied: "And why not sing God save us all, as well as the Queen?" There is something in this. We ought to find *room* for some other prayers without overlooking the Sovereign. Is there not a certain amount of vain repetition? The grand prayer in the Accession Service for unity ought surely to be more frequently used, and an additional comprehensive prayer introduced for all those in poverty, affliction, sickness, danger, doubt, or perplexity. Room should be found

for such prayers as these in the Order for Morning and Evening Prayer.

4. The prayers for Rain, Fair Weather, etc., require a little revision. And is there not a great need of a few prayers which might be used in the place of the State prayers on Rogation days, at a Service of Intercession for Missions, at Harvest Festivals, and on Hospital Sunday?

5. The Athanasian Creed, which in the opinion of some is a Canticle rather than a Creed;[1] which some hold to have been composed about A.D. 430, but which is of much later date in the opinion of others of authority, who hold it to have been composed, or at least its two parts brought together, between A.D. 813 to 850;[2] which, it is agreed, was not the work of St. Athanasius at all; which is not in use in the Greek Church; which is not found in the American Prayer-Book; which has ceased to be recited in the Irish Protestant Church; which was not introduced into our country until about the ninth century; moreover, which is later in date than the Nicene Creed, which was intended to be the final Creed of the Church—this Creed, the Creed of St. Athanasius so called, many would like to see treated as a Christian Psalm or Canticle, like the *Te Deum*, rather than as an exposition of faith required of all. Furthermore, certain verses which give offence to many, and (unless said with certain secret understandings and mental reservations) seem to go beyond the Scriptures in direct assertion, might well be altered, excised, or at least inserted in brackets, so that they might be omitted, if desired.

6. The Psalter also, it is contended, requires some rearrangement and revision: Psalms are wanted for the 31st day of the month, for Harvest Thanksgivings and for other special occasions. And what has been said of the Athanasian Creed might well be said of those Psalms known as the Imprecatory or Maledictory Psalms, in which there are sentiments which no Christian can properly sympathize with, as they are indicative of a zealous but barbarous age, and do not coincide with the

[1] Called anciently, "Sermo," or "Psalmus." [2] Lumby, Swainson.

Spirit of Christ, who on one occasion had to rebuke His disciples for displaying such sentiments, saying unto them, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of."[1]

7. In the Communion Service, which breathes the Spirit and, to a great extent, reproduces the exact words of some of the most ancient Liturgies, there is, probably, little many would like to alter, nor would it be easy to enrich it. One would like, however, to see the American Prayer-Book again copied in one respect. After the recitation of the Ten Commandments, the minister may say, "Hear also what Our Lord Jesus Christ saith: Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great Commandment. And the second is like unto it: Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two Commandments hang all the law and the prophets."

8. The Marriage Service, which is really two services in one, might with advantage be condensed, and certain portions which belong to a ruder age, and are somewhat shocking in the ears of some who hear them for the first time, might be modified or excised. Is it quite true always to say, "With all my worldly goods I thee endow," when, possibly, relatives have just been uttering some protest against an insufficient settlement?

9. In the Baptismal Service, the Exhortation might be amplified to show more clearly the Church argument for infant baptism. After "I will," one would like to see the words added, "the Lord being my helper," or "I will endeavour so to do, the Lord being my helper," as in the Baptismal Service for those of Riper Years. Some latitude might be allowed as to godparents. The child's parents might be allowed to stand. When necessary, as in ancient days, one only might be required—viz., one male godparent for a male, and one female for a female. Our own rubric was only inserted in 1662.[2]

10. It is always difficult to get people to come and take part in the Commination Service; perhaps there would be some-

[1] S. Luke ix. 55.

[2] Campion.

what less difficulty if the cursings of the law (which can be well explained, but which all the explanation in the world does not tend to make acceptable) were omitted, and if this beautiful and necessary service were to commence with the Exhortation, or Psalm li.

11. It is probable that no one would raise objections to the remodelling of the service for the Visitation of the Sick. Very rarely is it used in its entirety, and many additional prayers are required, and have to be found and used by the clergy from other parts of the Prayer-Book, from books of ancient Collects, and collections of prayers not issued by authority.

12. The Catechism would be enriched by having added to it the supplement adopted by the Lower House of Convocation in 1887.

13. Throughout the book the rubrics undoubtedly require revision. Some are practically obsolete and never acted upon. A few words also might well be altered since they have lost their original sense and taken on of late years a different signification (*e.g.*, "With my body I thee *worship*," meaning honour).

