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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

May, 1912.

The Month.

The Coal Strike.

THE strike is ended, but none too happily. The effort to bring peace, made so patiently and so gallantly by Mr. Asquith, failed, and the aid of an Act of Parliament had to be invoked. We do not wish to say anything about the conduct of either side, but we do point out that the country is faced with a problem which will need the most careful handling, unless it is to spell ruin for all. These recurrent strikes are not merely matters between masters and men, the nation is as vitally concerned as either. In the particular strike just ended, it has been difficult to decide with whom public sympathy lay and what public opinion on the matter was. The difficulty was caused by the technical character of the dispute. This means that, for the real settlement on proper and peaceful lines of the difficulties between capital and labour, we must have an educated public opinion. If this is true of public influence it is particularly true of religious influence. The Church cannot guide where it does not understand. We have said it before, but we must say it again. The study of social problems is part of the duty of the Church. The Conservative Churchman is afraid of that study, because most of it has hitherto been done by the Socialist and Liberal. There the Conservative Churchman has largely failed of his duty. We presume that behind a political position, as behind a religious position, there are principles. It behoves us

surely to study our social problems and to apply our principles to them. Principles that are incapable of application cannot be very valuable.

The Right to Strike.

In an article in the *Hibbert Journal* for April, Mr. Robert A. Duff discusses the question of the right to strike. Mr. Duff sees that if that right is carried too far it may cease to be a right and to become an act of tyranny. He counsels the more excellent way of mutual understanding and the wooing of public opinion. He is dealing with the railway strike of last August, but his words are even more applicable to the present struggle. We venture to quote two paragraphs from a thoughtful article:

"It is not by such coercive measures that better relations are established, but by seeking out the real causes of the difficulty. And that difficulty, in large measure at least, is common to both the companies and their servants, and arises from the heavy burdens imposed upon this public service by legislation, by imperial and local taxation, and the absence of any simple method of adjusting the charge to the discharges. Hence, capital is hard to get, workers are kept on small wages, and there is serious friction all round. If the real problem is to be faced, still more if it is to be solved, a larger and broader view will need to be taken by the State and by the public, as well as by the parties themselves, of the conditions necessary for success in this field."

"But I am convinced that the less the workers rely on their trump card, the strike, and the more they rely on full and accurate public ventilation of their case, the sooner will a remedy be found for their real grievances. They will make a grave mistake in tactics if they turn the sympathy of the public with their reasonable claims into the exasperation of the man who feels himself ill-used without cause. And they will gain much more in the end by asking for, and abiding by, some neutral arbiter's award, than by any attempt to coerce a whole nation into compliance."

Educational Movements.

The miners are not the only section of the community who are dissatisfied with the present condition and are agitating for a change. In the educational world many are by no means content with present methods, and there is persistent movement towards a change of system. The question of the abolition of Greek as a compulsory subject at the older Universities, is, for the moment, suspended. But it is refreshing to find a veteran teacher like Mr. Oscar

Browning come forward with such uncompromising support of the *status quo* as that given in his letter to the *Times* Educational Supplement of April 2. He writes as "one who has always endeavoured to stand in the van of educational reform, and who would die in the last ditch for the maintenance of what is called compulsory Greek." Towards another important movement we are, for our own part, very sympathetic, and hope for radical reform; that is the larger question of the examination system. The Consultative Committee's Report on the examination of secondary schools continues to evoke useful discussion. It is to be hoped that in the outcome, inspection of the school at work may come to take a larger part than it does at present, under the present system of external examination. A process of elimination, too, might well be set up with regard to existing examinations, with great advantage both to teachers and to pupils.

Reunion of Scotch Churches.

It is gratifying, amid the clash of conflict and the murmurs of unrest, to find that there are also spheres of our national life in which the movement towards unity and concord is the dominant theme. Important proposals have been framed on the subject of Scottish Church Reunion, and have been embodied in a "Memorandum showing suggested course of Procedure and of possible Legislation with a view to Presbyterian Reunion in Scotland." The proposals have been drawn up by the Church of Scotland Committee, and have been sent to the conveners of the United Free Church Committee. They are of course tentative, but the object of them is to show that Reunion is not only ideally desirable, but practically feasible, provided that there be earnest good-will on both sides. This is the only basis, as the framers are careful to emphasize, in which any scheme of Reunion can rest. The uniting Churches must be in hearty concord in this or any other scheme, before Parliamentary sanction is sought. One point in the proposals is of significant interest for ourselves who are deeply concerned for the future of the Church in Wales:

"The Church of Scotland maintains that the endowments are to be conserved for the United Church, and will go forward in the matter of union only upon the footing that the United Free Church and the Government of the day, which is to make itself responsible for the necessary legislation, accept the position that the endowments are not to be secularized." Scotland, at any rate, will not tolerate the idea that money given for sacred objects shall be put to secular uses.

Tendencies in England.

This movement towards internal reunion on the part of Scottish Presbyterianism is matter for profound thankfulness to all those who long for the general reunion of the Churches. A movement on so great a scale cannot fail to arrest public attention. There are in England, too, signs, far less prominent, but none the less real, that bodies of Christians, hitherto apart, are moving towards a closer approximation in thought and worship. One interesting example is worth mention here. Those who are conversant with the inner life of Wesleyan Methodism know that, till quite recent times, Good Friday, so far as it met with distinct observance at all, was something of a feast-day, on which the Band of Hope, or a similar organization, held its annual entertainment. This practice still lingers in country districts, and in Primitive Methodism is generally common. In a small northern watering-place—at which the writers of these words is staying—the Primitive Methodists are celebrating Good Friday with an annual tea-party followed by an entertainment, at which recitations, solos, action songs, are a leading feature. At the Wesleyan Methodist Church there is a service, with an address on the Seven Words from the Cross! The difference is marked, and very significant.

Letters on Vestments.

In the *Times* of April 3 there is published a correspondence between Lord Northampton, Lord St. Aldwyn, and the Archbishop of Canterbury, on the subject of the Eucharistic Vestments. The general result of it cannot fail to be very disquieting to loyal Churchmen.

Lord Northampton, who was one of the Royal Commissioners and signed the Report, is startled and alarmed by the Resolution of the Upper House of the Canterbury Convocation passed last July, which proposes to leave the words of the Ornaments Rubric unaltered, and "to authorize, under specified conditions and with due safeguards, a diversity of use." This means, as Lord Northampton points out, that without any reference to Parliament (inasmuch as the text of the Rubric is not altered) "a diversity of use of Vestments is to be authorized, in direct contradiction to the findings of the Law Courts in 1871 and 1877." We regret to say that Lord Northampton has been unable to get any satisfaction. The situation in a nutshell is this: Those who wish for the Eucharistic Vestments know that it would be useless to ask them from Parliament, inasmuch as that is the place—under present conditions the only place—in which the Anglican laity can give expression to its views. Reference to Parliament must, therefore, at all costs be avoided. This is technically possible by leaving the words of the Ornaments Rubric intact. Convocation is then to devise a "process" of disobedience to the only authoritative and legally binding interpretation of the words of the Rubric. Obviously the last word in this matter should not be allowed to lie with Convocation as at present constituted.

St. Matthew's, Sheffield.

The Archbishop of York, who had been appealed to by the churchwardens of St. Matthew's, Sheffield, on the subject of the recent removal from that church of certain images by a band of Kensitites, who conveyed them to the Archbishop's palace, has replied in two letters which are not calculated to lessen the disquietude with which the episcopal attitude towards law-breaking clergy is regarded by ordinary Churchmen. After expressing, very justly, his disapproval of the action of those who removed the images, the Archbishop urges the churchwardens and congregation to be patient in the matter, and to refrain from any provocation in word or deed, as in that way they will deprive the agitation of

any public interest or sympathy. He says, indeed, that there are matters in connection with the teaching and worship of St. Matthew's Church of which he cannot approve, and which prevent his visiting the church or licensing a curate to the parish, though in his subsequent letter he assures them that these matters do not relate to the fundamental articles of the Christian faith. In regard to these, he also assures them that he has "every reason to believe" the preaching of their Vicar "is, and always has been, true, earnest, and faithful." The question, however, is not whether the Vicar teaches the fundamental articles of the Christian faith, but whether, like the Church of Rome, he adds to them other teaching, which in practice goes far to deprive them of their life-giving power—teaching, moreover, directly contrary to that of the Church of which he is a minister.

Those who know the thoroughly Roman teaching and practice approved by the Vicar of St. Matthew's, Sheffield, will view the Archbishop's letter with grave anxiety, for it appears to indicate that nothing more is to be done to secure conformity to the Church's teaching and order in that parish. But if the matters are serious enough for him to decline to license a curate or to visit the Church, they are surely serious enough for him to take some further and more effective action.

issions in ndia.

A far-reaching step has just been taken. A native clergyman is to be consecrated bishop, and is to act as Suffragan to the Bishop of Madras. If we did not know something of the difficulties of Missionary work, we should be tempted to ask why has India had to wait so long. Indeed, that question does somewhat mingle with our satisfaction at the announcement just made. Natives of India have long shown their capacity for valuable service in commerce, in law, in medicine, and in politics. Moreover, splendid service has already been done in the Missionary cause by ordained native pastors. We cannot help feeling that we might have moved a little faster than we have. Of course, speed would have meant mistakes, but St. Paul was content to make them. His normal policy seems to

have been to have entrusted to each Church the control of itself. Perhaps if he had not done so the troubles at Corinth, the defection in Galatia, and the heresies of the Lycus Valley would not have arisen. Certainly, modern Missions would not have been so bold as St. Paul. But if St. Paul had possessed our modern caution, and instead of ordaining "elders in every Church," had depended for the government of the churches upon the mere handful of Missionary colleagues who travelled about with him, we cannot but believe that the area of his Missionary operations would have been considerably lessened. We know it can be contended that the "elders in every Church," were simply native pastors of comparatively inferior rank, but it must still be remembered that they were overseers—Bishops of the native churches. We realize how great are the problems and perplexities of modern Missionary enterprise, and we do not in the least wish even to seem to find fault, but now that the experiment has been made, we pray that God's richest blessing may rest upon it; and we venture to hope that our leaders in the Missionary cause may see their way to repeat it again and again.

Religion in France.

In spite of transient phases of national antipathy there have always been many bonds of union between England and France, and in matters of the intellectual life there have been many affinities. It is true that we in England with our slower processes and our apparently illogical compromises, in matters both ecclesiastical and political, have been amazed and almost shocked by the cool and remorseless logic with which conflicting issues have been perceived and acted upon in France. England was startled at the time of the Revolution by the clean sweep which France made of Christianity as presented by Roman Catholic Ecclesiasticism. In more recent times we have stood aghast at the "thorough" policy which has disestablished and disendowed the churches, expelled the priest from the schools, removed the crucifixes from the law courts, and driven away the majority of the monastic clergy. We have seemed unable to avoid the conclusion that France is hopelessly

atheist and radically materialistic. It is possible that such a judgment may turn out to be superficial and inadequate. M. Sabatier's recent book "*La France Nouvelle*," which has deservedly attracted considerable attention, maintains that France—so determinedly anti-Ecclesiastical—is religious at heart. She is, in her own way, feeling after God. It is true that the destructive phase has been fierce and ruthless. When we think what Roman Catholicism had come to mean for France by 1789, we can hardly wonder that it was so. But a constructive period may follow, and the present development of patriotism in politics, and of idealism in thought, may be the earlier stages of a movement which will bring France to a knowledge of God in Christ.

Robert Browning.

The present month will probably see a large output of literature on the subject of Browning, his place in the hierarchy of poets, and his general influence on thought. Our own pages contain an article on his religious teaching. In this place we must content ourselves with saying that the present seems especially to be a time when we shall do well to listen to his message of high faith and resolute optimism. Some are inclined to say that "God's in His heaven, all's right with the world," expresses a shallow view, and that all is most certainly *not* right with the world. This, however, is to miss the depth of Browning's idea. It is because earth is not all, but there is a heaven also, and that God's rule is not ended by earth, but continued in heaven; that we can work for Him and with Him in hope, and not simply struggle with the fortitude of despair. Another thing we may lay to heart is Browning's invincible optimism in his estimate of people; his power of seeing the good in those who seem so bad. Those who are compelled to take a share in party strife, whether ecclesiastical or political, may always sweeten its acerbity by seeing the good in those from whom they differ. And in these days of minute, critical investigation, the New Testament student will do well to read and re-read *The Death*

in the Desert. It may well be questioned whether the view of St. John and his writings there set forth is not nearer to the absolute truth than much of the critical writing of the present day.

Caution in Criticism.

The Rev. E. C. Dewick won the Hulsean Prize in 1908 with an essay which he has just published on Primitive Christian Eschatology. The book is interesting, thorough, and illuminating, and we hope to review it in our pages in due course. Here we only refer to it in order to notice two cautions which Mr. Dewick incidentally suggests to the students of to-day. Mr. Dewick is writing of the limitations of our Lord's knowledge, and raises some difficult questions; he then adds:

> Those who are willing to concentrate their attention on one aspect alone of the Person of Jesus will find little difficulty in supplying an answer to the questions such as these; but a satisfactory solution of the problem of our Lord's human limitations is one of the tasks which still lies before the Church of the future. In the meantime, it behoves the Christian scholar to remember the limitations of his own knowledge, and to abstain from hasty dogmatism on such matters.

Later on in his book Mr. Dewick has occasion to criticise the position taken by Professor Harnack, and adds:

> Harnack's contention would be weighty if Jesus had lived in the Germany of to-day; it does not apply to the conditions of life among the Jews twenty centuries ago.

Mr. Dewick is a young scholar, but he is a sane one. He has early learnt the lesson which comes so hardly to the younger, and, be it said without irreverence, to some of the older critics of to-day, that modern scholarship is not omniscient. He has learnt, too, that if we are to understand our Lord's teaching, we must understand the age in which He lived and the people to whom He spoke. There has been much wild writing on the subject of Eschatology during these latter days. We are most thankful for the spirit in which this latest contribution to the study of a subject, probably the most thorough in the English language, is presented to us. It is a book which must not be allowed to pass unheeded.

The Divine Education of Man: A Study in Ethical Progress.

By the Rev. G. S. STREATFEILD, M.A.,
Rector of Goddington.

I.

TO deal in any adequate way with the evolution of human character, or, as it might otherwise be expressed, the moral making of man, would require a volume rather than two short articles. All that will be here attempted is very briefly to draw attention to the progressive course of human history in regard to those moral and spiritual principles in which personal character is rooted, and from which, therefore, human conduct springs.

The subject is one beset with difficulty for more than one reason. To begin with, it is impossible to trace the earliest stages in the development of character, since we can only deal definitely with the annals of history, and the foundations of history are in the prehistoric past. Again, the Biblical records to which our appeal is chiefly made present problems which belong to the field of literary and historical criticism, and inferences drawn from those records are necessarily affected by critical considerations. For example, personally, I believe that the patriarchal narratives are substantially historical, and that they bear witness to monotheistic belief and worship previous to the Mosaic revelation.[1] I do not for a moment accept a criticism which represents the story of the patriarchs as almost the pure invention of the literary period of the Hebrew nation. But it does not necessarily follow that those who compiled and edited the ancient records, and threw them into their present form, did not colour the narrative, to some extent at least, with

[1] At the same time, the life of Jacob shows how narrow was the borderline between a primitive monotheism and the polytheism by which it was surrounded.

the religious conceptions of their own time.[1] Similarly, it would be unwise, considering the conditions of modern thought, to insist upon the traditional date of the Books which supply much of the material for our discussion; and until the chronological order of the codes of law incorporated in the Pentateuch is settled, it is impossible to use them with dogmatic confidence in an inquiry which is primarily, though not exclusively, historical. It is therefore necessary, in dealing with our subject, to treat it on the broadest possible lines, and we shall have accomplished the task we have set ourselves if we make it clear that the Christian character is the crown and consummation of historical development. Nor shall we now concern ourselves with the world at large, or the human race as a whole. Starting with the assumption of what has been termed "a central revelation,"[2] it will be our endeavour to show that one of the ways, indeed, the principal way, in which that central revelation declares its progressive nature, is in the type of character it has produced—in other words, in the moral and spiritual effect that it has had upon the nature of man.

We cannot, obviously, pass from the Pentateuch to the New Testament without realizing that there has been an onward and upward movement which places a great gulf between the times of the patriarchs and the Epistles of St. Paul. The ideal Christian is a very different man from the ideal patriarch. Much of St. Paul's ethical teaching would seem strangely out of place if transferred to the Book of Genesis. So, too, as we contrast the Apostle's conception of God and man's relation to the unseen with the spiritual ideas of the Hebrew as outlined in the narrative of the Pentateuch, we recognize, without effort, the fact that, in the one we are dealing with the childhood, in the other with the maturity of the human race.

There is, perhaps, nothing more difficult for the modern mind to grasp than the growth among the "chosen people" of the ethical conception—still more of the conception of holiness. For

[1] Thus much is admitted by Professor Orr. See "Problem of the Old Testament," p. 88.

