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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

November, 1912.

The Month.

Church Congress.

THE meeting of the Church Congress at Middlesbrough, "a very modern town in a very ancient diocese," seems to have been a great success in the best way. In his introductory address, the Archbishop of York, who was not only the President, but in a very real sense the inspiration, of the Congress, told his hearers that "it was not the business of the Church to take sides, but to implant in the consciences of men a new spirit, new moral and spiritual truths"; and, on the whole, the Congress followed the Archbishop's lead. The Church of England has suffered severely in the past from the fact that it has been commonly associated, in the minds of men, with one political party. To many minds our advocacy of religious education, and our protests against religious spoliation, have lost some of their effectiveness from this same fact. Some of our efforts on behalf of the Welsh Church have lost value because they have appealed too much to the enthusiasm of the Conservative Club—too little to the religious instincts and the real sense of justice of the Liberal and the Nonconformist. We must change all that. It must be possible for a Liberal or a Labour man to be regarded as loyal a son of the Church of England as the most old-fashioned Conservative. It is the Church of England, and therefore must welcome within its borders all Christian men willing to enter, whatever their political opinions, so long as they be honest and honour-

able. The Church stands above party politics, and must know nothing of their more sordid side. Just now, without its seeking, it is engaged in a controversy which has a political aspect. All the more important, therefore, that the Church Congress should rise superior to the merely party point of view; all the more urgent the Archbishop's plea for a new spirit; all the more welcome the fact that in the papers and speeches at Middlesbrough there were abundant signs that that spirit is coming, if it has not already come. The atmosphere of a great industrial centre seems to have been conducive to this new spirit, and we are glad, for it bespeaks new life and new power for the Church.

Miracles. One of the most important discussions at the Congress was that on Miracles. The papers were read by Dean Strong, Professor Sanday, Dr. Headlam, and Canon Carnegie, while the Bishop of Oxford devoted his Congress sermon to the same subject. The papers are worthy of serious attention, and we confess that we should like to see them published separately, together with the Bishop's sermon, and Dean Wace's article in the *Record* for October 11. Dean Strong cleared the ground: miracles are possible; the world is not governed by a mechanical materialism. Professor Sanday followed and raised a serious question; he made a distinction between the abnormal and the supernatural:

"On the one hand, I for one—but I believe really most or all of us—shall be ready to make the utmost allowance that can possibly be made for the presence in the world of a unique personality.

"But, on the other hand, I for one—and I expect some though not so many, with me—shrink from what is really abnormal. I mean, what we are obliged to regard as abnormal from our modern point of view. I need not say that there is not the slightest blame upon the ancients for setting down things that may be so described. They followed their ideas, and they could not do otherwise. But we also cannot help following our ideas. And the whole problem of miracles seems to reduce itself to this: To find the exact point at which the supernatural ends and the really abnormal begins; to determine in any particular case exactly what amount of allowance has to be made, and to reconstruct the narrative as best we can and as far as we can accordingly."

Professor Sanday is engaged upon a perilous quest, and he evidently felt it. His paper ended: "I hope before long to be able to go a little further." Dr. Headlam and Canon Carnegie, who followed, were much clearer and much more definite. We reverence, as do all, the caution and the learning of Dr. Sanday; we are glad to share his thinking as far as it has gone. We appreciate the immense service he does in showing sympathy to those who are finding their way to truth, from a "reduced" to a full Christianity, but we must definitely dissociate ourselves from the view that our conceptions of the abnormal are to be the tests of the miracles of the Gospel. Perhaps we do not quite understand Dr. Sanday's point. But he does seem to suggest that if something in a miracle seems to us to be abnormal we may begin to reconstruct. We venture to ask whether any history could stand if its testimony were always to be so subjective. Little wonder that Prebendary Webb-Peploe and Canon Skrine protested on behalf of the "Parochial Christian." Little wonder that the Archbishop felt obliged to remind the Congress that "the real meaning of the miraculous was that it was the assurance to us in our world that ultimately the Divine being was free and master in His own house; and that it was the coming forth of that fact into the world that carried with it the consequences they called miracles."

"A Practical Policy."

The *Record* for September 20 published an article by the Rev. H. A. Wilson, in which a question is raised of greatest significance for Evangelical Churchmanship. We trust that the article will not be forgotten, but may lead to some concerted and decided action. Its title is, "A Practical Policy for Evangelicals," and the gist of it is that we ought to take more active and practical steps than we have as yet attempted to take in the direction of fraternal intercourse with our Nonconformist brethren. It is quite true, as Mr. Wilson points out, that hitherto there have been more signs of amity between Nonconformists and High Churchmen than between Nonconformists and Evangelicals. And yet, in the

vital question of the Ministry and the Sacraments, the Evangelical holds a view that is nearer to that of the Methodist or Presbyterian than it is to that of the extreme Sacerdotalist. It may be that we are far distant, at present, from the realization of any scheme of corporate reunion. But in face of all the world's great and increasing need of Christ, it is little short of criminal on our part if we do not do all that it is possible, by social intercourse and by joint prayer and study, to prepare the way for combined and confederated action in the Master's service.