14. At most Diocesan Conferences the subject of Prayer-Book revision has been discussed, and the Lower House of Convocation, by a considerable majority, has decided in favour of it. Few will perhaps agree with all that has been said in this paper. No one will agree to everything. Still, I think many will find some points of agreement, and will be interested to investigate the subject; and it is a subject that concerns every member of the Church.

The Prayer-Book, to end where we began, contains, we all feel, far more excellencies than deficiencies. When the work of revision is attempted we trust the most capable and wise men will be chosen to deal with the matter. And we should one and all pray that they may be guided and governed in their labours by God's Holy Spirit, so that "all who profess and call themselves Christians may be led into the way of truth, and hold the faith in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace and in righteousness of life."

A Lesson from the Great Conferences of the Church.

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

THE intentionally ambiguous phrase, "Great Conferences of the Church," will suggest to some the famous succession during the four and a half centuries between 325 and 787 of seven Œcumenical Councils which have been appealed to since by all Christendom; perhaps, also, the thirteen Councils of the subsequent millennium (869-1870) which the Roman Church alone appeals to as authoritative. But others, to whom the Bible and the present day are more familiar than past ecclesiastical history, will think of various other gatherings; from that described in the Acts of the Apostles to that which was convened in Edinburgh in 1910. And if the main purpose of studying history is to interpret the problems of the present in the light of the widest possible experience in the past, we may surely bring together, in order to compare and contrast them, all these notable assemblies of Christians without confounding things which differ. The Councils have all been Conferences, though only some Conferences have been Councils.

For "Council" connotes a representative assembly of Bishops and other authorized delegates from different churches or dioceses, summoned to settle, by the decision of a majority, points in dispute. An Œcumenical or General Council originally signified one representing "the whole world" (*totus orbis*)—that is, the inhabited or civilized world, practically the Roman Empire, which was becoming synonymous with "Christendom" when the First Council met. Eventually, an Œcumenical Council implied one with legislative powers, officially summoned.

No one would dispute that the Conference at Jerusalem in A.D. 50 was one of the great turning points in Church history. But it cannot claim the title of "First General Council," often given to it. For Antioch seems to have been the only Church that sent delegates; there was no point in dispute between

church and church, and the decision to which "the whole Church" assented was based, not on the votes of a majority, but on the dictum of those who could say, "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us."

Passing from the earliest to the latest great Christian Conference, the one at Edinburgh consisted of a far larger number of delegates, and was drawn from a far wider area, than any Œcumenical Council, but its unofficial and purely deliberative character was marked by the fact that it wisely avoided the designation "Œcumenical," which had been claimed by its predecessor at New York in 1900. Whether any Christian Conference that has ever met was literally entitled to the name of Œcumenical is, however, a question that thrusts itself on those who look closely into the Councils which form the pivots of early Church history.

Three groups of Conferences stand out, one for each of the three divisions of the historic Church — Greek, Latin, and Anglican; and we may add a fourth group of modern conferences, which will certainly be recognized hereafter as having made history not less than the rest.

Even at the risk of wearying many readers who are entirely familiar with their story, consideration of the relation of all these Conferences to each other must be preceded by a rapid enumeration of the most important of them, noting when and where each was held, by whom it was summoned and ruled and attended, and what was its main object and outstanding result.

The earliest Christian Conference met at Jerusalem in A.D. 50, just twenty years after the Ascension, about the time that the Romans were colonizing London. It was summoned by the Apostles, presided over by St. James, Bishop of Jerusalem, attended by the Apostles and elders and by St. Paul and St. Barnabas as delegates from Antioch. Its object was to settle the terms on which Gentiles could be received into the Church in days when it was harder to conceive of Christians who were not Hebrews than it has been at many periods since to conceive of Hebrews who are Christians. Not a very large

meeting probably, not acknowledged to be a great event even in the Christian world, it resulted in determining once for all that entrance into the Church need not be through the synagogue. And therefore our religion survived when the Jewish State fell in A.D. 70. Henceforth it could be recognized as potentially universal, and the first step towards making it actually universal had been taken.

The first Council summoned by a prince in response to an appeal to the civil power was the Synod at Arles in Provence, called by the Emperor Constantine in 314, ten years after the last and worst of the Ten Persecutions began, and ten years before his own public profession of the Christian faith. It was attended by 200 Bishops, including three from Britain, and dealt with matters of discipline rather than doctrine, and especially with the Donatist Schism.