[2] Gwatkin, "The Knowledge of God," i., p. 133.

the Christian, accustomed to interpret these ideas by the life and example of our Lord, it is hard, not to say impossible, to throw the mind back to the time when the early Israelite thought of ceremonial "cleanness" and "uncleanness" as involving moral distinctions, and regulated his worship of the Divine Being by what is best described as a system of taboo. It is impossible to treat this subject in detail, but it must be borne in mind that to the ancient as to the modern Semite[1] life did not possess the ethical significance that it does for us. From the promulgation of the law, however, if not from an earlier period, this ethical significance found place in the general religious and social life of the Hebrew. We see the rude and superstitious tenets of savage society becoming instinct with moral and spiritual power. Contrast, for example, the heathen conception of the Divine jealousy with that which was fostered by the Jewish prophets. While the heathen worshipper pictured his god as standing stiffly on a sense of personal dignity that could be satisfied with a strict observance of sacrifice and ritual, Jehovah's jealousy was viewed by the prophets from a purely moral and spiritual standpoint, and constantly urged as an incentive to a purer and higher life. Jehovah is represented as not merely jealous for His own honour, but also for the character of those who worship Him.

No question has been, or still is, more keenly debated than the relative dates of the priestly and Deuteronomic legislation. On the one hand, it is contended that it is an anachronism to place the elaborate ceremonial of the priestly code after the more spiritual temper and teaching of Deuteronomy.[2] On the other hand, the internal evidence is unquestionably strong that pre-exilic Israel was unfamiliar with the greater part of the

[1] On the ancient Semite, see Robertson Smith, "Religion of the Semites," pp. 140-143, 249. On the modern Semite see Ives Curtiss, "Primitive Semitic Religion To-Day," pp. 66, 149. This lack of ethical enlightenment is not confined to the Semite, whether ancient or modern. Our missionaries in India tell us that the nearest approach to what the Christian knows as a sense of sin is produced in the Hindoo by the breach of ceremonial law and social etiquette.

[2] So Dean Strong in Hastings' "Dictionary of the Bible" (Ethics), i., p. 779.

Levitical code.[1] The truth lies, perhaps, midway between the two contentions. Without attempting to discuss this problem, it may, nevertheless, be pointed out that legislation on elaborately ceremonial lines for the post-exilic period can hardly be regarded as an anachronism in view of the fact that the Temple ritual served the important purpose of safeguarding the monotheistic faith of the Jew, and probably saved the Hebrew people from being absorbed into the surrounding nations; for, although it cannot be disputed that some of the ceremonial practices prescribed by the Levitical law were survivals from a prehistoric past,[2] others were emphatic protests against the customs of their heathen neighbours.[3] This, however, is certain, that the Jew, whether observing practices common to himself and his fellow-Semites, or those which differentiated his own worship from theirs, as from every heathen cult, was never allowed to forget that his worship was with a view to righteous living. Not only was Israel's ritual untainted by the moral pollutions that degraded alien religions, but it was an instrument for bringing the worshipper into contact with a God, who, above all else, was a God of righteousness. Thus, the idea of holiness which had its origin in superstition rather than reverence, in terror rather than love, developed an ethical significance commensurate with the increasing realization of the moral attributes of God.

However distinct, therefore, and separate in their origin were the two conceptions of holiness and righteousness, it is impossible to treat them separately in the history of revealed religion, for Israel's primitive ideas of duty were rooted in religious faith, and never dissociated from a sense of the Divine majesty. In the history of the nation the priest represented the principle of holiness, the prophet that of righteousness; and

[1] This is the central position of Wellhausen. For English readers it is effectively set forth by Professor Robertson Smith in "The Old Testament in the Jewish Church." See also Hastings' "Dictionary of the Bible" (Religion of Israel), Kautzsch, v., p. 612. The recent discoveries at Elephantinê seem likely to throw fresh light on this problem. See *Expositor*, August and November of last year.

[2] See "Religion of the Semites," pp. 140-143, and Note C, Appendix.

[3] See Hastings' "Dictionary of the Bible" (Unclean), iv., p. 827.

attention has often been drawn to the contrast between the priest and the prophet in respect of the religious life of the people. The contrast is more apparent than real. Unquestionably, a ceremonial conception of religion was the ruling principle of the priestly code, whilst righteousness was the burden of prophetic teaching; but it is a great mistake to think that the prophets set themselves against anything but a misrepresentation of the priestly office and the flagrant misuse of Temple-worship. What the prophet rebuked was not the observance of an elaborate ritual, but the self-deception that thinks to satisfy God by the externals of worship apart from conduct. Indeed, to the true Israelite holiness could not be divorced from righteousness, implying, as it did, the strict observance of law, both ceremonial and moral.

This ethical connotation of holiness is forcibly illustrated in the call of Isaiah to the prophetic office. "Woe is me!" cries the prophet, "for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips: for mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of hosts" (Isa. vi. 5). Isaiah's first thought as he heard the song of the Seraphim was, probably, one of ceremonial unfitness: he is "unclean"; but that first impression passes into an overwhelming sense of his moral unworthiness to stand in the Divine presence. The cleansing fire must be applied before he can accept the commission and say, "Here am I, send me." Fitness for God's presence and service, by the time that Isaiah came upon the scene, was felt to be ethical rather than ceremonial, "Lord, who shall sojourn in Thy tabernacle? who shall dwell in Thy holy hill? He that walketh uprightly and worketh righteousness, and speaketh truth in his heart" (Ps. xv. 1, 2).

It is in the study of the prophets and the Psalms that we can best trace the progressive nature of Israel's morality. The whole strength of the prophetic order was thrown into the endeavour so to link the principles of righteousness with the character and attributes of God that holiness and righteousness should be indissolubly united. "The ceremonial order and the

ethical code are two co-ordinate developments of the one principle—the holiness of Jehovah," so that "the central feature of Old Testament morality is that it is religious."[1]

The burden of the prophetic message was the triumph of the Divine righteousness. The horizon extended in the course of the ages. More and more clearly was it seen that the victory was not to be achieved in the history of the chosen people only, but also in that of the world at large. Nor is it unworthy of note that that section of the New Testament which breathes most of the spirit and reproduces most of the letter of the Old—namely, the Book of the Revelation—takes up, in the language of allegory and figure, this message of the prophets, and with it closes the canon of Scripture, "The Lord God omnipotent reigneth."

When we come to examine the prophetic conception of righteousness, we find that the sins against which Israel was warned were chiefly those by which their neighbour would be injured. Injustice, oppression, treachery, adultery, luxurious living, extravagance, drunkenness, are denounced by prophet after prophet. And it must be remembered that Israel alone of the nations learned that every breach of the moral law was an offence against God and man alike. "Sin," says St. John, "is lawlessness" (1 John iii. 4). Sin is the transgression of a divinely ordained law. Such, too, was the teaching of the Old Testament. To live a righteous life was to "walk with God"; the unrighteous man has departed from God. Even in the records of patriarchal history it is the narrator's aim to show that unbelief is the root of sin. It is from this point of view that idolatry presents itself to the successive teachers of Israel as the worst form of sin, because the most complete departure from God.

In dealing with the subject before us we must be on our guard against the fallacy, into which criticism often falls, of "measuring the average man by the leaders of thought." The moral standard of the Book of Judges is, to all appearance,

[1] Hastings' "Dictionary of the Bible" (Ethics), i., p. 783.

unquestionably low; but it is not to be concluded that that Book represents the highest ethical knowledge and conduct of the period it deals with. Indeed, the contemporary Book of Ruth gives a very different conception of social morality existing side by side with that depicted by the writer of Judges; and no greater surprise need be felt at the picture that has come down to us of Hebrew life in the days of Jephthah and Samson than at the morality, public and private alike, of the Middle Ages, or the ethical standard of Highland Chiefs at a much later date. When we come to the prophetical writings, nothing is more obvious than that the prophets are recalling the people from ways they know, or ought to know, to be wrong. Their teaching was always too spiritual for the masses. It has been said that Jesus Himself could add nothing to the words of Micah, "What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" Yet the picture that Micah draws of his social surroundings is one of the saddest in the Old Testament.

At the same time, it is impossible, in reading the Bible, to miss the principle of development in moral perception, and, consequently, of character. The standard and ideal of one age are not those of another. The morality of the Decalogue is higher than that of the patriarch, that of the prophet higher than that of the Decalogue. Every part of the Old Testament, but the prophetical books in particular, teaches us that "human history is a moral process," and we only have to call to mind the ideals of the prophets to see the forward movement that was to find its consummation in the teaching of the New Testament. Polygamy, for example, was not forbidden by the Mosaic law, but the principle of monogamy is exalted, and inculcated by the frequent employment of the conjugal relation to represent Jehovah's union with His people; and thus was the way prepared for the New Testament to make polygamy an impossibility in the normal life of Christian communities. War—war, moreover, with all the savage accompaniments of pre-Christian times, is never forbidden, often encouraged by

the prophets; yet the prophetic ideal is not only national but international peace. The *lex talionis* stood written in the Law till the time of our Lord, and was doubtless defended by those who sacrificed the spirit to the letter; but from the later portions of the Old Testament, especially from the Book of Proverbs, we should infer that a kindlier view of life came, in course of time, to prevail. Imprecatory psalms may retain their place in the Hebrew book of devotion, but more and more clearly, as time went on, was the note of mercy sounded and the horizon of charity extended. The avenger of blood could claim support from the law-books of Israel[1]; but as the national life became more settled and civilized, the exercise of this right gradually fell into desuetude, and, by the middle period of the monarchy, all cases of bloodshed were referred to a court of justice.[2] To give one more illustration of this onward march of thought—although the rewards of obedience were, throughout the Jewish dispensation, regarded as of the earth, earthy—there is a growing tendency on the part of the prophets to lift the mind of their age to the spiritual and transcendental.

II.

The upward, progressive moral movement, of which we have before spoken, is the unique characteristic of the religion of Israel. By Divine impulse, direction, constraint, Israel trod a path of moral growth, which, explain it as we may, was not opened to other nations. Alone of the several branches of the Semitic race, they believed in a righteous God, a God opposed to sin, a Lord good and upright, and who will therefore teach sinners in the way (Ps. xxv. 8), a God whose purpose is educational and redemptive. In the religion of the Israelite there was a sense of sin and guilt to which their heathen

[1] It must be remembered that the harshness of this custom in Israel, as compared with other nations, was from the first greatly mitigated by the distinction drawn between accidental and wilful homicide (Exod. xxi. 13, 14), and by the provision of cities of refuge (Deut. xix. 1 *et seq.*).

[2] See 2 Chron. xix. 10. Many critics would dispute the historical value of this statement; but at least it is clear that in the chroniclers' time the practice of blood revenge had become illegal.

kinsmen were strangers. "The people" (*i.e.*, the heathen Semites), says Professor Robertson Smith, "were satisfied with their god, and it was taken for granted that, under ordinary circumstances, their god was satisfied with them. There was no aiming at an unattained ideal of righteousness."[1] We should look in vain in the annals of any other part of the East for such an episode as the historian records in 2 Sam. xii. 1 *et seq.* David's sin was Oriental, its sequel uniquely Jewish. Up to the appearance of the prophet upon the scene, says Dean Stanley, "the story belongs to the usual crimes of an Oriental despot. Detestable as was the double guilt of this dark story, we must remember that David was not an Alfred or a St. Louis. He was an Eastern King, exposed to all the temptations of a King of Ammon or Damascus then, of a Sultan of Bagdad or Constantinople in modern times. What follows, however, could have been found nowhere in the ancient world but in the Jewish monarchy."[2]

Coming to the prophets of the exile we find an attitude to religious truth which is not only much in advance of previous teaching, but also an indispensable step in the direction of New Testament ethic. It was the individualism of Jeremiah and Ezekiel that opened the way and prepared the ground for the work of Christ and His apostles. It is easy to exaggerate the lack of individualism in the religious life of a remote antiquity, to make so much of the solidarity of life as almost to exclude the personal element. Even if we could accept the view of those who allow no historical value to the patriarchal narratives and little to those of early Israel, we are, nevertheless, brought in those records into contact with a literature earlier than the exile by some centuries; and it is impossible not to see a strongly individualistic and personal element in the religious character of Abraham, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, Joshua, and many others whose portraits are given in the earlier parts of the Old Testament. Moreover, although it is quite probable, if not

[1] "Religion of the Semites," p. 237.
[2] "Lectures on the Jewish Church," 2nd series, p. 108.

certain, that the more introspective Psalms are post-exilic, it is by no means necessary to assign so late a date to all those portions of the Psalter which express the sentiments of a deeply personal religion.

It is, however, beyond dispute that the later prophets inaugurated a new era in the spiritual life of the Jew. National calamities rapidly succeeding one another had predisposed the Jewish mind to a less collective and therefore more personal view of Jehovah's relation to His people. The violent interruption which the Captivity caused to national life had shattered the conviction of security under the protection of Jehovah. And out of disappointment and disaster religion came forth purified and intensified. With Jeremiah the relation of man's soul to God becomes much more personal than with earlier prophets. The actual bringing in of the New Covenant (Jer. xxxi. 31 *et seq.*) may, to his mind, have been much nearer than in fact it proved to be; but the description that he gives of that covenant reveals his inmost thoughts in regard to religion, and shows that his ideal was personal and individualistic; "I will put My law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts" (verse 33). Ezekiel, Jeremiah's contemporary, strikes the same note, but goes far beyond Jeremiah in the expression he gives to individualism (xviii. 1 *et seq.*); nor does he hesitate to modify the teaching of the Decalogue in his reiterated declaration that the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, thus affording a conspicuous illustration of that law of development which underlay and determined the moral history of the race.[1]

Such teaching as theirs, it needs scarcely be urged, placed

[1] "The emancipation of the individual soul, whether from a doom inherited from a former generation or from one entailed on it by its own evil past was, perhaps, the greatest contribution made by Ezekiel to the religious life and thought of his time. He probably reached his individualism by reflection on such events as the downfall of the state, leaving now no place for religion except in the individual mind, and on the sentiments which he heard expressed by men around him. His contemporary, Jeremiah, reached the same truth from another direction, from his own experience of the *inwardness* of the relation of God to men. The very nature of this relation required that the religious subject should be the individual mind."—A. B. Davidson, "Book of the Prophet Ezekiel," Cambridge Series, Introduction, p. li.

sin in a truer light than that of earlier times. The solidarity of Israel was not lost sight of by the later prophets; far from it. They point forward persistently to a Redeemer of the nation rather than of the individual; but the individual rather than the nation is the unit with which they deal, and to which they address their teaching. The individual is responsible before God for his own conduct; no one is involved in another's guilt; the guilt of sin is before all things personal; it is the sinner whom God calls to repentance; it is through the individual that He henceforth deals with the nation (Ezek. xviii. 27, 32).

When we pass from the Old to the New Testament we are, from the first, in the presence of a perfect moral and spiritual standard as exhibited in the life of Jesus of Nazareth. Sin had obscured, but not destroyed, the moral vision of man; and when a perfect ethical standard presented itself the world was not slow to recognize the true ideal and goal of humanity. That which is perfect had come, and in the light of perfection, imperfection was seen and realized as it never had been before; sin was felt to be more exceeding sinful than the law had ever made it, for man has always formed his ideas of moral evil by the principle of comparison and contrast. What Christ's coming did was to substitute an absolute for a relative standard. The relative had waxed old and was ready to vanish away. "In a world where all develops the true nature of each thing is to be seen, not in the germ it starts from, nor even in the successive, intermediate stages of its progress, but in the perfection of the final end."[1] The *perfection of the final end* had appeared in Christ. The prophetic teaching, in progressively revealing the moral attributes of God, had made increasingly clear the distinction between good and evil, and laid bare the true nature of sin, as the contradiction of an all-holy Will. But here, in the person of Christ, were those moral attributes manifested without a flaw in a sinless human life.

Nor, I would point out in passing, is there anything inconsistent with the principle of evolution, as expressed in the history

[1] Illingworth.

of the past, in this sudden appearance of a perfect type of humanity. That there was a prodigious leap in the world of moral and spiritual experience in the person of Jesus Christ will be denied by few even of those who would dispute the objective reality of that spiritual world which was so intensely real to Christ. Doubtless, like others, I bring presuppositions to the consideration of the subject, but nothing appears more certain to my mind than that our Lord's humanity was not the natural, evolutionary product of His age. Here, however, there is no inconsistency with the general principle of evolution, any more than there is in the transition from inorganic to organic, from unconscious to sentient life, from sentient to self-conscious life. There have been critical and formative moments in the history of our planet of which naturalism can give no account, and the greatest of these epochs, in the judgment of the Christian, is that of the coming of Christ.

To return to our main subject, we see from the Acts and the Epistles that the Church, from the first, took Christ Himself as its object-lesson. "As ye have received Christ, so walk in Him." "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus." "Even Christ pleased not Himself." "Leaving us an example, that we should follow His steps." Thus was met the general, if not universal, need of man. "The vast majority of men are utterly unable to understand an argument; all can appreciate a character."[1] It was on this principle, consciously or unconsciously, that the first disciples acted. Although practical precepts for the direction of life, both individual and collective, abound in the New Testament, there is no carefully reasoned and formulated code of ethics, no philosophy of life; but Christ had lived; the cherished memories of His life are the Christian's rule of living—his vade-mecum that can be applied to every circumstance, to every experience.