Ten years later, at Nicæa in 325, the first Œcumenical Council met, summoned by Constantine, presided over by Hosius, Bishop of Cordova, attended by 318 Bishops, of whom 310 were of the Eastern and eight of the Western Church, and by other clergy, perhaps by 2,000 persons in all. It was the first example of a large assembly professing to represent the voice and conscience of the whole Christian community. Its object was to condemn the Arian heresy, and all Christendom now accepts its ruling as to the Deity of Christ and the magnificent Nicene Creed which it formulated.

The second Œcumenical Council met at Constantinople in 381, summoned by the Emperor Theodosius, presided over by the Bishop of Antioch, and later on by the Bishop of Alexandria, and attended by 186 Bishops, all of the Eastern Church. Its object was to condemn the Macedonian heresy and the Apollinarian heresy, affirming the Deity of the Holy Ghost and reaffirming the Deity of the Son. Incidentally, it settled rival claims to the See of Constantinople.

The third Œcumenical Council met at Ephesus in 431, summoned by Theodosius II., presided over by the Bishop of Alexandria, and attended by 200 Bishops, of whom two repre-

sented the Western and the rest the Eastern Church. Its object was to condemn the Nestorian heresy (that there are two Persons in Christ), and its result was the secession of the Nestorian or Chaldean Churches, still found in Kurdistan and Persia.

The fourth Œcumenical Council met at Chalcedon in 451, about the time that Hengist was landing in Kent, summoned by the Emperor Marcian, presided over by the Bishop of Constantinople and by the two envoys of Leo, Bishop of Rome, attended by 630 Bishops, all, except two from Africa and the two from Rome, being of the Eastern Church. Its object was to condemn the Eutychian or Monophysite heresy (that there is only one nature in Christ), and its result was the separation of the Coptic Church, and also, through an unhappy misunderstanding, of the Armenian Church, which really approved its condemnation of Eutyches.

The decrees of these first four Councils were raised by the Emperor Justinian to the level of Holy Scripture; and Anglicans generally would accept Bishop Taylor's statement that "besides the decrees of the four General Councils nothing is to be required as matter of belief necessary for salvation." On the three later Councils at Constantinople in 553, 680, and 879, and on that at Nicæa in 787, we need not dwell, for their decrees are seldom quoted by Reformed Christendom.

Geographically all these Councils took place within a limited area; Chalcedon was a suburb of Constantinople, Nicæa in Bithynia is within 60 miles of it, and Ephesus only 170 miles off; and although the Western Church had become powerful in influence and wide in extent in the fourth and fifth centuries, and in Leo I. Rome had one of her greatest bishops, the seven Councils practically represented the Eastern Church only.

We owe much to them for formulating the Faith clearly, and contending for it effectually, but they benefited the Church by what they asserted rather than by what they denied. Subsequent history has, indeed, abundantly justified their condemnation of Arius, by demonstrating that the Gospel of salvation is bound up with the Catholic faith, recognizing the Saviour as Perfect

God and Perfect Man, and that no form of Christianity which falters about this supreme truth has ever been permanent or aggressive. But remembering that heroic missionaries of the Nestorian Church carried the Gospel right across Asia; that Armenia was the first country to adopt Christianity as its national religion; that its Church in olden days was also actively missionary, and has in our days a noble roll of martyrs; that the Coptic Church won Abyssinia to the faith, and has survived extraordinary persecution and isolation, and that the Copts are still the brain of Egypt—we must regard as deplorable the action that drove these three Churches outside orthodox Christendom, depriving it of their evangelistic zeal, and depriving them of its support when the storm of Islam overwhelmed them. As years rolled on, their own lamps burned dimly, and little trace of their propaganda remained. But had orthodox Christendom been less ready to rail on Nestorius as "a new Judas," to brand as heresy their efforts to express mysteries that baffle expression, these churches might have quickly recovered their swerve from Catholic completeness, and they and the rest of Christendom might have been saved from the loss that followed secessions due not more to persistence in error on one side than to lack of patience and charity and desire to understand on the other.

Gladly would one ignore the bitter, contentious and intolerant spirit of those early Councils. But one ought not to do so when there are in our midst those who like to think that all error starts from and centres in Rome, or that all sectarian strife dates from the Reformation. When we read of Constantine burning unread, at the Council of Nicæa, letters in which Bishops had penned fierce accusations against each other for him to adjudicate on, and appealing to these acrimonious ecclesiastics to refrain from recriminations; or of the six lay commissioners trying to still the tumultuous cries of militant parties at the Council of Chalcedon, we blush for the Church; especially now that the idealized Constantine "equal to the apostles" of tradition has given place to the historical Constantine, neither theologian nor saint, but an imperfect Christian, like

many both of high and low degree to-day who are newly won from heathendom.

Remote as they are from modern controversies, these early Councils may well teach our generation that nothing but harm and scandal to the cause of Christ can come from harsh thoughts and words or violent deeds.

Of later Œcumenical Councils which were as definitely Roman as the earlier ones were Greek, we need only recall three. The Fourth Lateran Council met at Rome in 1215, summoned by Pope Innocent III. and attended by over 2,000 persons, 412 of them Bishops. It stereotyped the dogma of Transubstantiation, destined to become the test question between Roman and Reformed in the sixteenth century.

The Council of Trent sat from 1546 to 1563 under three successive Popes, and out of the 800 sees Rome reckoned, 33 primates and 238 Bishops came to it, two-thirds of them from Italian States. It issued, as the authorized summary of what Rome adds to the Nicene Creed, the Creed of Pius IV., in the very year that our Thirty-nine Articles were set forth, and its outcome was the scission of the Mediæval Church into Tridentine and Reformed.

The Vatican Council met in Rome in 1870 under Pius IX., and included 589 Bishops from Latin countries and 14 from Germany. From this twentieth and last Œcumenical Council (as Rome reckons) the dogma of Papal Infallibility was promulgated, of which the Old Catholic Movement on the Continent is the result.

The Councils of the Anglican Communion may likewise claim a place in the story of the Universal Church. The first was held just three years before the Roman Church held its latest. The actual number of Bishops summoned by the Archbishop of Canterbury to Lambeth in 1867, 1878, 1888, 1897, and 1908 may seem small compared with the numbers mentioned for 451 and 1870. Archbishop Longley brought together 76, Archbishop Tait 100, Archbishop Benson 145, Archbishop Temple 194, and Archbishop Davidson almost

250. But then, no Church has ever had such large dioceses as our Church has. The 330 Bishops invited in 1908 represented not only the British Empire (which contains at least four times as many people as the Roman Empire contained at its largest, of whom quite sixty millions may be reckoned Christians), but also vast missionary Sees in China and Japan, while 330 of the Bishops who came to the Vatican in 1870 represented only Italy, with a population of about twenty-five millions.

The record of the earlier Lambeth Conferences (they were not termed "Councils") reminds one of the earliest Councils. In 381 rival claims to the See of Constantinople had been settled; so in 1867, the prominent question was the action of the Bishop of Cape Town in deposing Bishop Colenso from the See of Natal for heresy; and various questions of doctrine and discipline and episcopal jurisdiction had to be determined in 1878 and 1888. As we have seen, previous Councils had likewise defined doctrine, promulgated Creeds, and fixed the Canon of Scripture; had ordained rubrics and ritual; had regulated public worship and Church discipline; had adjudicated on claims to sees; had dealt with the relation of the Church to the State and of one Church to another; had condemned heresy and endeavoured to crush error by thrusting out heretics, and to compose differences by discussing them. But heresy had not been exterminated, differences had often been accentuated, and deeper division, instead of reconciliation, had come of discussion.

For absorbed with the thought that many of their fellow-Christians held unsound views, Churchmen generally had altogether lost sight of the more clamant fact that the great majority of their fellow-creatures were not in any sense Christians. When the Council of Chalcedon met, Ninian and Patrick were evangelizing Scotland and Ireland; when the Fourth Lateran Council met, Francis of Assisi was preaching Christ to the Moslem in his own camp at Damietta; three years after the Council of Vienne met in 1311, Raimund Lull closed his long and heroic missionary career by a martyr's death in North Africa; the earlier years of the prolonged session at Trent coincided

with the dauntless pioneer labours of Francis Xavier in India and Japan; a few years before the second Lambeth Conference the illustrious Bishop Patteson was martyred in the South Seas; three years before the third, Bishop Hannington laid down his life in Central Africa. But not one of these Councils, nor any of the others we have recalled, seems to have made any attempt to bring home to the Church that the purpose for which it was founded was that it might win the world to Christ.

It is true that the Archbishop's invitation to the Conference of 1867 was "to consider together many practical questions, the settlement of which would tend to the advancement of the Kingdom of our Lord and Master," but the extension of that Kingdom found no place in Pan-Anglican discussions until we come to what may well be termed the epoch-making Resolution of the Lambeth Conference of 1897—a Resolution inspired by Archbishop Temple and the present Bishop of St. Albans. Here it is, and, so far as we know, it has no parallel in the records of any previous Council of the Church of Christ: "We recommend that prompt and continuous efforts be made to arouse the Church to recognize as a necessary and constant element in the spiritual life of the Body, and of each member of it, the fulfilment of Our Lord's great Commission to evangelize all nations." Thirteen similar Resolutions followed, and one-quarter of the whole Report of the Conference is occupied with missionary topics. Moreover, the Encyclical Letter spoke of Foreign Missions as "the work that at the present time stands in the first rank of all the tasks we have to fulfil." We all remember that the note struck thus loudly and clearly in 1897 sounded yet more loudly and clearly in 1908.