And, as we stand in the presence of Jesus Christ, we are aware of something more than a vast stride in the growth of knowledge—knowledge, that is, of good and evil, truth and falsehood. It is a new departure. It is not merely a perfect

[1] W. S. Lilly, "On Shibboleths," p. 44.

example of the highest existing ideal of goodness that we see. Our Blessed Lord, both by His teaching and example, introduced into the world a new type of excellence. It is quite true that the best representatives of Judaism approximated in life and spirit to the New Testament standard. In the heart-religion—the expectancy, the unworldliness, of Mary, Simeon, Nathanael, and many another—there was, when our Lord came, a seed-plot for Christianity; but mixed with these higher elements was much of the legal spirit which had been strengthening its hold upon the Jew ever since the return from Babylon; so that the typical Jew of New Testament times, especially in Palestine itself, was above and beyond everything else a legalist. His conception of righteousness was obedience to specified directions and commands. The more commandments he could obey, the greater his righteousness. "Why did God give so many commandments?" is one of the questions asked in the Talmud; "That He might multiply Israel's merits," is the reply. No wonder, then, that tradition multiplied the commandments until thirty chapters of the Mishna were filled with directions concerning the use and purification of vessels. The superficiality, the externalism of the righteousness which Christ rebuked and repudiated is forcibly illustrated in the ready, self-complacent reply of the rich young ruler, who came running to Jesus with the question, "What good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life?" "If thou wouldest enter into life, keep the commandments." "All these things," returns the ruler, "have I observed; what lack I yet?" (Matt. xix. 17 *et seq.*). *All these things have I observed;* yes, and many more. The same characteristic temper, only in a far more offensive form, is exemplified in the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican.

At the same time, although our Lord rejected the Pharisaic conception of righteousness as worse than inadequate, and by a single sentence repealed the Levitical regulation as to "clean" and "unclean" in respect of food (Mark vii. 18, 19, R.V.), He did not break with the past. It was not a beginning *de novo;* it was rather a notable and decisive new departure in the history

of development; final, indeed, in one sense, because it brought to the world a sinless life, and therefore a perfect model for all time; not final, but progressive, in another sense, because a growing conformity to that model was thenceforth to be the end and aim of human history on its spiritual side. "It is difficult to see how the Christian morality can ever be brought into antagonism with the moral progress of mankind; or how the Christian type of character can ever be left behind by the course of human development, lose the allegiance of the moral world, or give place to a newly emerging and higher ideal. This type, it would appear, being perfect, will be final. It will be final, not as precluding future history, but as comprehending it. The moral efforts of all ages, to the consummation of the world, will be efforts to realize this character and to make it actually, as it is potentially, universal."[1]

There was, then, no break with the past; Christ came "not to destroy, but to fulfil"; there was much, indeed, that was new, much, on the other hand, that was old; so that "every scribe who hath been made a disciple to the kingdom of heaven, is like unto a man that is an householder, which bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old" (Matt. xiii. 52).

It is with the new that we are now concerned. The Sermon on the Mount occupies a relation to the kingdom of Christ similar to that which the Sinaitic law held to the Old Covenant. And in reading this sermon we are at once aware of a profound difference between the spirit of the old dispensation and that of the new. The sermon opens with the Beatitudes which "describe what a man is in the secret springs of his motives and dispositions." As we listen to the voice of Christ in these epoch-making words, we do not wonder at His declaration that the righteousness of His kingdom must exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees. At whatever period of our Lord's ministry the various parts of the sermon may have been spoken, they form, as they stand in the Gospel, an introduction to His teaching; and we are made at once, at the outset, aware of the advance that is

[1] Goldwin Smith, quoted from a lecture by Bishop Westcott in "Historic Faith," p. 231.

made upon the Old Testament conception of righteousness and of character. The rightness or otherwise of conduct is made to depend upon thought and motive; it is no longer the outward act alone that breaks the Divine law, but the wrong desire, the indulged inclination towards evil. It is in this spirit that our Lord deals with the Sixth and Seventh Commandments, together with the law of perjury. At the same time He enjoins, in striking contrast with the past, love to enemy as well as friend. Love, universal love, is to be the root of conduct; and St. Paul takes his stand on the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount when he says, "Love is the fulfilling of the law." Such, in a sentence, is New Testament ethic. God is love; man made in the image of God must be like Him; "Ye shall be perfect, even as your heavenly Father is perfect"—"Sons of your Father which is in heaven; for He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust" (Matt. v. 45, 48). And it was no mere sentimental love that Christianity planted in the world; it was a love that made men brave to act, brave to suffer, brave to serve. It was this love that evangelized the world; a love that realized the brotherhood of man through the revelation of the Fatherhood of God.

It is this principle of universal love revealed in Christ that accounts for the conspicuous contrast between the motives which characterize the two Testaments. Self-interest is taken for granted in the one; it is forbidden in the other. When we turn from the Book of Deuteronomy or Proverbs to the Sermon on the Mount or the twelfth chapter of Romans, we are breathing a different atmosphere, we have risen to a far higher plane of religious thought and experience. You could not transfer the promises of temporal reward for righteous living which abound in the Old Testament to any part of the New without rousing a sense not merely of incongruity, but of contradiction. The assurance of worldly prosperity was a trusty weapon in the hand of the Old Testament moralist; it has no place in the kingdom of Christ. Love from the New Testament point of view is its own reward. In passing from Old Testament to New we pass from carnal to spiritual.

Nor, in conclusion, must we forget that the ethic of the primitive Church, as reflected in the Acts and the Epistles, is inseparably bound up with faith in Christ, as the Divine Redeemer. The believing Christian's relation to the world was the corollary of his relation to Christ. To reproduce the mind which was in Christ Jesus was the aim, the ambition, of each member of the Church; but this only through union with the living Head of the Church. "By the grace of God I am what I am" (1 Cor. xv. 10), "Christ liveth in me" (Gal. ii. 20). So St. Paul described himself; so would he have described every true brother and sister in Christ. It was an ever-living, an ever-present, an essentially Divine Christ that he realized in his own experience and preached to others.

It has been already pointed out that the Sermon on the Mount holds something of the same relation to the Christian covenant as the Sinaitic law to the Jewish. We may go a step farther, and say that to Christ Himself is assigned in Apostolic thought a position, an authority, not inferior to that of Jehovah in the Old Testament. This was but to carry on the teaching of our Lord Himself, as recorded in the Gospels. It is His own kingdom that He proclaims, His own Church that He founds and builds, His own servants that He sends forth, His own presence and power that equip them for their work. And as the rejection of Jehovah is, from the prophetic standpoint, the root of sin and failure, so the rejection of Christ is regarded in the New Testament as the cause of all that contradicts and opposes the will of God. "He must reign till He hath put all His enemies under His feet" (1 Cor. xv. 25). "Till we all attain unto the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full-grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ" (Eph. iv. 13). Such was the vision that inspired the evangelistic labours of St. Paul; for he knew that when Christ has drawn all men to Himself and made them like Himself, then indeed will the kingdom of God be come, because His will will then be done upon earth as it is done in heaven.

The Continental Reformation.

By the Rev. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D.

VIII.—Calvin in France and Switzerland—*Conclusion.*

IT is said that three representative individuals chanced, for a short period, to be in Paris at the same time—Rabelais, Calvin, and Ignatius Loyola.[1] May we think of them as candidates for the patronage of France? And if we had been there with them, could we have guessed which of the three R's France would adopt, the Renaissance, or the Reformation, or Rome?

One might have supposed that the Gallican independence of the French Church, and the traditional jealousy respecting Papal encroachments upon the rights of French Kings, would have made France a hopeful field for the work of reform; all the more so, because early in his reign (1516) Francis I. had concluded a Concordat with Leo X., by which the King got the right to nominate to the higher ecclesiastical posts, both episcopal and monastic, in the realm. And when reform came in the shape of Calvinism, one might have expected that it would be specially attractive to Frenchmen.

Calvinism, in some respects, is thoroughly French. It is the product of a Frenchman; and its lucid and logical system is just what a very able Frenchman would be likely to produce, and ordinary French people to appreciate. Lutheranism had no such recommendations. The mere fact that it was made in Germany was enough to make it unacceptable in France. Some cultivated Frenchmen read Luther, and were influenced by him. But to the majority he was unacceptable. Although he was indifferent to politics, he was a German of Germans, and could not help showing his sympathies with Saxony and the Empire—powers that were generally antagonistic to France. Not until the Reformation movement came in the form of Calvinism did it make much progress among the French. Calvinism is, as

[1] Fisher, "The Reformation," pp. 248 *et seq.*

French revolutions are apt to be, a radical break with the past. There is a great deal of conservatism in Lutheranism, a desire to preserve, when destruction is not absolutely necessary. But Calvin seems to have had little sentiment about old traditions or a long past. With him the past was not specially venerable; and whatever could not justify itself as being sanctioned by Scripture, or at least strongly commended by reason, was surrendered without a pang. We have something analogous to this in the modern French temper, which, after a sharp political crisis, destroys national monuments, changes the names of streets and bridges, and strikes the name of God out of all official textbooks.

But there were other elements in Calvinism which were the reverse of attractive to the French character, and which more than counteracted its specially French features with the large majority of French people. Two of these told against its obtaining any wide reception amongst persons of culture, and one told against its reception by the nation in general.

Its leading doctrine of Predestination was abhorrent to most of the educated, and, indeed, to anyone who had clear ideas of justice. Was it credible that God would condemn men to everlasting torment for committing deeds which He had decreed from all eternity that they should commit?

Again, the failure of Calvinism to attain, either on its religious or its philosophical side, to anything approaching to liberty of thought or toleration of differences, was highly distasteful to those who were inclined to look upon all creeds as only tentative, and more or less open to question. And there were many such persons in France.

Above all, the sternness of the Calvinistic system, and its severity, not only to vice, but to many innocent pleasures, which may lead to vice, made it thoroughly unwelcome to the large majority of so gay a nation as the French. It is curious to speculate what might have been the result, if the genial Luther had been born and bred in France. Being German, he was impossible there.

Was, then, the only alternative to the rigidity of Calvinism, the more picturesque, but hardly more elevating, rigidity of Rome? Was Loyola to secure those whom Calvin failed to attract, so that Spanish Papalism, with its demand for unreasoning obedience to existing authority, was to decide doctrine and ritual for a Church which had just parted with the Pragmatic Sanction?

There were probably not a few Frenchmen in that age, including many of the more thoughtful as well as the most thoughtless, who would have said to these two rivals: "A plague o' both your houses." The liberal-minded followers of the Renaissance did not see why they should sacrifice either their freedom of life to Calvin or their freedom of thought to Rome. It was more in accordance with good taste and sound sense to have a good laugh over all things in heaven and earth with Rabelais, whose "Pantagruel" and "Gargantua" seemed to be far more in touch with human life than either the "Institutes" of Calvin or the "Spiritual Exercises" of Ignatius Loyola.

In 1536, Calvin resolved to bid farewell to France and settle in the Empire. The war between Francis I. and Charles V. caused him to go to Geneva, where he was caught by Farel, who with almost frenzied vehemence declared that God required him to stay at Geneva and help the work of reform.[1] In vain Calvin pleaded that he needed leisure for private study at Strasburg. Equally in vain Farel pleaded the needs of Geneva. At last Farel descended to terrible adjurations, and declared that God would curse Calvin's leisure, if he refused to help in time of need. God had stretched out His hand to stay him. Calvin was frightened, and was convinced that this really was a Divine call. He was now twenty-seven, and he and Farel worked with such energy to enforce strict discipline in Geneva that two years later they were banished.

In 1540 Calvin went to the Diets at Hagenau and Worms, and in 1541 to the far more important Diet at Ratisbon, which

[1] Kidd, "Documents," p. 544.

was presided over by the Emperor Charles himself. Here Calvin formed a very close friendship with Melanchthon. It was during this period of banishment that a French translation of the Bible appeared at Geneva. It bore Calvin's name, but like Jerome's Vulgate, it was only a revision of a previously made translation. Calvin had revised Olivetan's French version. Its publication may have helped to restore him to favour at Geneva. He was recalled, and on September 13, 1541, he returned, not at all eagerly, but believing once more that the hand of God was upon him. Beza says that he was received with the greatest congratulations of all the people, and recent historians speak of immense enthusiasm. But there seems to have been no public demonstration.[1] He presented himself to the Little Council, and began work again that very day. His banishment, during which he had married, was treated as a mere interlude. So far as was possible, he went on where he had left off three years before. But he had now to work single-handed, for Farel had found a sphere for his energy elsewhere.

Calvin's labours in Geneva from his return till the time of his death—nearly twenty-three years—were enormous. It was reckoned that every year he delivered nearly two hundred lectures and preached nearly three hundred sermons. In addition to this, he had constantly to be attending meetings and writing replies to criticisms. He was also producing the "Commentaries" which are still read by many, and was carrying on a large correspondence with persons in various parts of Europe, especially with the Protestants in France. His health was not strong, and, like Erasmus, he suffered in his later years from gout and stone. He often lay down on a couch and dictated his "Commentaries" and his letters. When he could no longer walk he was carried to the pulpit. He allowed himself fifteen to thirty minutes exercise in the day, and this he commonly took walking about the room. No wonder that he suffered from indigestion! He says that he was usually too busy even

[1] Williston Walker, "Calvin," p. 262.

to look out of window, and he writes to a friend that he has almost forgotten what the sun is like. Many of us know how beautiful the surroundings of Geneva are, with its lake and its mountains, and the amazing blue of the Rhone. It is said that in all the sixty volumes of his works there is not a single reference to these glories. "No vestige of poetical feeling, no touch of descriptive colour, ever rewards the patient reader" of his letters.[1] The varied responsiveness to the feelings of others, and the conscious sympathy with Nature, which often brighten the letters of Luther, are absent from the severe correspondence of Calvin. In such ceaseless pressure of work, he can hardly have had time to feel anything beyond the ceaseless impression that it was an evil world, and that he was called by God to reform it. Like the Pope in Browning's "The Ring and the Book," Calvin lived in the mental attitude of being "Heartsick at having all his world to blame."

Calvin is a conspicuous example of the clear-headed, confident man, who insists upon being heard, because he is quite sure that what he has to say is both true and important. Luther, perhaps, was equally confident, at any rate, as regards opposition to Rome, but he did admit that he had made mistakes. And in their opposition to Rome they were not influenced by the same motives. Luther saw in Rome a system which cheated man of his salvation. Calvin saw in it a system which cheated God of His honour. Both of them protested that they were teaching no new doctrines, but reviving old ones; but Calvin held that a new system was required, intelligible, lucid, and consistent. Rome's strength lay in its skilfully compacted system; and without system it could not be vanquished. Unlike Melanchthon and Luther, Calvin was troubled by no doubts. He was quite sure that in his "Institutes" he had taken the right ground and had mapped it out clearly. "He who makes himself master of the method which I have pursued will surely understand what he should seek for in Scripture," which implies that what Calvin sought for in Scripture he was always

[1] Tulloch, "Luther and other Leaders of the Reformation," pp. 241, 242.

able to find there ; and this is no uncommon experience. Calvin is "the greatest Biblical dogmatist of his age";[1] and it is through his apparently Biblical system that he has had such wide and prolonged effect, especially in Switzerland, Holland, and Scotland. During the lifetime of each, Luther was a more powerful force in Europe than Calvin ; but in the history of subsequent thought and action, Calvin has had far the greater influence. Calvin's is a system which requires as complete a sacrifice of the intellect, and as much subservience of the will, as that of Rome ; and both systems still find millions of adherents who are willing to render both of these. But such submission is not likely to continue in an atmosphere of increasing thought and enlightenment ; and in both communions the submission has been seriously diminished of late years. There are beliefs which, as time goes on, cannot be maintained, and there are rules to which men will not continue to submit.

We must pass over Calvin's controversies with Albert Pighius in 1543, and Jerome Bolsec in 1551, on the question of Predestination, and with Castellio (Chasteillon) in 1544 on the Inspiration of the Song of Songs and on the Descent into Hell. Far more important and far more famous was the disastrous controversy with Servetus. Its tragic finale ranks with Luther's posting of his Ninety-Five Theses at Wittenberg, and the flight of the Emperor Charles V. from Innsbruck, before that perplexing person, Maurice of Saxony, in 1552, among the greatest events of the sixteenth century.

We have always to remember that in putting Servetus to death neither Calvin nor the Council had any jurisdiction whatever. It was lynch law of a revolting kind. Castellio, Calvin's old opponent, with some others, drew up a collection of opinions against the use of force in religion. It was urged that "Christ would be a Moloch, if He required that men should be offered and burned alive." But Calvin had the support of the large majority of Swiss Protestants; and even Melanchthon said that the hideous deed was "justly done."

History treats the burning of Servetus as one of the great

[1] Tulloch, p. 254 ; see also Hobhouse, "Bampton Lectures," p. 228.

horrors of the Reformation; and a horror it certainly is, all the more so, because those who perpetrated it had to claim freedom of thought in order to justify their own position. But history is sometimes capricious. One striking event stands out, and is remarked by everyone; other events of the same character are recorded, and are at once forgotten. Hundreds of Anabaptists had suffered in the same manner as Servetus by a variety of cruel deaths, and nobody cared. Nobody cared then, and hardly anybody cares now. Some of us at times recall the extravagances of the Anabaptists, and the hideous things which some of the maddest of them perpetrated. But we do not so often remember that the Anabaptists had their martyrs, who suffered horrible tortures, and faced cruel deaths, as bravely as Servetus did, simply because they would not be false to their religious convictions.