And while the responsible leaders of the oldest Church and strongest force in Reformed Christendom have urged this duty, so obvious yet so long neglected, upon her whole world-wide Communion, it has been set forth in another series of Conferences, initiated at New York in 1854, continued at Liverpool and Mildmay in 1860 and 1878, attaining conspicuous size and widely representative character in London in 1888, and in New

York in 1900, and culminating in the memorable World Missionary Conference of 1910. Nearly 1,300 official delegates met at Edinburgh, over 500 from Great Britain, over 500 from the United States; over 170 from nine European countries, nearly 30 from South Africa, nearly 40 from Canada, and 20 from Asia, first-fruits of the Indian and Chinese and Japanese and Korean Churches that are to be. It was not summoned by a prince or a primate, though King George V. wrote a gracious message of Godspeed and goodwill, and both the English Archbishops took part in its proceedings, together with many other Bishops. No Church, as such, sent official delegates, but all the Reformed Churches were represented, and individual Greek and Roman prelates sent greetings. It had no legislative power, but one already sees its effectual influence working in many directions. Censure of other people is always as cheap as it is gratifying to our own self-complacency, but here was a truce to controversy, and a complete absence of contention and recrimination, because we met to carry out the marching orders of the Church. We cannot name any Council avowedly summoned to promote unity which has given so much diligence to keeping the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace as this assembly, called, not to compose differences, but to promote obedience to the plain command of the Master.

We Anglicans should learn from past and present great Christian Conferences not merely that the Greek and Roman communions failed to fulfil their early promises, and fell short as pure and strong and overcoming forces in the world to-day, because their Councils were concerned with defending rather than with extending the Church, but that we, living in an age when the missionary obligation on the Church is obvious as it has never been before, shall be far more blameworthy than our predecessors if we disregard it. With all the experience of this long past to guide and warn, our highly privileged Church can be pure and strong, can justify its claim to God's grace and man's allegiance, only as it strives with all the powers of all its members to overcome the non-Christian world and to win it to Christ.

The Missionary World.

IT was Edison, according to a writer in the March issue of *The Bible in the World*, who defined American genius as two per cent. inspiration, and ninety-eight per cent. perspiration. The phrase has a wide application to current affairs. The urgency of the foreign need, the apparent time-limit of the opportunity, the strange mingling of increased missionary interest and increased missionary inertia at home, generate a sense that any cessation in action is criminal, and make it easier for a Christian in the present day to work than to think or to pray. Yet our strenuous working appears to result in but little: the Church is quickened to interest, but so far adequate supplies of men and means are withheld. At home, amongst ourselves, there is industrial unrest, the warring of diverse interests, the stringent claims of those who desire lives more nearly approximating to our own, the startling revelation of solidarity as the trade of the nation has been paralyzed into inactivity, all the members of the body politic suffering almost as one. Here, again, at a time when action seems imperative, the power to act is gone. From the ends of the world, and from the heart of our own country, God speaks with one voice, not now still and small, but as the sound of many waters. From abroad and from at home there is a call to something deeper than action, a call to turn inward and consider our own ways. Why is the Church ineffective in the day of her opportunities in the world? Why is she tongue-tied, an almost negligible quantity in the social turmoil at home? Why does she not come and shout in lead, in light, in liberty? Why is she, as a whole, deaf to the cry of the East, and dumb in the miseries of the masses? Why is she tinkering at remedial measures, and ignoring the causes which underlie effects? Why does a land called Christian pour out non-Christian influence, and measure its missionary service by the drop? Why do we contribute a few thousands—metaphorically

speaking—to home "charities," and squander millions on luxuries, while the sweater thrives in the land ?

* * * * *

Of set purpose there is over-statement, lack of balance in the words. There is, of course, another side. Yet the harsh and jarring sentences are horribly true. A few weeks ago a ten-shilling subscription was withdrawn from a worthy object with the plea, "We cannot afford it, as we have so many expenses now, and we have just got a new motor-car, besides." Men have been compelled to pause in action that they may have time to *think*, time to realize the meaning of things, time to reconsider and repent. In individual life a time of forced inaction has resulted often in a reorganized life. It may be that God has brought us to face our measure of home and foreign failure with the same great end in view. More than nineteen centuries ago, in Palestine, there was lived a Life which set the model for lives that would vanquish self and the world. From that Life, reglorified, there flowed out a power which was sufficient, from circumference to centre, to establish a reign of righteousness, peace, and joy, even the kingdom of God. The power of that endless Life has never been withdrawn ; it is simply, absolutely, triumphantly sufficient to-day. The Christian Church is being forced to face its own relationship to that Life—a corporate yet an intensely individual thing. Heart, home, habits, expenditure, ambitions, business, class distinctions of an invidious kind, need to be passed in review in the light of the Life of Jesus. A Christianity which does not completely dominate us can never dominate the Church nor spread victoriously through the world. The root of the matter lies here, and herein lies its hope. "I am come that they may have life, and may have it abundantly," belongs to the twentieth century as truly as to the first. But it may be true now, as then : "Ye will not come to Me that ye may have life."

* * * * *

China has been slowly uncoiling her great destinies this month, the whole world watching the straightening of her affairs.

Inevitably there has been much disturbance of missionary work and a good deal of looting here and there, but the bloodshed has been wonderfully little, and one of the greatest revolutions of history has been carried through with admirable self-restraint. Every missionary magazine gives letters from the front, many add illustrations of great interest. The most striking contribution to our knowledge is that by Mr. Marshall Broomhall, editor of *China's Millions*, who travelled out to China some weeks ago in the steamer with Dr. Sun Yat-sen. He says of him :

" That this man is seriously in earnest in desiring the good of his country, that he is a quiet, determined, thoughtful man, sympathetic with Christian missions, and himself at least a nominal Christian, if not more, is fully evident. For him and for those representing other political ideals in China at this time, earnest and constant prayer needs to be made, for the happiness or the misery of nearly a quarter of the world's population rests on decisions made by these men."

Yuan-Shih-kai is himself a Confucianist, but has four sons being educated in the L.M.S. College at Tientsin ; General Li Yuan-hung—so we read in *The Bible in the World*—is an earnest evangelical Christian. Mr. Broomhall gives information as to the secret growth of the revolutionary party, and quotes several incidents which help to determine its spirit. As superficial indications of the change, he comments on the disappearance of the queue in Southern China, and the extraordinary demand for " anything " in the way of foreign hats ; " the dignified Chinese robes have given place to a mixture of East and West, which amounts frequently to caricature." The old calendar, which dates from the Manchu rulers, has disappeared. This has thrown all the new year calendars just printed out of use, one large Chinese firm in Shanghai having lost thirty thousand dollars by the change. Meantime, the famine in districts ravaged by the Yellow River is terribly severe, though its extent is scarcely realized by those whose eyes are focussed upon the political situation.

* * * * *

The relations of Missions to Governments is always a delicate subject. At present there are serious difficulties in Madagascar

which call for much wisdom on the part of the societies concerned, and much prayer from the home Church. The Friends' Foreign Mission Association, the L.M.S., and the S.P.G. are the British societies at work in the island, besides two Continental and two American missions. Bishop Montgomery recently said :

"It would seem that there is no course open to the English missionary societies but to approach the Foreign Office with an urgent, though respectful, request that communications should be opened without delay with the French Government. We are threatened under present regulations with a complete destruction of all Christian effort, of all leave to evangelize, and even of permission to worship privately as well as publicly, except as individuals. It is not expedient to say more as yet. Bishop King, of Madagascar, feels it to be his duty to return home under these circumstances to press the claims of Christians who desire to be loyal subjects of the French Empire."

* * * * *

The increase in the Christian population in India, tabulated carefully in the *Times*, naturally forms the basis of thankful comment in many periodicals. In the C.E.Z. magazine—*India's Women*—Canon Weitbrecht makes an interesting study of the Punjab returns, which show the astonishing increase of 431·6 per cent. in the decade since the former census. This is largely accounted for by a great Mass Movement, which affords an opportunity which Canon Weitbrecht considers "unparalleled in India," inasmuch as the accessions are independent of any marked external cause, such as famine. The situation is equally full of peril and of promise; there is need for a generous advance on the part of all Punjab missions, notably those of the C.M.S. and C.E.Z.M.S.

* * * * *

The South American Missionary Society has issued an effective appeal to British investors in South American securities. Christian men who have a financial stake in a country should make proportionate effort for its spiritual help. If the principle were generally recognized and acted on, not South America only would gain. Every mission field, and the needy settlers in

our great colonies, would receive fresh aid. There is a work here for the Laymen's Missionary Movement to take in hand.