Calvin lived a little more than ten years after the burning of Servetus. On February 6, 1564, he preached his last sermon; on May 2 he wrote his last letter—to Farel; on May 27, about 8 p.m., he died, not quite fifty-five years of age. We admire his immense industry and ability, his skill in organizing men and in systematizing the products of men's minds: above all, we admire what the Genevan Council called the "majesty" of his character. But we are sure that the truth which makes us free, cannot be confined within the barriers which Calvin attempted to place round it, and that God has other ways than those of Calvin for drawing and governing men.

The Reformation was still running its course when men began to ask what were the moral effects of it; and that question has been constantly discussed down to our own day. From the nature of the case, nothing better than a very tentative answer can be given. Even with regard to our own times, respecting which we have elaborate statistics of many kinds, it is impossible to decide, with regard to a given decade or even half-century, whether public morality has improved or deteriorated. With regard to the latter portion of the sixteenth century, it is impossible to obtain a sufficient amount of trust-

worthy evidence. Such evidence, however, as has been collected, points to the conclusion that the *immediate* moral results of the Reformation were, on the whole, bad.

Protestants cannot comfort themselves with the reflection that the evidence comes chiefly from Romanist writers, who were interested in showing that the teaching of the Reformers was productive of much immorality. A great deal of the evidence comes from the Reformers themselves, and from their followers. Döllinger, in his "History of the Reformation," has collected much material from contemporary writers, giving a very gloomy picture of the condition of the Reformed Churches.[1] That work was published in 1848, and twenty-two years later he told the present writer that it was a "one-sided book," produced for the purpose of making out a case. In the latter part of his life he wrote and spoke very differently of the Reformers, especially of Luther and Melanchthon. Nevertheless, the quotations from Bucer, Osiander, Justus Jonas, Bugenhagen, and very many other Lutherans of that time, hold good as evidence, whatever the original motive for collecting them may have been; and they give a very dark picture of Protestant morality, especially with regard to sexual offences. The bad report of the immediate consequences of the Reformation cannot be explained away as being entirely due to Romanist misrepresentation.

It is more to the point to remember that disappointed enthusiasts are apt to be pessimistic, and to exaggerate distressing facts, while they lose sight of what is encouraging. Such catastrophes as the Peasants' War, and the monstrous behaviour of the wilder Anabaptists, to say nothing of the bitter controversies among the Protestants themselves, were disquieting enough, without taking account of any deterioration, real or supposed, in the morality of private individuals.

The deterioration was probably real. In the history of every revolution, and especially of religious revolutions, there are

[1] "Die Reformation, ihre innere Entwickelung und ihre Wirkungen im Umfange des Lutherischen Bekenntnisses."

always persons who are eager to take advantage of all the freedom which the new movement gives them, while they ignore all the new obligations. It was so when St. Paul preached Christian liberty at Corinth and elsewhere,[1] and it was so in Germany when Luther raised the same inspired cry. There were plenty of people who were eager to abandon compulsory confession and fasting, and to admit the nullity of good works, but who would take no pains to acquire that holiness of life which is the sure evidence of Christian faith and Christian freedom. Luther's own evidence is very strong. The devil must have been at work among them: "for under the bright light of the Gospel there are more avaricious, deceitful, selfish, heartless, unchaste persons than under the Papacy." The peasantry "know nothing, learn nothing, and do nothing, except abuse their liberty. They don't say their prayers, don't confess, don't communicate;—as if they had thrown off religion altogether."[2] Granting the truth of all this, many of these evils were the fruits of the old system, rather than of the new. The best fruits of the Reformation did not become generally manifest until the leaders had passed away.

The good fruits are neither small nor few, and first among them we may place the freeing of men's minds from the terror in which the ecclesiastical tyranny of the Middle Ages had held them. Obedience to the hierarchy had been made the first requisite of salvation. A man's eternal welfare depended on his satisfying the demands of an official class who could exclude him from heaven for disobedience. From this miserable dread, the Reformation set men free by bringing each soul into communion with God, without the necessary intervention of priest or Pope. It would be difficult to overestimate the value of this emancipation. Like the right of everyone to religious toleration, it was very imperfectly worked out at the time; but in both cases the general principle was made clear. The Reformation was a great stride towards the Apostolic ideal, "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty."

[1] K. Lake, "The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul," p. 46.
[2] Harnack, "The Social Gospel," pp. 54 *et seq.*

Religion and Life.

By the Rev. CHARLES COURTENAY, M.A.,
Late Vicar of St. Peter's, Tunbridge Wells.

THE question of modern religion and modern life is engaging the thoughts and pens of many at the present time, and another contribution to this burning subject may not come amiss.

There seems to be, unhappily, some serious cause for anxiety on the part of those who care for the spiritual welfare of their race, for the visible aspect of religion and life is not healthy; indeed, the many ugly symptoms only too visibly point to something radically wrong with the body Christian. Every age has, no doubt, its alarmists, who are ever crying "Wolf"; but it is not the alarmists who are crying out this time, but the sober, quiet people who, as a rule, possess their souls in patience.

I. Let us soberly and calmly look around us, and try to reckon up the spirit of the present age, not laying too great stress on details, nor seeking to aggravate symptoms which are innocuous.

For one thing, the *spirit of inquiry* is well to the fore in this present age. The old sacred fences which surrounded holy truths have long been broken down, and men are swarming over the ground like the crowd on a cricket field when the bails are removed. Nothing is to-day taken for granted. Everything is being shaken to test its stability. The fires of criticism are playing over the most sacred of documents, the most venerable of doctrines, and the most ancient of institutions. Old claims, accepted for many a long century without question, are being challenged one by one. It is not so much superstructures which are being examined as foundations. Now, *reverent* inquiry we welcome gladly, for why should we fear investigation, when we know that our ground is sure? But this spirit of free inquiry to-day is not always reverent. It is a hunt as for rats, which are to be destroyed.

Not only is this an age of inquiry, ruthless and rigid, but it is *an age of resurrections.* The study of comparative religions has much to do with these resurrections of old faiths, for out of Buddhism has emerged an esoteric Buddhism; out of Hinduism has been evolved a Theosophic system, embodying much of its tenets. Plotinus has his devotees to-day; the Neoplatonists are being reproduced, and no doubt the list might be considerably lengthened. All this reminds us of the days of decaying Rome, when Paganism was dying; then, you remember, the cult of the foreign and the odd ran its violent course, the East being ransacked for new faiths.

It is an age, too, of *strange conceit;* a conceit which, in its naturalistic tendency, deems human nature sufficient, without any outside importation. Man is again making self the great source of religious life, and the belief that to follow nature is to do right is largely prevalent. Probably, evolutionary thought is largely responsible for this, for does it not teach that man is on the upgrade, moving on to higher and higher perfections? To the modern, even sin is only a stage in the process of life, being just a dark tunnel reaching up to the light, presently to be met. And this conceit has awkward tendencies, compelling man to deny any other source of life than self.

It is only natural, too, that, being all this, it should be an age of *great denials,* that what is mysterious should be rejected, that the supernatural should go by the board, and that the Personal God should be resolved into a Great Unknowable, an Infinite, a Stream of Tendency, an Absolute.

Whatever is a strain on faith is rejected as impossible. There is no tendency to believe as of old, "because it is impossible." And because this strain attaches itself to most of our most cherished Christian truths, they must go. The Virgin Birth is out of the course of nature. No evidence is sufficient to prove the Resurrection of the Lord; the Ascension sounds too like a legend to be admissible. Of course, miracles draw far too largely on our credulity to obtain the assent of the intellectual world. And so they are all calmly thrown over-

board. What else, they say, can thinking, sensible people do? At the present time a philosopher is known, not by his reasoned beliefs, but by the number and quality of his doubts.

Naturally, because of these tendencies of to-day, the present is *an age of great unsettlement.* Nobody seems to know what is left standing amidst the smoke and dust of the fierce assault. The general world stands between the two positions—the position of the old theology and the position, proud and self-reliant, of the new—hesitating which to follow. For the assaulters are no longer ambushed; they have come into the open. They run a Rationalist press, they sell their publications at the cheapest possible cost; their lecturers stand at the street corners and preach aloud their unsettling doctrines; they mix their ferment with books of fiction; they write to the newspapers. That, under these circumstances, the unthinking and untaught crowd should be mystified and nonplussed is not to be wondered at. They hear the triumphant shouts of the assailant, and fancy that there must be something valid in the note of victory, and, so long as they are left to their ignorance, what can we expect but a crumbling of the little faith they have? You offer them a Bible, and they will tell you calmly that it has no authority, because the Higher Critics and the Modernists have emptied it of all its genuineness. You quote the verdict of the Church at large, and they tell you that a Church divided against itself can have no weighty and authoritative voice.

Now, if this unsettlement were confined to a few, we might calmly say, "No matter; it has always been so; history is only repeating itself." But, unfortunately, it prevails largely. The man in the street has been caught by the sceptical tide; the young are infected by it; and even in circles where we might least expect to find it, it turns up and stares you in the face with the most unblushing effrontery. Yea, and even in Christian spheres this spirit, like a rising tide, has eroded whole stretches of faith.

And yet, amidst all this incredulity of the time, it is also *an age of great credulity.* That an age which is rejecting the

truths of the Gospel should take in the hoary heresies of the past and the baby heresies of the present is surprising enough; yet so it is. What is denied to a Christ and to a Paul is given freely and unquestioningly to Mrs. Eddy, and what the philosophers of the Christian Church have believed for nineteen centuries is passed by at the demand of a modern Campbell. In fact, the very people who shake their wise heads at the claims of Christian truth will crowd the palmists' chambers and gaze ecstatically at the necromancer's crystal ball. The clients of the fortune-teller are in many cases the apostates of the Christian Church. Having turned Christianity out of doors, they welcome the charlatan, the cheat, and the wizard. Men must believe something, and if they will not credit the reasonable and the divine, they are given over to believe a lie, smitten through and through with strong delusion.

That it should also be *an age of levity* is not at all surprising. Religious doctrines are dealt with in the most jaunty of fashions, and discussed with the same easy manner as the last ball or the state of the weather. Half the world scarcely seems to realize that these are eternal questions, matters of awful moment, and that golden things ought not to be thrown about like pebbles. It is this lack of seriousness which is one of the most distressing signs of the times; an utter inability to see the gravity of the spiritual. Mankind nowadays is too much like a ship without either cargo or ballast, with all anchors hauled up, and drifting lightly here and there as the currents choose to take them. Being the sport of the waves, we naturally expect just such a cork-like buoyancy as exists. Men call it freedom; it is more like tragedy.

The direct consequences of all these sad features of the age are that it is also *an age of license.* Is it any wonder that we see the world engulfed by a high and strong wave of worldliness just now, like the tidal wave after the earthquake? And what this advanced, and advancing, wave is sweeping away we know too well. It is removing some of the most sacred of our landmarks. It is helping to decimate our churches. It is

depleting the Church of its old, warm blood, and replacing it with the chilliest of chill fluids. It is shutting men's Bibles, secularizing our Sundays, and profaning what we most venerate. Its effects are seen in our churches, our Sunday Schools, and in the increasing difficulty of filling the vacancies in our working staff. It is lifting pleasure to a serious pursuit, and crowning sport, games, and amusements with a dignity and importance which they never have had before, except in heathen ages. Our sacred services are only tolerable when they are made spectacular and professionally perfect. The money which once helped to keep parochial wheels turning is now, in many cases, consumed on bridge, week-ends, motor-cars, and extravagant dress. The sons are not as their fathers were, and when the old generation passes away, it is a common complaint that the heirs do not fill their places. How can they, when they dismiss their fathers' faith and godliness? When the fear of God is gone, there is not much left.

And yet all the time the gay world smiles on, expecting, it seems, that flowers are to be grown without roots, that ships are to be sailed without pilots, that harbours are to be entered in the dark with nobody at the tiller, and that the machinery of life is to be run by moonbeams.

Such are a few of the disquieting signs of the times; familiar to us all and questioned, I think, by none. The fear is lest, in our love of peace and quiet, we cover them up and refuse to face them; although, how it is possible to do so when they thrust themselves close to the most purblind, I cannot think. Things are not improving; we are not as a Christian people holding our own; the Church is fast losing its faith and integrity; faith is being submerged by a rising tide of doubt; indifference is smiting even more, and all the land over the religion of the Lord Jesus is being thrust into the background.

II. I have put the question as uncompromisingly as I could, because I feel that the more clearly we see things, the more likely we are to be on our guard and to try to reverse the evils of the day. But first, I think, we must ask the question whether

there is no blue sky of religion; whether there are no alleviations.

I think there are. I think the very symptoms of unrest have a good side to them. If we cannot get full satisfaction from this conviction, we get enough to lead us on to inquire further. Let us endeavour to discover, if we can, some hopeful signs from the present darkness.

Is inquiry, let us ask, wholly bad? May it not be distinctly good? People who are wholly unconcerned about religion do not study religious matters, do not ask questions, do not burn midnight oil over them. And *ought* we not to inquire, and search, and grope about the foundation of things? How can we give a reason for the hope that is in us, if we have not found any reason for ourselves? Are minds given us to lie fallow, and are thoughts to be shut down like a played-out mine? Are we intended to open our mouths and shut our eyes, and take what any religious teacher may be disposed to give us? The Church of Rome may command it, but not the Protestant Church of England. If it be a fact that only the truth which we have digested and spiritually grasped is of any avail, then there is all the reason in the world why we should examine all claims and test all offered truth. The heap of truth which lies on the mind is larger than we are conscious of; we have to treat it as the unground corn in the hopper of the mill is treated—turn the mind's handle, that it may fall within the rollers and be ground into wholesome wheat. May not, then, the sceptical world be working out its own enlightenment by the very process of thought which so far has had such unpleasant consequences? I do not think we need ever despair of an honest inquirer coming round to the truth.

There is a little satisfaction, too, to be gained from the *sceptical world's honesty.* They say, "We cannot come to your churches because we are not persuaded that you are right. And so we prefer to stand back until we can come honestly." Probably, in the olden days, there were many who had as little religion as the modern man, but they disguised it, covered over their in-

difference and doubt with silence or nominal adherence, or with a general acquiescence. This is not the case to-day, when it has become more fashionable to deny than to profess. There is no fear of public opinion being against the unbeliever now, for the fashion lies elsewhere. But this present attitude may be a more moral thing than the old, and we are more likely to see good come from it than by the falsity of nominal consent. The cold is better than the lukewarm, we are taught.

There is also a clear possibility that scepticism will *work its own cure*, from the fact that the failure of search in the wrong direction may lead the seekers to turn their weary eyes to the orthodox faith. We know that they are wandering in boggy ways in which they will never find foothold, and we can only hope that after they have slipped about enough they may see the wisdom of planting their unsteady feet on the Rock of Ages.

Neither must we forget that as there is a *Providence which watches over children and drunkards*, so the same Providence is watching over these wanderers. He, Whose love is so infinite, is not likely to forget the many who, longing for the light, cannot yet see their way aright. He who bore with a Thomas, and finally led him into the safe harbour of faith, can be trusted to guide all erring feet into the true fold, if so be they are honest seekers for truth.

There is a big bit of brightness, too, in *the analogy of the past*. Dark days of carelessness and unbelief are not confined to the present age. Take the eighteenth century, and we may congratulate ourselves on our present spiritual condition. And God Who drew back the sceptical veil, and irradiated the land with the light of the Gospel through the efforts of His servants, will, doubtless, in due time bring light into the darkness. The darkest hour is before the dawn, and we may therefore confidently hope that some great spiritual revival will come to break up the present indifference.

If, too, we are at the parting of the ways in religious matters, where the seas of conflicting thoughts are meeting, *we may expect some disturbances*. Undoubtedly, we are passing through

a religious crisis in which the fierceness of the conflict is more evident than the usefulness of it. Nevertheless, if we believe that our God rides upon the storm we may confidently expect that the great calm will follow. The position of things to-day is not unlike the clash and thunder of some great dockyard where a monster ship is in course of construction. To the onlooker all is confusion, and it seems impossible to imagine anything perfect emerging from it. Nevertheless, we know that before long there will slide from the stays a finished, mighty Dreadnought, which shall sweep the seas if necessary. The plan was there all along, known to the builder, just as we believe the plan of the renewed Church is in the mind and purpose of our God, Who doeth all things well.

Still, with all these considerations to comfort and assure us, we must not let our eyes close on the dismal present, with its deadness and indifference and unbelief. There is less religion than there was; there is a huge divorce of religion from life; and there is a fear lest amongst the so-called religious many may have a name only, and are dead.

III. Passing on now to another division of our subject, let us ask ourselves *whether any blame for the present condition of things may be laid at our own doors.* Is the Church to blame for the deadness of the present age to things religious? May it not be that the alienation of men is a revolt from our unsatisfactory leading?

For instance, have we ourselves been *fair representatives* of the faith we profess? Have we lived up to it day by day? We are not perfect; but might we not have been more perfect, more consistent, more unworldly, more true? We are living in days when the cloth is not respected for the cloth's sake. Our people look deeper, and judge more rigorously.

Have we ever assumed the garment of *infallibility*, and presented our truth as if we were the perfect exponents of it, ranging all truth under the same category, and being as positive about disputed points as we are about the undisputed, about the minor as about the major ones? There is a fear lest in our

positiveness we declare our truths without giving any reasons for their reliability but our bare dictum? All this hurts, and is naturally resented.

Have we lost ourselves in mere *externals*, and buried ourselves under our multitudinous machinery? It is possible we have been simply fussy servers of tables, and have neglected the weighter matters of the Gospel.

It may be, too, that while we have been doing our duty well, we have been neglecting the inner heart of things; attending to the material rather than the spiritual.

It is possible, too, that *the man has hidden the God* in our work, and that we personally stood too vividly in the sunlight. Such diversion is bound to be fatal, for there is no poison so deadly as the self-spirit, when injected into our spiritual fare.

Perhaps we have been *unduly denunciatory*, condemning what we did not understand, and in our outbursts falling foul of innocent things.

It is very probable also that we have, for sheer lack of knowledge, *failed to understand modern thought* and modern movements, and, venturing to speak, have spoken foolishly. For nothing in this world is so disastrous as to deal with a man wiser than ourselves, and to correct views which we have not the power to appreciate at their true value. No layman is going to sit at the feet of a minister whose mind is a blank on the weighty questions of life, and it is a calamity for us to hear of modern difficulties first from the suffering souls who are distressed by them.

There is a tendency, too, for some minds to *throw everything into a controversial mould*, and to bring their truth, cast into bullets, to fire off at the mistaken. Controversy has its use, and the controversialist is born, not made, but no controversial truth ever converts a soul or builds up a Christian. Has the Church been too controversial?

Have we been *too frigid* in our presentation of truth, serving it up in cold masses, unappetizing and indigestible? We know the danger of it. Spiritual appetites have to be tempted, and

many a soul has been thrown off its feed by uncooked, or badly-cooked, and slovenly-served truth.

Have we raised *unnecessary barriers* to man's approach to God, making the way unduly circuitous? If the way be open, why interpose anything or anybody? Men are apt to resent these interpositions.

I have ventured to suggest a few of the causes for the common damping down of the religious fires of to-day, because, as a matter of fact, much of the diversion of men from our Church ways and orthodox creeds has arisen from such souls seeking in the new thought and ways just what we may have omitted to give them.

We have, for instance, proclaimed a *Transcendent God* and pressed this doctrine home, while often the equally genuine truth of an Immanent God has been left out. And, consequently, the New Thought, having raised this immanence to the summit of their creed, has gained multitudes. We have proclaimed a God at work in the heavens, in the Church, and in the world; they strike in with the even more necessary truth of a God at work in the human heart, resident there and inspiring. It is no new truth; it is the old, old truth since the Day of Pentecost. "That Christ may dwell in your hearts," prayed St. Paul; "Christ in you the hope of glory." And just because many of us have lost the right emphasis, we are corrected by those who saw the gap and hastened to fill it. Can we complain?

Take the question of *the inner light*, pressed for long by the Mystics and the Quakers, and now insisted on by the New Thought. We are all getting to be Mystics now, because we see that it is a real part of Divine revelation and the genuine dowry of man. But why did we drop it? Why did we so long treat the mystic faith as if it were an extravagance, and as if the cultivation of the thought of the presence of God within would be likely to lead to the visionary and unreal, as if a first-hand dealing with God was dangerous. Now that we are bringing it again into prominence, we find that multitudes have gone off

perhaps never to return again. It is easier to cast out than to recall. Surely, is it not this mystic element which is the chief charm of Theosophy and of the revived Neoplatonism? The pity is that, having lost these earnest souls, we have handed them over to systems in which much error is interwoven with the truth, for the new Mysticism is not so sane as the old.

Take the question of Christian evidences in which we have been so well drilled. But the opposition has wheeled round since those days, and has developed new methods of attack. And so the old defence touches but feebly the needs of to-day. The argument from prophecy, from miracle, from Bible coincidences and designs, are not the same sharp weapons as of old, although to us as Christians they are entirely convincing. To-day we are required to deal with Evolution and its manifold applications to life, with Philosophy and Metaphysics, with Higher Criticism and Modernism, with Spiritualism and Christian Science and New Theology. No longer do we tilt against Science and Natural Law, for Science has held out its hand to Religion, accepting its claim to insist on its own inner evidences, and accepting Christian experiences as valid proofs. The intuition and the axiom are allowed an articulate voice in the debatable sphere; and all this has made a tremendous difference to the science of the Apologetic.

Take the *findings of the New Psychology*, which are now a commonplace, but which are revolutionizing the minds of our thoughtful laity, working out into definite faiths, with huge followings; the great *power of thought* to affect for good or evil both body and soul, sweetening or poisoning the centres of life; an echo, by the way, of the old truth, "As a man thinketh in his heart so is he"; the discovery of *the dual mind*, with its objective and its subjective plane. For if this subjective mind be a reality, and if only a tithe of the powers attributed to it be valid, we are on the verge of enormous revelations. We are "more fearfully and wonderfully made" than we know. The tremendous *power of suggestion* in the moral and physical world, whether hypnotic or not, whether self-suggested or suggested

by another, the minister of Christ cannot afford to neglect. Surely, we cannot leave these findings of psychology to the quack or to the unauthorized. Whatever is a fact of God is a fact for His Church to use, is a revelation which can be easily absorbed into the Christian message. In fact, it is only in its proper place when so applied. Let it not be said that the Christian Scientist and the Theosophist exercise a more direct and sweeping faith than we Christians do. With ourselves, moreover, the pressure of such truths will be free from the extravangances of modern thinkers. The peril of the New Thought is in its tendency to Pantheism, in its identifying the world with its God and identifying the soul with God, treating it as a bit of His essence and Being. This is why we press Transcendance as well as Immanence. But let us be careful lest in our zeal for orthodoxy we denounce *all* their thought as false and misleading. It is in such ways as these, I think, that we as religious men have to mend our ways and our methods.

IV. The last division of our subject brings us to *the question of remedies.* The world is largely alienated. How shall we regain it?

Not by surrendering our own established truth. We are invited to do so by liberal theologians. But while we are willing to believe that many of their contentions are new forms of the old truth, we are not going to change our terminology, or throw scorn on the old theology. These are no days for surrender, but for holding fast the more strongly what we have tried and proved. The process of give and take for the sake of unity and peace may be too expensive, and is not likely to win anybody. They must step up; we cannot step down. It will possibly be found that while we have been joining hands at the outposts, the enemy has captured our citadel.

Not by charitably covering over men's errors. The worldly theology of the day, for all its soft speech and Biblical phrasing, is steeped in assumptions which, if admitted, will work our ruin. The golden rule in reading such works is to look, not so much at their *ad*missions, but at their *om*issions. They will be found

to leave out some of the most necessary truths of our Christian faith. The reality of sin, the Divinity of our Blessed Lord, the uniqueness of our Scriptures, the necessity of an atonement, have no place in their creeds. Thus, the very foundations of our faith are ignored.

Not, again, by blotting out distinctions. The world is not the Church, and never can be. The natural spirit of man and the Holy Spirit of God are whole worlds asunder. The improved natural man is not made into a Christian man by his amendments. The ardent theologian, who is a keen student of truth, is not necessarily a converted man of God. In a common tendency to merge all men into a Church upon earth, we are in danger of breaking down Divine barriers and creating new standards which God does not respect. We must draw the largest of distinctions between a religion which is alive and a religion which is dead.

Not, either, by lowering our standards. Once begin to eliminate this or that requirement of Christ, and we may soon find ourselves in a morass. Where modern thought can raise our standard higher we are willing to raise it. We are willing, with the Christian Scientist, to insist on the intimacy between mind and body, to believe more in the sacredness of the body, and in the contention that God is the great Healer. But then this is Christianity, and ought never to have dropped out of our creed. We are willing to accept the possibility of a Divine power entering into every part of our nature—spirit, and soul, and body; but we ought to have believed this before. And if, as I think, they have shown us the duty of enlarging our Christian boundaries, and of putting a greater emphasis on certain forgotten truths, we are not ashamed to learn from them and to be thankful to them. But we are not disposed to *diminish* our boundaries anywhere—no, not by a hair's-breadth.

Neither can we diminish our Christian demands. We are not going to say, "It does not matter what you believe so long as you are in earnest." We are not inclined to raise sincerity into a safe religion. Neither are we going to say that all roads

lead to heaven, and that God is not particular how we approach Him. We intend to be as broad as God is broad, and to be as narrow as God is narrow, and these are our rigid limits. Repentance and faith, in our view, are the two great indispensables of the Christian's entrance, and we have no right to waive them aside as unnecessary. The need of a new nature is a prerequisite of a new life and a new standing before God. And the test of the life is always, and will ever be, the only satisfactory evidence of the possession of a Divine religion. Christ Jesus is the Way, and the only Way, and only by faith in Him do we come to the Father. We cannot diminish the supremacy of Christ by elevating men to be Christs, too, in potentiality. Neither can we broaden the narrow way to admit an unrepentant multitude. Our Christian demands on the soul are an irreducible minimum, and they are all as indispensable as the keystone of an arch. What is dispensable we are willing to waive, but the indispensable must abide.

Now all this may appear to the world as somewhat unnecessarily rigid and unbending. Let it be so; it is safer so.

Then, it may be asked, are you not closing the door against the lapsed and the lost? No, we are opening it; we are emphasizing it; we are giving it its proper prominence.

The truth is, that no propaganda which is based on surrender and compromise will ever prevail, and the sooner we understand that it is *not* along these lines that we shall win the world, the better. Christianity will become winsome to the outside world only when the exponents of it are themselves winsome. The latest modern warship has deviated from the old by the simple device of so mounting her guns that they can all be fired from either side in one great broadside. Hitherto, the Church has been firing her guns in units; what the world calls for now, if real execution is to be done, is that the whole of the Christian guns should fire as one. Single Christians have lived the true life and have done some good near at hand, but what a power would be felt if all who name the name of Christ were alive, and loving, and joyous, and kind; if all set forth the glories of

their common faith, and trod the way of life in step, and praised in unison! So long as the Church hides its light, and masks its beneficent batteries, so long shall we be ineffective in our Christian crusades. Nothing can be recommended for the rallying of her scattered children, for the wakening of her sleeping ones, and for the quickening of the dead multitude, but a Church setting forth the beauty of holiness, and instinct with the love and life of our Lord. A revived Church would mean a revived world. The reproach will go the moment her pulse quickens and the glow of joyous health shows in her face. The possibilities of our Christian religion are unspeakable. When what is possible becomes visible, the battle, so nearly lost to-day, will be won.

The Religion of Browning.

By MARY BRADFORD WHITING.

ON May 7, 1812, Robert Browning was born in his father's house at Camberwell, and in this centenary year the articles written in commemoration of the poet who came so tardily into his kingdom of fame, will be as the sand of the sea for multitude. There are, indeed, so many points of view from which Browning's poetry may be regarded, that there is some excuse for the neglect from which he suffered through the early part of his career; he was not only a poet, he was a philosopher, a seer, a theologian, a moralist, and a scholar; a singer fired with the white heat of passion, yet at the same time never losing sight of his sacred mission. It is not strange that the work of such a man was bewildering in its effect; but now that a hundred years have passed since he first saw the light, his genius has found universal acknowledgment and its component parts are given a just recognition.

There are many critics who declare that Art and Religion can have nothing to do with each other, but few would be bold enough to attempt the interpretation of Browning's poetry without reference to his religion, for religion can scarcely be called a component part of his genius, it was rather the atmosphere in which his genius lived and moved and had its being.

"The development of a soul: little else is worth study. I, at least, always thought so." This was his own statement in a letter to his friend, M. Milsand, and the practice of his whole literary life bears it out. He does not merely depict the thoughts and the deeds of men and leave them to point their own lesson; he holds them up to praise or blame according to their repressive or their incentive effect upon the soul of man. He does not revel in sensuous enjoyment: Keats may say:

> "Beauty is truth, truth beauty—that is all
> Ye know on earth, and all ye need to know!"

But Browning strikes a deeper note :

> "Oh! world as God has made it, all is beauty;
> And knowing this is love, and love is duty,
> What further may be sought for or declared?"

Love is duty! Those words, alone, would mark him out as fundamentally different from the many poets who have maintained that love is not a discipline but a gratification, a lulling luxury and not a spur to effort.

But in dealing with the question of Browning's religion, we must not forget that his writings are in great measure dramatic. He himself tells us that his method of presenting his Men and Women is to

> "Enter each and all, and use their service;
> Speak from every mouth,"[1]

and therefore the test of haphazard quotation is almost as unfair with him as with Shakespeare. The only possible means of arriving at a conclusion is to trace out the main lines of his religious belief and follow them through his works; no characteristic of his faith is more marked than its continuity : what he believed when he took up his pen in 1833, that he still believed when he laid it down in 1889; but it is evident that such an inquiry can only be carried out very imperfectly within the limits of a magazine article, and that only a few of the necessary quotations can be given.

The first to be noticed of these main lines of belief, is his sense of the all-pervading presence of God. He neither holds that the world is a fortuitous concourse of atoms, nor that, having made it, the Creator leaves it to go on its way unguided and unremembered; he holds that the Creator is indispensable to the creature, that His omnipotence and His omnipresence are not only inseparable from His Divine nature, but inseparable from human existence; that God, in fact, is man's first and greatest need. We find this idea expressed in his first poem, *Pauline :*

[1] "One Word More."

"My God, my God! let me for once look on Thee
As though nought else existed: we alone!
And as creation crumbles, my soul's spark
Expands till I can say, 'Ev'n from myself
I need Thee, and I feel Thee, and I love Thee;
I do not plead my rapture in Thy works
For love of Thee—nor that I feel as one
Who cannot die—but there is that in me
Which turns to Thee, which loves, or which should love.'"

The same thought breaks out again and again throughout his works, as, for example, in *Abt Vogler*:

"Therefore to whom turn I but to Thee, the ineffable Name!
Builder and Maker, Thou, of houses not made with hands!
What, have fear of change from Thee, who art ever the same?
Doubt that Thy power can fill the heart that Thy power expands?"

And when towards the end of his life, he looks back over the years at work accomplished and fame achieved, he tells us that the one thing he wishes his fellow-men to remember:

"Confidently lay to heart, and lock in head their life long—this:
'He there with the brand flamboyant, broad o'er night's forlorn abyss,
Crowned by prose and verse; and wielding with Wit's bauble, Learning's rod,
Well? Why, he at least believed in soul, was very sure of God!'"[1]

This unalterable belief in God's omnipotence and omnipresence, has seemed to some of Browning's critics to be merely the result of his personal optimism. Here was a man, they say, of magnificent health, both mental and bodily; possessed of a competence that saved him from the heart-rending struggle with circumstances that has embittered so many poets, and crowned with that perfect satisfaction in love which so many men have longed for and sought in vain—why should the problems and pains of life press upon him? To such a one as this there is no merit in being able to say:

"God's in His heaven,
All's right with the world!"[2]

This brings us to another main line of the poet's religious thought. He did not, as some have declared, ignore the sorrow

[1] "La Saisaiz." [2] "Pippa Passes."

and suffering of the world, but he welcomed them as part of a mighty and beneficial plan. This belief may be traced through the whole of his works, but only a few selected illustrations can be quoted here. The object of *Paracelsus*, published in 1835, was to show that the sufferings, the sorrows and the disappointments of the great philosopher were all needed to teach him the lesson that God designed for him to learn. This thought is the comfort of his friend Festus, as he watches over the wreck that lies upon the bed in the hospital at Salzburg :

> "God, Thou art love! I build my faith on that,
> Even as I watch beside Thy tortured child,
> Unconscious whose hot tears fall fast by him;
> So doth Thy right hand guide us through the world
> Wherein we stumble."

So Rabbi ben Ezra is not only patient under sufferings and limitations, but hails them gladly:

> "Then welcome each rebuff
> That turns earth's smoothness rough,
> Each sting that bids not sit nor stand, but go!
> Be our joy three parts pain!
> Strive and hold cheap the strain;
> Learn, nor account the pang; dare, never grudge the throe!"

This lack of content, this impossibility of perfect satisfaction, is, indeed, a proof of the divine spark within us; were we untouched by grief and disappointment we should be even as the beasts that perish :

> "For thence—a paradox
> Which comforts while it mocks,
> Shall life succeed in that it seems to fail:
> What I aspired to be
> And was not, comforts me:
> A brute I might have been, but would not sink i' the scale."

Unless man could grieve as well as joy, he says in effect, he would be no man at all, but a mere puppet-like automaton; he must be capable of fear, of pain, of doubt and of loss, or he can never know happiness or lift up his soul in worship. This is the teaching of the great parable-poem, *Easter Day*: having realized what it would be to be shut outside the scheme of

human experience, the soul returns to God with a cry for reinstatement:

"'Thou love of God! Or let me die,
Or grant what shall seem Heaven almost!
Let me not know that all is lost,
Though lost it be—leave me not tied
To this despair, this corpse-like bride!
Let that old life seem mine—no more—
With limitation as before,
With darkness, hunger, toil, distress:
Be all the earth a wilderness!
Only let me go on, go on,
Still hoping ever and anon
To reach one eve the Better Land!'"

* * * * *

And so I live, you see;
Go through the world, try, prove, reject,
Prefer, still struggling to effect
My warfare; happy that I can
Be crossed and thwarted as a man,
Not left in God's contempt apart
With ghastly smooth life, dead at heart.'"