* * * * *

There is a pathetic but courageous editor's letter on "Candidates for Lay Work Abroad," in the *S.P.G. Home Workers' Gazette.* The subject is characterized as "depressing," because, except as members of a celibate brotherhood and specially for educational work, few vacancies for laymen can be found in the S.P.G. fields. The difficulties are real, because, on the one hand, an ordained man is needed for the oversight of a congregation, and a layman who breaks down in health has no career open to him on his return home. Care must be taken lest men, lacking true call to the ministry, take Holy Orders as the only way to fulfil their missionary vocation. Are there no means by which such men, if physically fit, could be given personal help and guidance, and go forth to commercial posts in the mission field? Their influence is sorely needed, and in many spheres their Christian character would be welcomed by employers. Some link of associateship would serve for the transmission to them of spiritual stimulus and fellowship from home. Here, again, the Laymen's Missionary Movement would have a noble sphere.

* * * * *

The current (March) number of the *C.M. Review* will attract many. The first part of Rev. P. I. Jones' account of Delhi, the new capital of India, is distinctly good reading, and there is more to come. There is a double record, through report and visitation by Bishop Peel, of the extraordinary promise in the C.M.S. Mission in German East Africa. With his wonted industry and perspicacity, Dr. Stock analyzes the list of the preachers of the C.M.S. anniversary sermons, and their texts, from 1801-1911. Dr. Crawford, transmitting the story told by the last survivor of the faithful "Nasik boys," forges fresh "links with David Livingstone." The Rev. E. S. Woods urges "A Call to New Discipleship." The number also contains the committee's reply to a memorial addressed to them. In it the unfaltering adherence of the Society to the great living

principles which dominated its founders is affirmed. To those in doubt the sober, well-balanced statement will bring reassurance and relief. For ourselves, we need no affirmation of that which has always seemed unmistakably clear to our eyes. The editorial notes on this subject are effective and strong.

* * * * *

The *Student Movement* has a long and thoughtful article on "The 'New Thought' and the Missionary Message," by the Rev. A. W. Davies, a young C.M.S. missionary at St. John's College, Agra. It deals gently but trenchantly with the tendency to overrate the good elements of Hinduism, and points out the dangers which attend "the sympathetic attitude"—"an exaggeration of the value of the non-Christian religions, a depreciation of the importance of individual conveniences, a tendency to emphasize Christian living at the expense of Christian faith." Mr. Davies is meeting a real danger, and for the student audience to whom he has addressed himself we would not modify a word. But the paper lays itself open to misuse by those who tend towards "the unsympathetic attitude"—a fault of age, as the other is a fault of youth. Perhaps the *Student Movement* will "follow up" by a mediating article from a middle-aged man! There need be no antithesis between sympathy and truth.

* * * * *

A great missionary has passed from among us in the person of Bishop G. E. Moule of Mid-China, who died on March 3, at the house of his brother, the Bishop of Durham, in his eighty-fourth year. He went out as a C.M.S. missionary in 1857, and for over half a century served his Master with unsparing devotion in China. He was not only a true missionary, but a great Chinese scholar. The roots of his influence struck deeply into the life of the country which he loved. Thousands of Chinese will mourn his loss. But how many will await him with welcome in the many mansions of the Father's House!

G.

Notices of Books.

COMFORTABLE WORDS FOR CHRIST'S LOVERS, BEING THE VISIONS AND VOICE VOUCHSAFED TO LADY JULIAN, RECLUSE AT NORWICH IN 1373. Transcribed and edited from the recently discovered Manuscript ("Brit. Mus. Addit.," 37,790). By the Rev. Dundas Harford, M.A. *H. R. Allenson, Ltd.*

The substance of this treatise has been some years before the public in Miss Grace Warrack's edition of the larger version, of which this has been regarded as a condensation. It is maintained by Mr. Harford to be earlier. In this latter form it is now printed for the first time, from a manuscript bought by the British Museum at Lord Amherst's sale in 1909. It seems to be the manuscript described by Francis Blomefield, in the eighteenth century, in his "History of Norfolk." Mr. Harford identifies the two for reasons not given in the Introduction: first, the agreement in the number of the pages; secondly, the identity—with trifling variations of spelling—of the title in each case. Blomefield, however, gives a wrong date in his Introduction, and has thus misled later writers—*i.e.*, 1442 instead of 1413.

Lady Julian was an anchorite at the Church of St. Julian, Norwich. Hardly anything is known about her except from her own writings. We share the editor's admiration of this little work. Some may be repelled by the morbid craving for suffering which is manifested at the beginning, but, in spite of this, we think she represents the best type of medieval mystics. She is not one of those who are specially influenced by the Neo-platonic tradition, which, intellectually stimulating as it was, could never be wholly assimilated by Christian theology. She does not crave absorption of thought and faculties in a Divine automatism. On the other hand, she is no mere visionary. Her spiritual insight is essentially inward, central to her being. Her revelations, as she tells us, took three forms: (1) "bodily sight"; (2) "words formed in mine understanding"; (3) "ghostly sight," which she could never fully explain. Here we have the sense of a gradation, recognized by the most thoughtful and balanced of the mystics, between the knowledge of definite truths and the ineffable direct experience of God. It excludes a crude dependence upon special explicit revelations on the one hand, and an unbalanced appetite for emotional or super-emotional ecstasies on the other. God's self-revelation is felt to be personal and ineffable at the core; yet there is intellectual, if not always emotional, sobriety; and the revelations take the form not of speculation, but of devotional teaching, submissive to, yet relatively independent of, her traditional creed. This last point may be illustrated by her teaching on Assurance: "Verily it is God's will that we be as secure in trust of the bliss in Heaven, whiles we are here, as we should be in security when we are there" (p. 107). And this is more even than an assurance of present acceptance; our Lord, she tells us, said to her "with full sureness, 'Thou shalt not be overcome.' And this teaching and this true comfort is as generally to all my even-Christians, as I have before said; and so is God's will" (pp. 116, 117).

Her thoughts about sin are also profoundly affected by her mystic standpoint. She emphasizes its nothingness as having "no matter of substance,

nor part of being," and says even that it were "a great unkindness of me to blame God for my sins, since He blames not me for sin" (pp. 76, 77). Sin is, for her, made visible, so to speak, in all pain and suffering, above all in the Passion of Christ, outside of which it is unthinkable. There is, of course, a one-sidedness, in such handling of the subject. From one point of view, this one-sidedness may perhaps be regarded in connection with the failure of the Roman Church to provide the assurance of a status of pardon on the basis of the Atonement. The mystic whose experience of God is the cause rather than the effect of his deliverance from the terrors of the Law, sees in the Cross not so much the annulling of guilt as the abiding expression of the daily forgiveness and purification that presupposes union with God. Of course, not all Christian Mysticism is Roman Catholic, and if its Protestantism is not always as definitely Christian and Evangelic as we could wish, it is well, surely, to make Mysticism more orthodox by making orthodoxy more mystical and experiential, and not to hold aloof from the study of writers, who, whether Roman or only vaguely Christian at all, disclose any peculiar experiences that are fruitful in practical goodness.

A. R. WHATELEY.

VAL AND HIS FRIENDS. By Agnes Giberne. *S.P.G.*, 15, Tufton Street, S.W. Price 2s. net.

It is encouraging when a well-known writer lends her energies to a missionary tale. Val is a capital little lad in an English town; his principal friends are an Indian boy sent over for an English education and a dreamy second-hand bookseller who is opportunely left sufficient income to enable him to go out as a lay agent of the S.P.G. to North India. The Indian boy is baptized ere the story closes, and Val has set his face to the Mission-field. It would be easy to criticize; but the tone of the book is so uniformly good, and so much useful information is pleasantly conveyed, that we forbear. The book is meant for boys; but it was, perhaps, scarcely necessary to omit all reference to the fact that there are also little girls in the world. The rector's daughter is grown up, so does not strike the chord which a little sister would have touched. It is one to which boys respond.

COMMUNION WITH GOD. By Darwell Stone, D.D., and D. C. Simpson, M.A. Edinburgh: *T. and T. Clark.* Price 4s. net.

This little volume is not, as its title might seem to imply, a book of private devotions; it purports to give a brief history of man's quest for God and of the revelation of God to man, from the earliest dawn of history till the coming of Christ. The chapters, though necessarily somewhat slight, are worth reading. Not the least valuable portion of the book is the Appendix, which contains a carefully arranged list of books that readers may find useful for further study of so deeply important a subject.

DEATH AND THE HEREAFTER. By Henry Drew. *Oxford University Press.* Price 2s. 6d. net.

Thoughtful sermons, mostly about death, but full of faith and hope, by the late Rector of Hawarden. Marred here and there by a narrow and somewhat bitter High Churchmanship.

PRACTICAL PSYCHOLOGY. By Gregory Smith. London: *The Century Press.* Price 3s.

An attempt to apply practically some of the results of the modern study of psychology. The writer decides that religion is founded on morality; we believe the converse. Interesting and suggestive, but scarcely a safe guide to psychology or to life.