Nor does this sweet use of adversity reveal itself only in physical trials; it is revealed also in that worst of mental trials—doubt. Doubt, according to Browning, is not to be regretted, for without the faculty of doubt man could never offer to God an acceptable faith; he must be able

". . . To grieve Him,
But able to glorify Him too,
As a mere machine could never do,
That prayed or praised, all unaware
Of its fitness for aught but praise and prayer,
Made perfect as a thing of course."[1]

This idea is elaborately worked out in *A Death in the Desert*, where Browning deals with the question, Why, if belief is so necessary to the soul, did God not make the facts of religion as plain as the facts of every-day life: why is it not, for instance, as easy to believe in the salvation of Christ as in the benefit of that gift of fire which Prometheus is said to have brought down from heaven for men? To this he replies that the reason is

[1] "Christmas Eve."

plain to all who have ears to hear, for were there no possibility of any difference of opinion, the faculties of the soul would not come into play in choosing the better part:

"Were this our soul's gain safe, and sure
To prosper as the body's gain is wont,—
Why, man's probation would conclude, his earth
Crumble; for he both reasons and decides,
Weighs first, then chooses: will he give up fire
For gold and purple once he knows its worth?
Could he give Christ up were His worth as plain?
Therefore, I say, to test man, the proofs shift,
Nor may he grasp that fact like other fact,
And straightway in his life acknowledge it,
As, say, the indubitable bliss of fire."

This conception of pain as an agent of development, and of life as a preparation, leads us to another main line in Browning's religious thought: his belief in the immortality of the soul. Why were we placed here, he says, to suffer and to learn, if we had not a future before us in which our lessons might be put to use; let works of Art be perfect; they are limited by time and space:

"To-day's brief passion limits their range,
It seethes with the morrow for us and more.
They are perfect—how else? they shall never change;
We are faulty—why not? we have time in store.
The Artificer's hand is not arrested
With us—we are rough-hewn, nowise polished
They stand for our copy, and, once invested
With all they can teach, we shall see them abolished.
'Tis a lifelong toil till our lump be leaven—
The better! what's come to perfection perishes.
Things learned on earth, we shall practise in heaven.
Works done least rapidly, Art most cherishes."[1]

The same truth is taught in *La Saisaiz*:

"I have lived, then, done and suffered, loved and hated, learnt and taught
This—there is no reconciling wisdom with a world distraught,
Goodness with triumphant evil, power with failure in the aim,
If (to my own sense, remember, tho' none other feel the same)—
If you bar me from assuming earth to be a pupil's place,
And life, time, with all their chances, changes, just probation space."

It is, in fact, only as man recognizes the power of God, and submits to the eternal law of suffering and limitation, that he

[1] "Old Pictures in Florence."

may hope one day to be made one with God, and enter into His glory :

> ". . . God is seen God
> In the star, in the stone, in the flesh, in the soul and the clod.
> And thus looking within and around me, I ever renew
> (With that stoop of the soul which in bending upraises it too),
> The submission of Man's nothing-perfect to God's All-Complete,
> As by each new obeisance in spirit I climb to His feet.'"[1]

But the proof of immortality is not found alone in human sorrow ; according to Browning, it is found also in human joy and love. The test of his faith came to him when the exquisite happiness of his married life ended with the death of his wife in 1861. If he had allowed his crushing load of grief to harden into despair, it might justly have been said that his beliefs were not strong enough to stand the shocks of experience ; but during the twenty-eight years of his loneliness, he never once wavered in his certainty of their re-union. Love cannot die ; this was the innermost core of his creed. Love is of God, and the love that we lose on earth we shall find in heaven, because love is God, even as God is love. This belief he held even before the desire of his eyes was taken from him :

> ". . . Love, which on earth, amid all the shows of it,
> Has ever been seen the sole good of life in it,
> The love, ever growing there, spite of the strife in it,
> Shall arise, made perfect, from death's repose of it !
> And I shall behold Thee, face to face,
> O God, and in Thy light retrace
> How in all I loved here, still wast Thou !"[2]

But the separation which tore his life asunder could not disturb his faith, and he gives expression to it in *Prospice*—a poem written a few months after Mrs. Browning's death:

> "I was ever a fighter, so—one fight more,
> The best and the last !
> I would hate that death bandaged my eyes and forbore,
> And bade me creep past.
> No ! let me taste the whole of it, fare like my peers,
> The heroes of old,
> Bear the brunt, in a minute pay life's glad arrears
> Of pain, darkness, and cold.
> For sudden the worst turns the best to the brave,
> The black minute's at end ;

[1] "Saul." [2] "Christmas Eve."

And the element's rage, the fiend-voices that rave
Shall dwindle, shall blend,
Shall change, shall become first a peace out of pain;
Then a light, then thy breast,
O thou soul of my soul! I shall clasp thee again,
And with God be the rest!"

Nor was this a passing mood; the beautiful address to his wife in *The Ring and the Book* (written in 1868), which is too long for quotation here, shows that he thought of her as still living, still constant in her love to him as he in his love to her. And again, in *Abt Vogler:*

"There shall never be one lost good! What was, shall live as before;
The evil is null, is nought, is silence implying sound;
What was good shall be good, with, for evil, so much good more;
On the earth, the broken arcs; in the heaven, a perfect round."

Throughout the whole of his long poetical career we find illustrations of this belief, until at its close, in the volume published in 1887, we see it expressed with the same clearness as it had been in the beginning:

"By proved potency that still
Makes perfect, be assured, come what, come will,
What once lives, never dies; what here attains
To a beginning, has no end, still gains
And never loses aught."[1]

The field of inquiry is so wide a one that these few remarks can do no more than induce the reader to explore it for himself; but perhaps enough has been said to show that the fundamental facts on which Browning's religion is based are the existence of God and the existence of the soul. These facts he does not attempt to prove:

"Prove them facts? That they surpass my power of proving, proves them such!"[2]

What he does try to prove is that these two facts—God and the soul—are not at war, but are made one by love—a Divine, self-sacrificing, all-perfecting love:

"'He who did most, shall bear most; the strongest shall stand the most weak.
'Tis the weakness in strength that I cry for! my flesh, that I seek
In the Godhead! I seek and I find it. O Saul, it shall be
A Face like my face that receives thee: a Man like to me

[1] "Gerard de Lairesse." [2] "La Saisaiz."

Thou shalt love and be loved by, for ever! a Hand like this hand
Shall throw open the gates of new life to thee! See the Christ stand!'"[1]

Then, once reconciled with God, he seeks to show that the soul can "endure His act"—can face doubt, can master temptation, turning stumbling-block into stepping-stone, and can use the joys and sorrows, the hopes and fears of life, as aids to that supreme object of our existence—the learning of love.

With such a noble conception of life as this, it is little wonder that Browning was able to look calmly upon death; such a splendid joy in strenuous living could not cease with the grave. William Sharp, in his life of the poet, repeats the indignant words that he once heard him let fall on that fear of death that creeps into so much modern thought: "The shadow of death—call it what you will, despair, negation, indifference—is upon us. But what fools who talk thus! Why, *amico mio*, you know as well as I do that death is life, just as our daily, our momentarily dying body is none the less alive and ever recruiting new forces of existence. Without death, which is our crape-like, churchyardy word for change, for growth, there could be no prolongation of that which we call life! For myself, I deny death as an end of everything. Never say of me that I am dead!"

It is the very spirit, the very words almost, of that *Epilogue* which he placed at the end of his last volume of poems so that those who might be tempted to pity him as laid low should be reminded that he was not "imprisoned" by death, but was still

"One who never turned his back, but marched breast forward,
Never doubted clouds would break,
Never dreamed, though right were worsted, wrong would triumph,
Held we fall to rise, are baffled to fight better,
Sleep, to wake!

No, at noonday, in the bustle of man's worktime,
Greet the unseen with a cheer!
Bid him forward, breast and back as either should be.
'Strive and thrive!' cry, 'Speed! fight on, fare ever
There as here!'"

[1] "Saul."

Our Sunday Services: Are They Too Long?

By the Rev. S. C. LOWRY, M.A.,
Rector of Wonston.

VARIOUS answers will be given to this question, according to the various types to whom it may be addressed. The careless, perfunctory Church-goer, who satisfies his conscience or the expectations of Society by making an appearance at Public Worship once on Sunday, will probably answer a decided "Yes." On the other hand, the earnest middle-aged or elderly Churchman will probably say "No;" in some instances, because he really feels that the time spent in the House of God is all too short; in other instances, because the Conservatism, which seems inbred in most Churchmen, resents any modification of the services; possibly in a few cases because, if he gives an affirmative reply, he fears he may be thought to undervalue the privilege of prayer.

We are not called, however, in our *Sunday* services to think only of the elect few who find no difficulty in concentrating their attention for a long period; we have to seek to help and edify the average man in the pew; we are bound to make greater efforts to check the tide of absenteeism which, as every census of attendance shows, has grown apace in the last decade, and we cannot disregard our Lord's command to go out into the "highways and hedges" and by all reasonable and legitimate means to "compel them to come in."

It will hardly be open to dispute that the present age is less patient and less long-suffering than its predecessors. Prolixity in conversation or literature is resented. The "short story" takes the place of the lengthy serial. The news of each day is provided for us in a concentrated form. Mainly owing to the multiplicity of subjects which invite our interest, we seem to be less capable than our forefathers of prolonged attention. We may deplore this tendency; but it exists, however much we may deplore it. Times change; circumstances change. Is

the Church alone to remain stationary, like an anchored boat, which does but show the rapidity of the current that is running past it?

In the Preface to the Prayer-Book the compilers state that "upon weighty and important considerations, according to the various exigencies of times and occasions, such changes and alterations should be made as to those that are in a place of authority should from time to time either seem necessary or convenient." Apparently there was never any intention on the part of the reformers that the structure of the Prayer-Book should be crystallized for all time, or that any future improvement in the way of modification, curtailment, or addition, should be deemed impossible. With many earnest souls the conviction is growing that the "exigency" of the present time is calling for important changes in the Prayer-Book. Modifications in the phraseology are needed. Additions of various prayers and special services are still more urgently needed. On these points, however, this paper will be silent; its aim is simply a plea for the shortening of our services.

In one department of Public Worship we have already recognized the call for curtailment. The modern *Sermon* is shorter than the Sermon of our childhood's day. Fifty years ago the average length of a Sermon was not less than half an hour; *now* a Sermon of thirty minutes' duration is rare, except in famous pulpits like St. Paul's or in a University Church, and the average in the Church of England is probably well under twenty minutes. In former days a long exordium used to tell who said the text, and why, and where, and to whom he said it; now we commonly plunge at once *in medias res*, and leave much of the application to the hearers. The demand for short Sermons is not altogether a healthy one, and the Sermonette of eight or ten minutes rarely makes, and perhaps is not expected to make, any deep impression. Sunday is the only day on which most of our worshippers receive any spiritual instruction, for week-day Sermons, which of late have been enormously multiplied, seldom attract any considerable number of hearers,

and these are almost entirely of one sex. It is, therefore, to be regretted that often so little care is bestowed on the *Sunday* Sermon both as regards quantity and quality, and the absence of men, which is more marked in Church than in Chapel, is, we believe, largely due to this cause.

The shortening of the Morning Sermon, however, which has been a marked feature in our time, is due in part to the length of the preceding service. When the service is held, as it commonly is, at 11 a.m., the Sermon rarely begins much before noon, and by this time the worshippers are tired, and, unless the preacher be of exceptional interest, they are not disposed to give him a lengthened hearing.

It may be said that the clergyman is not bound to have Morning Prayer, Litany, and Holy Communion in close conjunction, and that if they are separated, as they often are, the length of any one service is not excessive. In towns and cities the Litany is now commonly read in the afternoon, with the somewhat unfortunate result that it is never heard by any except the few elderly ladies and others who form an afternoon congregation. The Holy Communion is also in many places used only as a separate service. This cannot be regarded as entirely satisfactory when it is remembered that children and others who do not communicate are deprived of hearing the Epistle and Gospel—*i.e.*, the most distinctive teaching of the Sunday. But there are thousands of parishes where this severance is difficult or impossible. Many a country clergyman cannot afford to read the Litany in the afternoon to an empty church when he has other more important duties in school or class. Owing to the exigencies of distance, etc., he is also compelled to have the Holy Communion at midday rather than at some earlier hour. Is not, therefore, the power to shorten Morning Prayer one of the reforms most urgently needed, either in order that the Holy Communion Service—which is, after all, the more important service—shall begin within a reasonable time, or in order that occasionally the morning congregation may be able to join in the Litany? Strong efforts have been made of late to inculcate

the superior merit of early Communion; but there will always be a considerable number of people who, very reasonably, prefer to communicate at midday, and it may be questioned whether they would not join in the Communion Service with greater freshness, and greater benefit, if it were preceded by a less lengthy service than that which is usual at present.

The following suggestions are made for the shortening of Morning, and possibly Evening, Prayer:

1. It would seem desirable that the Exhortation should be either omitted or abbreviated. There is no need to remind a congregation 52 or 104 times a year of the purpose for which they meet together. As a matter of fact, the words receive little attention from the worshippers, and in some places are so whined or so gabbled that they are not likely to excite it. Through general consent the longer Exhortations in the Holy Communion are almost invariably omitted, even by the most law-abiding of Bishops. Why should not a similar abridgment be ordered or silently sanctioned in the less important service?

2. Our present use of the Psalter is indefensible. Apart from the incongruousness of certain Psalms for certain seasons—*e.g.*, the use of jubilant Psalms in Lent, or the 51st Psalm when Easter Monday happens to fall on April 10—the present mode of recitation is altogether too long for real edification. We should never think of singing four or five hymns in rapid succession. For the first five mornings of the month the Psalms, with the *Venite* and *Glorias*, contain an average of over sixty verses, and a recitation of sixty verses is, we consider, too much for average use. Surely, at any rate on such Sunday mornings when the Holy Communion follows Morning Prayer, a very much shorter selection might be sanctioned, and this selection regulated not merely by the day of the month, but by the intrinsic fitness of certain Psalms for the expression of common prayer or common praise.

3. It may well be thought that some of the Lessons are of undue length. The whole Lectionary needs revision, and, should it be revised, it is not irreverent to indulge a hope that

the question of length may be considered. At present, some of the longest and least helpful chapters in the Bible from the Historical Books are read on the hot Sundays of July and August.

4. In a growing number of churches it is considered the proper thing to use the *Benedicite* through Lent and Advent. It is time that a strong protest should be made against this tendency. Anything more unsuitable than *Benedicite* for a penitential season it is difficult to imagine. There is not a single minor note therein from beginning to end. But, in addition to its unsuitability, and its somewhat wearisome iteration of the same phrase, it unduly lengthens the service at a period when the first Lessons are of exceptional length, and when it is desirable that the Litany should be regularly used on Sunday mornings.

5. The use of the "Athanasian Creed" touches a question of doctrine, and with doctrine this paper does not propose to deal. But it may be asked whether on Easter Day and other great festivals of the Church, when it is desirable that the midday Communion should not be too long deferred, it is well to lengthen Morning Prayer by its recitation.

6. When the Holy Communion Office follows Morning Prayer, it is surely unnecessary to use the Lord's Prayer a second time in the earlier service, or to use any of the prayers which follow the Third Collect. The substance of all the latter prayers is contained in the Church Militant prayer and other parts of the Holy Communion Office, and the repetition is neither satisfactory nor edifying.

Passing from Morning Prayer to the Office for the Administration of Holy Communion, it may be remarked that, while the need of abbreviation has already been shown by the customary omission of the longer Exhortations, further modifications in this direction may be desirable.

7. It may, for instance, be thought by some that a solemn recitation of the Two Commandments as quoted in the New Testament might well be used as an alternative to the Ten Commandments of the Old. The repetition of a ten times

repeated *Kyrie*, drawn out sometimes to abnormal length by music *rallentando* to the point of weariness, is not altogether helpful.

8. The Collect for the Sovereign which follows the Commandments is altogether unnecessary in view of the prayer for the Church Militant, especially if prayer has already been made for the King after the Third Collect. These repeated petitions for the Sovereign are a severe tax on loyalty and unsuited for an age whose conceptions of monarchy are very different from the views common during the Stuart dynasty. Can anything be more indefensible than that in village churches, where three services are often necessarily combined, we should pray for the Sovereign no less than five times within the space of two hours?

9. A permissible shortening of the Words of Administration to Communicants is urgently needed when there are exceptionally large numbers. At a church within a mile from the place where this article is written there were 420 Communicants at 8 a.m. last Easter morning, in spite of four other opportunities for Communion. Is it possible to administer severally with reverence and deliberateness when the words have to be repeated so often? Is not the result weariness to the congregation, and are we to be surprised that at this particular service barely a third were present for the concluding prayers? Surely some change is needed to prevent undue length on such occasions. The recitation of all the words to each railful is, of course, possible, and those who have done so assure us that the result is impressive. But many prefer the personal recitation to each individual, which is evidently contemplated in the rubric. May we not justly claim that where the number exceeds, say, fifty to each officiating clergyman, power should be granted to use only part of the prescribed formula? It would be clearly understood that this was not done for any doctrinal purpose, and that the abbreviation was only sanctioned when the numbers made it a convenience or a necessity.

It is not probable that the reader will agree with *all* the suggestions made in these pages: but that some modification is needed, most of those who have been born in the last fifty years

will admit. Among the unfortunate results produced by too lengthy services the following may be mentioned:

1. Gabbling and indecent haste in the recitation of the Prayers and the reading of the Lessons. In this, *Non multa sed multum* should be our motto. Our Lord uttered His protest against "long prayers" devoid of sincerity, and "vain repetitions."

2. The substitution of the Sermonette for the Sermon.

3. The almost invariable disregard of the rubric that Holy Baptism should be administered in Morning or Evening Prayer "when the most number of people come together." The main reason for this complete disregard is probably that the Baptismal office unduly lengthens the service. Might it not be possible, once a quarter, that one Lesson and one Canticle should be omitted in order that the people might have a periodic object-lesson on their initiation into the Christian Society?

4. A feeling of weariness on the part of many children and others who are unable to enter into long and sustained devotions. It is idle to say that men can sit for three hours without feeling tired at a concert or a theatre. Such attendance makes little demand on the mental and spiritual faculties, and bears no comparison with attendance at a religious service, which varies little from one end of the year to the other.

5. A disinclination, except on the part of very devout souls, to remain frequently for Communion. Some, of course, object to any Communion after breakfast; but to the large number who rightly have no such scruples, the length of Morning Prayer is, we are persuaded, a barrier to frequent reception and too often the idea is current that 11 a.m. Morning Prayer is the essential thing, the Holy Communion an appendage which may be dispensed with according to taste.

6. Lastly, it is not improbable that, if ever we are to make any effectual attempt to regain the "lapsed masses" to our services, the regular attendants must be prepared in certain places to submit to some alteration in our evening services.

In many ignorant or neglected districts a simple Liturgical

service on the lines of Evening Prayer, but so short that it may be printed on two sides of a card, is much more likely to attract and to help non-Church-goers than is a service, which, however excellent, is puzzling to an outsider, and sometimes, because he does not understand it, repellent.

The question of Prayer-Book revision has now reached the sphere of practical politics. If the granting of "Letters of Business" is simply to issue in the toleration of Vestments, many thoughtful minds will regret that a great opportunity was lost, and some will indignantly feel that it was altogether misused. Additional services, additional prayers are urgently needed—prayers for Missions, for Commerce, for Confirmation Candidates, etc. *But the present length of our services will preclude additions on Sundays unless there be some corresponding subtraction.* If by removing Exhortations which have lost their force, or needless repetitions of the same supplications, or by reducing selections from the Psalter to a more reasonable length, the services of our Church can be improved, why should we hesitate to seek their improvement? No doctrinal change is involved in the suggestions given in this article. They are simply the requirements of common sense. It may be well to "stand in the old paths," but even the best of roads occasionally need remaking; and, after all, we are not simply called to "stand," we are called also to "go forward." If the Spirit of the living God is urging us not to acquiesce in the present religious or irreligious state of the nation, but to adapt our methods to the legitimate needs of the times, it is faithlessness and cowardice on our part if we refuse to listen to His Voice.

Postscript.—This article was written before the recent publication of the (preliminary) Report of the Committee of the Lower House of Canterbury Convocation on the subject of Revision. The Recommendations of the Committee endorse the suggestions in this paper, numbered 6, 7, and 9. In my opinion, far more is needed in the way of curtailment. Still, I am thankful that these few Recommendations of the Committee seem likely to win acceptance in Convocation, and I trust that the outside agitation against any Revision may not succeed in rendering them ineffectual.

The Missionary World.

MISSIONARY notes, for a month in which fall Ascension Day and Whit-Sunday, must start with a triumphant recognition that death and seeming failure lie behind, victory and life abundant in front. We who have lately stood within the shadow of the Cross, where all the forces of evil worked their worst upon one defenceless Head, and then beside the empty tomb whence the defeated Victor has arisen to live for evermore; we who pass in this month through the forty days of self-manifestation to the quiet glory of the Ascension and the descending power of the promised Comforter falling upon the infant Church at Pentecost, look out upon the world from a vantage-point which each succeeding century of Christian history makes more sure. True, we see not yet all things put under Him, but we see Jesus, because of the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour, and we have proved that year by year "many sons" are brought into the glory of their Lord. It is only a question of time, His final victory; or shall we not rather say a question of the faithfulness of those who call themselves "His own"?

* * * * *

What is "the world" which "God so loved"? The thought pervades the writings of St. John, and richly rewards the student's toil. It is worth while to search out all the passages, classifying them in the light of comments from such thinkers as Bishop Westcott and Dr. Inge. The result will be a great polarization of existing thought, a forming of new and unexpected combinations, a taking up of the narrow separatist teaching of fifty years ago into a more vital region, a quickening of formal, half-abandoned restrictions into new purpose and life. It will need many minds to interpret the fulness of meaning for present-day conditions, but already for some there is emerging a unity as great as that for which the Liverpool Conference

stood, and with issues as far-reaching in practical life. Through the writings of St. John we come to see "the world," Jesus in the world, ourselves as sent into the world. The geographical aspect of the phrase falls into the background; we face a great order apart from, or even opposed to, God. The deeper meaning of the great "conflict" chapters, and still more of St. John xvii., begins to emerge. Gradually we find ourselves approaching the social problems of the home Church and the needs of the mission-field, but from a fresh and individualistic side. The rebirth of the human soul into the new sphere of the kingdom becomes a central aim—of ours as it was of His. A great truth has rolled from one of its facets to another, and we see, freshly and with glad conviction, what has always been there.

* * * * *

Missionary literature is being greatly enriched by the two quarterlies devoted to the cause. We are increasingly thankful for the many-sidedness and freshness of *The East and the West*, for its interesting presentation of the current thinking of many varied minds, and for its real contribution to the expansion of missionary interest. The current number opens with two able articles—one on "Social Changes in the East," by Dr. E. W. Capen, the other on "Christianity and the Japanese Government," by an S.P.G. missionary. There is a delightful paper on "'Robinson Crusoe' and Christian Missions," and, towards the close of the number, two valuable letters to the Editor—headed "Is it quite fair?"—on the compulsory teaching of Scripture in mission schools. Mr. A. G. Fraser's affirmative answer is full of cogency.

* * * * *

The International Review of Missions fills a different sphere, and lays the serious student of missions under deeper indebtedness. The second number, in range of thought, in force of expression, in applicability to current matters, and in living interest, far surpasses the first. A comparison in one department only—that of the Book Reviews—demonstrates this. Each article is in itself a very careful study, yet the full value

is only realized when several articles bearing on one subject are compared. For instance, the growth of the Church among the Bataks in Sumatra and that in the C.M.S. Missions in West Africa, given in the first and second issues, are mutually illuminative; so are the articles in each number on the Vital Forces of Christianity and Islam. The preparation of missionaries is furthered by a report of the well-considered methods followed in Holland. On the anxious question of unity and co-operation light falls from three sides in the current issue—the Bishop of Oxford, incidentally but strongly, takes the High Anglican line so clearly identified with him; an able Presbyterian missionary deals at length with the question as it exists in the Indian mission-field; a well-known L.M.S. medical missionary, writing of China, again sets forth incidentally a third ideal. Each article is a clear statement, and all together make a large contribution to a matter which lies near many hearts. Perhaps the most noteworthy article in the whole number is that by Professor Cairns on "Christian Missions and International Peace"; it is charged with thought and feeling of the highest kind. The "Notes on Current Periodicals" furnish valuable material drawn from many sources; the Bibliography is excellent—indispensable to the real student of missions. The Editor expresses his gratitude for the "unexpectedly generous and cordial reception" given to the first number. Contact with many missionary thinkers and workers confirms the opinion expressed in these pages, that the *International Review* has come to meet a real need.

* * * * *

Those who value clear thought and careful survey should read "The Heights and Depths of Hinduism," by Mr. J. N. Farquhar, the general student secretary of the National Y.M.C.A. of India, in the April *Missionary Review of the World*. Recognizing the wide divergence between those who unduly extol and those who unduly decry Hinduism, Mr. Farquhar shows where both are at the same time wrong and right. The article has distinct uses at this juncture, though its

brevity and the general scope of the periodical in which it is issued keep it from dealing with the deeper aspects of Hinduism. Still, one feels all the time that the man who is writing *knows*. The same number contains one of Dr. Pennell's fascinating accounts of medical experiences on the Afghan frontier. It is one of the mysteries of missions that so beloved and so successful a worker should have been "needed elsewhere" by a Master who makes no mistakes. Dr. Pennell's death leaves a great blank in "the thin red line" on the Indian frontier. He had got right home to the rugged tribesmen's hearts.

* * * * *

The adequate training of native doctors begins to attract attention, and it is time that it should. Methods held to be efficient a few years ago will not serve in the "awakening East." It appears from the April issue of *Mercy and Truth* that the C.M.S. are welcoming the fullest light on the subject, especially in relation to the development of Union Medical Schools in China. A note in the S.P.G. *Mission Field* leads to the following comparison of the extent of the medical staff in the two societies: The S.P.G. have thirty-three doctors, of whom nine are men and twenty-four are women. The parallel figures for the C.M.S. are ninety, sixty-six, and twenty-four. The S.P.G. have fifteen missionaries who are trained nurses; the C.M.S. have fifty-six.

* * * * *

Mercy and Truth contains also a graphic paper, written by one of the missionary nurses at Foochow, on "Women and the Reformation in China." It is moving to read of "the passion of patriotism" which has laid hold of Chinese women, and the way in which some of them are mistakenly pushing themselves forward as soldiers to fight side by side with the men. Their passion for reform offers a great opportunity to the missionary, and lays a burden of responsibility upon the women of those Western nations who have aroused them to assert their freedom. Few appeals to the Christian Church have been more urgent than that arising from the needs of those Eastern women who

are in danger of rushing all unprepared from bondage into licence, miscalled "liberty." They need the best aid that Christian womanhood can give them, and they need it at once.

* * * * *

It is significant that at such a time the C.M.S., which has now 430 single women on its staff, should have called a Women's (Foreign) Committee into being. The full text of the General Committee's resolution will be found on p. 106 of the *C.M.S. Gazette.* The functions of the new committee are as follows:

(*a*) To consider general foreign matters affecting women; and such matters of current foreign business as are referred to it by the General Committee, Committee of Correspondence, the Group Committees, the Medical or Educational Committees, or any other Committee of the Society, and to advise the Committee referring the matter, or the Committee concerned, thereupon.

(*b*) To consider matters affecting women missionaries on furlough, and to report thereon to the Committee concerned.

(*c*) Any other functions assigned to it from time to time by the General Committee.

The membership will be not less than twelve or more than twenty, together with the hon. secretary of the C.M.S. and the three foreign secretaries, besides five women missionaries or wives of missionaries who may be co-opted as members. The elected officials of this committee and one other of its members will be entitled to attend, without a vote, the meetings of the group committees which administer the foreign business of the Society. Without modification of existing practices, the time for which has not come as yet, the C.M.S. have thus given women at home a real place in the administrative aspects of their foreign work, and have taken an important step towards the adequate consideration of those larger needs of women in the mission-fields, which, in the pressure of current business, have too often been pushed aside.

* * * * *

The increase of serial matter of a really instructive nature is noteworthy in the missionary periodicals of our Free Church friends. The Wesleyan *Foreign Field,* for instance, is running an excellent series, well illustrated, on "What the Other

Missionary Societies are Doing"—the article this month is by the editor of the Friends' Foreign Missions Association Quarterly —and another on "The Non-Christian Religions of the World." The L.M.S. *Chronicle* has begun a series of four articles, called "In the Days of Livingstone," by the Rev. Nelson Bitton. The B.M.S. *Herald*, struggling bravely to represent many interests, has no room for this educative work. It remains to be seen whether the larger circulation of its single periodical will compensate for the loss of opportunity for doing the deeper work which was possible before.

* * * * *

In *China's Millions*, Mr. Marshall Broomhall continues his fascinating "Glimpses of China in Revolution." He has the art of seeing and of telling just what one wants to know. He quotes passages from several utterances by Dr. Sun Yat-sen, which are full of promise, and notes hopefully "the way in which Christian truth is seen glimmering here and there through the lurid pictures" of the revolution. Many will have read with almost painful interest the article in the *Times* of April 4, entitled "Sun Yat-sen's Prayer." It is an historical summary rather than a "prayer," but it appears to have been accompanied by some definite act of sacrifice to the spirit of the founder of the Ming dynasty. It is difficult for Westerners to estimate the hold of ancestral worship upon the Chinese, or to allow for the obligations of official duty; but we shall await with some anxiety the comment of missionary leaders, and still more of settled Chinese Christians, upon the whole incident.

* * * * *

Meantime famine is rife in China. Two and a half millions of people are said to be in dire necessity. The desperate condition is said to be mainly the result of the failure of the late Government to keep the river channels in order Now the revolution is absorbing China's resources and thought. *The Bible in the World* contains an earnest appeal for aid, which, if sent to the Bible House, 146, Queen Victoria Street, London, E.C., will be duly forwarded. G.

Notices of Books.

NEWTON'S "CARDIPHONIA," WITH AN APPRECIATION. By Dr. Alexander Whyte. *Morgan and Scott.* Price 3s. 6d. net.

For two reasons there is something valuable and timely in the republication of these letters entitled "A Real Correspondence by the Rev. John Newton," one of the Fathers of the Evangelical Revival within the Church of England. In the first place, the "letter," or "epistle"—not to draw here any fine distinction between them—is peculiarly characteristic of the Christian method of conveying truth; and Newton's use of the method is singularly happy. In the second place, we have in these letters a frank and candid statement of fundamental Evangelical principles, such as are in danger to-day of being lost sight of, in the general tendency of "Central" Churchmen to amalgamate with the teachings of "High" and "Broad" schools, and to avoid being "extreme."

Throughout these letters a clear line is drawn between the "natural" and the "spiritual" man. Writing to the "Rev. Mr. S.," Newton does not hesitate to class him with the former: "I now return your sermons; I thank you for the perusal; I see much in them that I approve, and nothing in them but what I formerly espoused. But in a course of years, a considerable alteration has taken place in my judgment and experience. . . . Then I was seeking, and now, through mercy, I have found the pearl of great price. It is both the prayer and the hope of my heart, that a day is coming when you shall make the same acknowledgment. . . . But fidelity obliges me to add, 'Yet one thing thou lackest.'" He proceeds to describe the only type of preaching which will reclaim men from "open wickedness or lifeless formality." "The people will give you a hearing, and remain just as they are till the Lord leads you to speak to them as criminals condemned already, and whose first essential step is to seek forgiveness by the blood of Jesus, and a change of heart and state by His grace, before they can bring forth any fruit acceptable to God." Is this the tone of the modern pulpit? and have we improved upon the old? There is much of a lighter character in these letters, which have often a playful touch, which brightens the more sombre passages. Take but one example: "You say you are more disposed to cry *miserere* than *hallelujah*—why not both together? When the treble is praise, and heart-humiliation for the bass, the melody is pleasant, and the harmony good." We should have been still more grateful to the publishers if they had given us a table of contents at the beginning, as in earlier editions; and could not an editor have been found to add a few notes, as, for example, to tell us that the "Nobleman" of the first twenty-six Letters was Lord Dartmouth, or to give a few leading facts of Newton's life? But, confessedly, the way of editors is hard.

D. HARFORD.

PROBLEMS IN THE RELATIONS OF GOD AND MAN. By Clement C. J. Webb, Fellow and Tutor of Magdalen College, Oxford. London: *J. Nisbet and Co., Ltd.* 1911. Price 7s. 6d. net.

This book originates from lectures given in Oxford a year ago by Mr. Webb in connection with the Philosophy of Religion. It does not pretend to be an

exhaustive study of its subject, but to introduce readers now, as hearers then, to a consideration of three great problems—Reason and Revelation, Nature and Grace, Man and God: antitheses known to philosophy as those of Subject and Object, Freedom and Necessity, Particular and Universal.

Mr. Webb writes not only as a philosopher, but as a Christian philosopher. There are minds to which it is always a shock to find the positions won by Christian theology treated as illustrations of broad philosophical principles. And if the stage of illustration is never passed—as, for instance, in the late Dr. Caird's treatment of the Incarnation — the uneasiness is legitimate. There may be pages in Mr. Webb's book where the doubt might arise as to whether the philosopher is not given too much, and the Christian too little; but the treatment of the Incarnation (pp. 240, 241) is not an instance of it. The union of God and man follows naturally from primal affinity, but it is not, therefore, spread out over the whole of humanity; it is a concrete reality concentrated in one historic Person, doubtless for all mankind, but not in humanity in general. This discussion of the Incarnation, as also a discussion of the doctrine of the Trinity, comes opportunely in the middle of a long chapter on the Personality of God. The term "Personality" is not free from objection, any more than was the Greek ὑπόστασις or the Latin *personæ*; Augustine's regretful use of the latter term is well known. But it has a definite religious value, whereas such a term as the Absolute, useful though it may be for thought, makes no religious or ethical appeal: while the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation ought to safeguard Christians against imagining that Personality in God is just similar to the personality of any individual. In connection with this branch of his subject, Mr. Webb joins issue with Dr. McTaggart as to the meaning which the term God has for religious people, in order to combat the suggestion that the term is honestly used only when made to represent a powerful and predominantly good person, whose personality exceeds that of men in degree only, but not in kind. Mr. Webb doubts, and gives good reason for doubting, whether religious people do conceive of God under such a form.

We have begun at the wrong end of the book, for Mr. Webb's third part is certainly the most important, as it is the longest, of his book. Of the two earlier sections, that on Reason and Revelation is more satisfactory than that on Nature and Grace in its breadth of treatment. As to Mr. Webb's conclusions, we are sure that he tries to do full justice to the idea of Revelation, but he does not quite succeed. We shall all agree—or ought to agree—that the two are not opposed to one another; for Mr. Webb they are correlative—reason the apprehension of revelation, revelation the substance of reason. This is a true enough statement of the relationship between the two, but, just as in a celebrated essay by Canon Wilson in the "Cambridge Theological Essays," so here we are left in considerable doubt as to the subject-matter of revelation, though Mr. Webb's opposition to the traditional distinction between Natural and Revealed Religion helps to make his meaning clearer, as do his suggestions alternative to that distinction; but from the religious standpoint we remain less than satisfied.

Of his second part we have not space to speak. Kant's criticism of the doctrine of Grace forms its starting-point. Mr. Webb's treatment of the

interposition of freedom between Grace and Nature, with its appearance of the supernatural when viewed from the side of Nature, and of the natural when viewed from the side of Grace, is extremely interesting; yet the discussion is hardly adequate as to religious experience, and does not lend itself well to compendious treatment.

We could wish Mr. Webb's style sometimes other than it is, a more happy union of thought and expression, but we trust that the book, taken as a whole, will have a healthy influence on the cause of Christian philosophy.

J. K. MOZLEY.

THE DATE OF THE ACTS AND OF THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS. By A. Harnack. Translated by the Rev. J. R. Wilkinson. *Williams and Norgate.* Price 5s.

In his first chapter Harnack reprints the we-sections, underlining the Lukanisms. The second chapter brilliantly refutes the argument that St. Paul's attitude to the law in Acts is inconsistent with that disclosed in the Epistles. Unlike some German scholars, Harnack knows that life is larger than logic. St. Paul's enemies were, in a sense, right. Judaism was no longer possible within the Church. St. Paul had severed it from its roots. Nor was it possible to maintain a double fulfilment of the Old Testament—the one for Israel after the flesh, the other for Israel after the spirit. This argument is so developed as to deepen our sense of St. Paul's greatness and spirituality. The apostle's passionate patriotism was sometimes too strong for his logic, but it never seduced him from his fundamental spiritual principles.

The chapters which have made this book famous are slighter. Harnack pronounces definitely for the view in his Acts that St. Luke wrote that work at the end of St. Paul's two years at Rome. This, of course, involves an earlier date for Luke, and a still earlier for Mark. Harnack has been largely anticipated by Rackham, whose work he apparently has not seen. A much fuller discussion of the evidence of Clement as to Mark is required. Zahn is the only writer who has handled it on at all an adequate scale, and that writer's judgment is not always as impressive as his learning. Probably Harnack has more to give us, but we shall have to wait until he is released from his work on the recently-discovered commentary of Origen on Revelation. The book before us has done great service by calling the attention of scholars to a series of problems which have been inadequately considered. There is likely to be a movement of critical opinion towards the early dating of the Gospels. We may mention Allen's recent discussions of Matthew in the *Expository Times*, and the interval of time which Sir J. Hawkins would interpose between Luke and Acts.

Mr. Wilkinson has done well to avoid excessive literateness in his translation, but we doubt whether his suppression of part of Harnack's argument against the Virgin-birth was justified.

H. J. BARDSLEY.

THE EVIDENCE FOR THE SUPERNATURAL. By Dr. Ivor Ll. Tuckett. 7s. 6d. net. *Kegan Paul and Co.*

The writer of this book is a medical man and Cambridge scientist who was led to inquire into the subject of spiritualism through seeing some articles on the subject in a London paper. From investigating the

phenomena of the occult, he proceeds to examine the nature of all that can be classed as supernatural. He writes from "the coldly critical standpoint" of an "agnostic scientific philosopher." He is very anxious to judge impartially, and conscientiously, we must believe, he strives to write "without bias," to use his favourite word. But, perforce, a man sees from where he stands, and his outlook is what would naturally be expected from a physiological specialist. Moreover, his standard does not always seem to be uniform. The evidence of highly qualified scientific men, when they report on supposed spiritualist phenomena, is criticized with a keenness that lets nothing escape, while, in searching for details of savage religious beliefs—a most difficult thing to estimate—he quite cheerfully accepts the statements of a boy who a century ago was captured at the age of fifteen and spent four years of enforced residence among the Tongan Islanders.

Again, is it quite worthy of the writer or in good taste to arraign the clergy as unsuitable and biassed judges because their wives and children are dependent upon their orthodoxy for bread? Yet he does so twice (pp. 197, 216). Nothing is easier than a *tu quoque*.

Again, the clergy may be unqualified, because untrained, to pronounce upon scientific questions; but the proverb "Ne sutor ultra crepidam" can be applied to both parties. We may equally dismiss one of his leading arguments upon the question of sin, when he states, without explanation, that "the tendency of expert *medical* opinion at the present day is to regard sin and ignorance as interdependent" (p. 175).

The writer is interesting from another point of view. He was brought up in "strict Quaker principles," which admit of no religious expression in a visible way, but which base themselves entirely upon inner subjective spiritual experience. George Fox may have been an excellent man, but is hardly the best religious model for the active mind of an imaginative and intelligent boy! We can scarcely wonder that Dr. Tuckett has "gone to the other extreme," and that we find him fearing that his early upbringing may still make him unduly partial to a belief in the supernatural (p. 8).

The first part of his book deals with Spiritualist Phenomena. Broadly speaking, he regards spiritualism as a mixture of fraud and conjuring; telepathy as coincidence; mediumship as a combination of collusion, guesswork, muscle-reading, and surreptitiously obtained knowledge. He finds no satisfactory scientific evidence for communication between the departed and the living. This portion of the book is naturally very interesting, and he has some really valuable remarks on the value of evidence. At times, however, after reading some of the incidents and his remarks, we feel, as often we do with some Higher Critics, that their explanations are harder to accept than is the original story!

It is when Dr. Tuckett proceeds to deal with "Prayer," "Miracles," "The Divinity of Christ" and "The Soul," that we seriously join issue with him. Much we agree with: much we disagree with. He will find that by no means do all orthodox Christians agree with what he thinks are the essentials.

Again, this book illuminatingly shows how religion is really based on its great ultimate principles. With these the writer deals sparingly, if at all.

He occupies himself with secondary things and causes. He apparently has no conception of "God." To him the universe is self-contained and self-sufficient. But it has constantly been shown that even if the whole universe, visible and invisible, could be demonstrably proved to be under the rule of law—which we all hold as a final theory—that this does not rule out or dispense with an Infinite directing and sustaining Intelligence, or Mind, or First Cause. How can it? Evolution is a method, not a thing in itself. How can the universe go by itself? It is unthinkable. Again, *physiologically*, mind may be a function of brain matter (p. 185), with no evidence (physiological again, we presume) for the soul or will being independent of matter. *Physiologically*, we may quite agree.

But this is not the whole story; not even half. To assert that, in fine, is almost to say "we live to eat." Matter serves mind, and exists for it; not *vice versa*. The greater does not serve the less. Matter may be our—even only?—medium for apprehending mind; but to say that "destroy the brain, you destroy the mind," is akin to regarding the breaking of the violin as the extinguishing of musical harmony. The "eternal" things of mind (or spirit) exist independently of the media whereby they become apprehensible to men, even as invisible light rays existed before instruments sufficiently delicate could appreciate them. Matter is the medium of mind or spirit. To reverse the order is entirely wrong. The main centres of life are in "the *Unseen*." So it is that we cannot entirely classify "spiritualistic phenomena" and the facts of religion, as we understand it, in our list. The "*moral*" element is absent from the first: it is of the essence of the second: the expression of the "mind of God." There is a difference of kind as well as of degree.

It is of these things that one must first take cognizance for even an elementary apprehension of the "Divinity of Christ." The main proofs are not in "texts," but in "the nature of God." Infinite mind is ever expressing itself in and through the universe. That is the latter's *raison d'être*. "Omnia ad gloriam Dei." Then God, who in sundry ways and divers manners has spoken, has finally spoken and revealed Himself in His Son. Here we have the main line. History—Old Testament, New Testament, general, and in personal experience—comes in to supplement and substantiate. "Religion" is the knowledge of the contact of our "mind" (or spirit) with the Infinite Mind (or Spirit). Even if telepathy—the contact of mind with mind independent, to a certain extent, of matter—be disproved, contact with "headquarters" can be. Branches generally communicate with each other, *not* directly, but through the "headquarters." Religion is essentially teleological. The early experiences of which the writer speaks were truer than he could realize under the influence of the extreme form of religion wherein he was nurtured, and which shut him off from so much that he could rightly have claimed.

At the end of his book he writes well of Truth, Justice, Love, and Duty! Yes; but where is his sanction and motive, if the universe is merely a self-running machine? *Quousque?* The "Principles" are the great thing, as this book so singularly shows, from dealing with the subject without taking them into account.

F. G. GODDARD.

LIBRARY OF HISTORIC THEOLOGY. Edited by the Rev. Wm. C. Piercy, M.A. 5s. net per volume. *Robert Scott.*

THE CHURCHES IN BRITAIN BEFORE A.D. 1000. Vol. i. By Rev. Alfred Plummer, D.D.

THE CREEDS: THEIR HISTORY, NATURE, AND USE. By Rev. Harold Smith, M.A.

The object of this new series is to present in an accessible and practica form a review of the results of recent research into questions that are of living and vital interest to the faith.

These two volumes are an efficient advance-guard of the series. It is not often we have history presented to us as attractively as Dr. Plummer presents it. He knows how to use documents without becoming dry. He makes us feel the romance of history without strainiug historical facts. He succeeds in being simple without any loss of freshness. The main purpose of the book is to remove two widespread misconceptions—viz., that "the British Church" and "the English Church" are synonymous terms, and that the English Church owes its foundation to the English State. And the author works towards his purpose by piling up weighty arguments, skilfully cemented by happy illustrations and apt quotations.

The second volume, on "The Creeds," will, if we mistake not, be heartily welcomed by theological students. It is a scholarly piece of work, compact, carefully written, and containing the essence of older and fuller works on the same subject by Pearson, Maclear, and Swete. Inserted in the text at frequent intervals are tables of reference to literature which deals more exhaustively with the separate clauses of the Creeds; these, together with the Appendix, containing in tabular form the stages of creed formation, with notes on the various changes, will be found especially valuable.

THE RULE OF FAITH AND HOPE. By Canon Ottley, D.D. London: *Robert Scott.* Price 5s. net.

The Library of Historic Theology, of which this is a volume, represents an endeavour to provide the "large mass of parochial clergy and students" with the results of the newer learning in a not too specialized form. Canon Ottley's book deals with the Creed, and is to be followed by similar volumes on the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments.

Any treatment of the Creed must naturally encounter very many important and controverted points, and Canon Ottley has shown no tendency to avoid meeting such. In a volume of 226 pages we deal with such matters as Miracle in Christianity, The Virgin Birth, Prayers for the Dead, The Literal Nature of the Ascension, The Second Coming, The Nature of the Atonement, The Inspiration of the Bible, The Nature of Sin, The Threefold Ministry, and The Nature of the Resurrection Body. The attitude adopted throughout by our author is that of an orthodox, moderate Churchman. "New" theology receives no encouragement. Christianity was, is, and must be miraculous. The Virgin Birth was demanded by the "new beginning" which Christianity made, and is no more marvellous than "the admitted

marvel of Christ's life." The Cross is the central fact of the faith; the Resurrection and Ascension really happened, and there is a real Second Coming of Our Lord.

Canon Ottley is strongly impressed with the fact that "the great need of our age is a strong and simple theology" (a phrase which we noticed in at least three different passages)—"a theology in close and living contact with human needs," and this he certainly tries to give.

We welcome his insistance on the need of conviction of sin, on the reality of Christ's redemption from sin, and on the *spiritual* nature of Christianity. Several times he pleads hard for an increase in missionary zeal and activity, urging that no Churchman is truly "catholic" who is not ardent in the missionary enterprise. He truly says, that while we are glad to accept all that modern scholarship and investigation may have to tell us, we, nevertheless, "approach the Bible" not for Biblical criticism, but "to learn more about God and His will." The Church consists of "all orthodox baptized Christians," albeit the threefold ministry pertains to its catholicity and apostolicity. A special chapter on the Redemption emphasizes the three aspects of Christ's work: (1) Christ with man as example; (2) Christ for man as atoning and interceding; (3) Christ within man as indwelling by His Spirit. The book commences with a definition of faith as "personal choice," "an act of personal adhesion" leading to "personal relationship" and "fellowship between man and God."

The "Rule of Faith and Hope," therefore, which Canon Ottley portrays, is no mechanical automatic human system by which we are to work our way into a position of favour with God, but is, rather, a spiritual, devotional, helpful, explanatory survey of those fundamental "articles of the Christian faith," revealed in the Bible, summarized in the Creed, in which is proclaimed the salvation of sinful man wrought out by God in Christ.

In a work which covers so wide a ground it would be beforehand probable that we should light upon some things with which we did not agree, and such in fact, is the case. The "wistful hope" encircling prayer for the dead is supported and argued for, although with moderation. The traditional account of the Ascension is *almost* abandoned, and in any case is rather over-spiritualized, nor are we quite as enthusiastic as our author over the words of Leo the Great (quoted in reference to the Ascension) that "what was actually visible in the Redeemer passed over into the Sacraments." More than once we find ourselves wondering whether the Atonement which Christ made is as closely identified with His *death* as it is in the New Testament. But that Canon Ottley has added a useful book to the parochial clergyman's library goes without question. Helpful material for simple, popular Scriptural teaching on the Creed is here in plenty, and the general treatment of the Christian verities is, in these days of "blasts of vain doctrine," one for which we are profoundly thankful.

TWENTY-SIX PRESENT-DAY PAPERS ON PROPHECY. By the Rev. E. P. Cachemaille, M.A. *Seeley, Service and Co., Ltd.* Price 6s. net.

An explanation of the visions of Daniel and of the Revelation on the continuous-historical system. Great praise is due to the author for the laborious research to which this bulky volume bears witness, and for the numerous maps and diagrams by which it is illustrated. To those who adopt the author's point of view it will be invaluable. For ourselves, we can only express our profound disagreement.

Received: POWER THROUGH PRAYER. By E. M. Bounds. London: *Marshall Brothers.* Price 2s. 6d. A particularly useful book on a subject of the highest importance. CHRISTIAN RE-UNION. By Rev. H. J. R. Marston. London: *Sutton and Goodchild.* Price 3d. Mr. Marston writes clearly and thoughtfully on this complex subject. THE PERSON OF JESUS CHRIST. Price 1s. *Student Christian Movement.* Three addresses delivered at the Summer Conference at Swanwick. HEART CURES. By Hugh Callan, M.A. London: *Elliot Stock.* Price 2s. 6d. net. THE ARMY OF GOD. By S. B. Marcy. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 3s. 6d. net. Being the story of the Church during the first six centuries, written for children. Written from an ecclesiastical point of view that we cannot commend. THE SCRIPTURE OF TRUTH. By Sidney Collett. London: *S. W. Partridge and Co.* Price 2s. 6d. net. ENGLISH CHURCH REVIEW (Feb.). London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 6d. net. LONDON DIOCESE BOOK FOR 1912. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 1s. 6d. net. FROM PARIS TO NEW YORK BY LAND. By Harry de Windt. *Nelson* 1s. *Library.* Price 1s. net. ON THE MOUNT OF BLESSING. Rev. H. R. Scott. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 1s. 6d. net, A series of eight addresses on the Beatitudes, with an introductory address suited for giving them a Lenten use if required. GOD'S IMAGE IN EBONY. By T. H. Darlow. London: *C.M.S.* Price 1s. 6d. net. A textbook for intermediate study circles excellently put together. STARVING CELESTIALS, AND HOW WE FEED THEM. By J. Heywood Horsburgh, M. A. London: *Marshall Brothers.* Price 1s. THE MALE CHOIR. By Ira D. Sankey and George C. Stebbins. London: *Morgan and Scott.* Price 6d. net. Collection of Gospel Hymns and Sacred Songs arranged for Male Voices. PERSONALITY. By A. W. Momerie, M.A., D.Sc., LL.D. London: *H. R. Allenson.* Price 6d. THE GARDENER AND THE COOK. By Lucy H. Yates. London: *Constable.* Price 3s. 6d. MY LARGER EDUCATION. By Booker T. Washington. London: *Hodder and Stoughton.* Price 6s. THE CHRIST LIFE. By A. B. Simpson, D.D. London: *Morgan and Scott.* Price 1s. 6d. net. EVERYMAN'S LIBRARY. London: *Dent.* Price 1s. Messrs. Dent have issued another fifty numbers of this invaluable series, bringing the total up to six hundred. JAMES CHALMERS: HIS AUTOBIOGRAPHY AND LETTERS. By Richard Lovett, M.A. London: *R.T.S.* OUT OF THE IVORY PALACES. By Rev. John Wakeford. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 9d. net. THE OFFICIAL YEAR-BOOK OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 3s. A DEVOTIONAL PSALTER. By Charles H. Robinson, D.D. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 1s. net. AFRICAN MISSIONS: SOUTH, EAST, AND CENTRAL AFRICA. By Rev. B. G. O'Rorke. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 3s. 6d. net. SEVEN WORDS FROM THE CROSS. By Rev. V. R. Lennard. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 6d. Eight addresses for the service of the Three Hours. THE NATURAL HISTORY OF RELIGIOUS FEELING. By Isaac A. Cornelison, D.D. New York and London: *G. P. Putnam's Sons.* Price 6s. net. ABIDE WITH US. By Constance Coote. London: *Marshall Brothers,* Prayers for home use, morning, evening, and special days.