The Evangelical Task.

Mr. Wilson's message comes as a trumpet-call, and we trust that it will not fall on deaf, unheeding ears. The Evangelical School of thought has had its distinctive message in the past, in its emphasis on conversion and a life of personal holiness. May we not say that it is now called on to emphasize the Catholic character of the Church, the true significance of the Body of Christ? We are well aware that the Tractarian Movement has had much that is good to contribute to Church life and thought, and we should be the last to underestimate what it has accomplished of permanent benefit. But this sentiment of gratitude must not be allowed to blind us to the essential weakness of the extreme High Church position, its defective apprehension of the Church as Catholic, and its inability to grasp the Pauline conception of the Church as the Body. A firmer apprehension of these truths is the great need of our age, and, so far as the Church of England is concerned, Evangelical Churchmen are those who may well undertake the task of giving them their proper place and emphasis. We hold, as we believe, a conception of the Church which is both primitive and Scriptural—a conception which makes it possible for us to arrive at a large and true synthesis unhampered by false and misleading ecclesiastical theory.

A Word of Counsel.

Mr. Wilson pleads earnestly for greater social intercourse, in which Anglican and Nonconformist ministers should meet as friendly acquaintances for frank discussion. May the writer of these words, who has had

personal experience for some years of such a friendly gathering, offer a word of counsel to his brother-clergy of the Anglican Communion? The counsel is this: To avoid with the utmost care a slight air of condescension, a faint *soupçon* of gentle graciousness, which so often seems to breathe from the youngest Anglican in his dealings with the most aged and venerable Nonconformist minister, and which cannot fail to be distinctly irritating to those on whom it is inflicted. This air of beneficient toleration may be quite unconscious. It is the explicit manifestation of an implicit conviction: "The Dissenters are queer people; their thoughts and habits are strange; but we must be friendly, and do all we can to make them comfortable." The Nonconformist who has a sense of humour is not unobservant of this. He knows his Anglican brother means well, and, if he is large-hearted enough, he forgives him for his manner, and no great harm is done. But our intercourse will be more real, and our sympathy more profound, if we can break down the barrier of this unconcious mannerism, and fraternize with ease as fellow-servants of Jesus Christ.

Marriage.

Owing to the fact that the Report of the Royal Commission has been delayed, the discussion on Marriage was eliminated from the programme of the Congress. It is still much in the minds of Christian men, and when the Report does come, serious questions will have to be faced. With a small party in the Church it is the fashion to use very strong language, and to pretend that that language is really the voice of whole Church. It has been done in connection with the Banister *versus* Thompson case, and we cannot believe the result will be good. If Churchmen use extravagant language where it is out of place, we shall not be listened to when a really forcible protest is needed.

The two great schools of thought in the Church must not differ on so fundamental a question as marriage, and they will not differ if we exercise prudence in statement. For such prudence we should like to refer to some words of Bishop Collins quoted by Canon Mason in his interesting sketch of the Bishop's life.

The quotation is long, but it would not be fair to give it except almost *in extenso*. Bishop Collins gave directions to his diocese as follows :

"One such Rule or Law of the Church, which is expressed in, but does not originate in, the 99th of the Canons of 1603, forbids the marriage of a man to his deceased wife's sister. Formerly this was enforced by the law of the land; now it is no longer so enforced. But the law of the land, as we have seen, explicitly recognizes the fact that it still exists; and it is hard to see how anybody can suppose that it can be altered but by the action, explicit or implicit, of the Church itself.

"Yet it is not to be wondered at that the position of the English Church in the matter has been so largely misunderstood; and, as usual, we are ourselves largely to blame. The use that has been made in the past of the argument from Leviticus cannot but seem unreal to those who reflect that we should never dream of conforming our social life to some other precepts of the Hebrew ceremonial law. . . . There has been far too much loose and irresponsible speech about 'the law of God,' as though, with our partial vision and imperfect sight, we were able to lay down dogmatically what is and what is not justifiable for other men, who stand and fall before their own Master, and not before us. In question-begging ways such as these we have largely incapacitated ourselves for bringing home to the consciences of men what are the real objections to the new law; and yet we are in no doubt as to what they are. Briefly, we hold that it makes a grievous and unnecessary inroad upon the family circle; it introduces an unfair and unjustifiable distinction in the treatment meted out to women by men; and it sows the seeds of future dissension by introducing a contradiction between the marriage law of the State and that of the Church.

"Personally, nevertheless, I can think of it as quite possible that the rule of the English Church in the matter might be altered in the future in the direction of the new law. I have the strongest sympathy with what has been said by the Bishops of Hereford and Carlisle, as to the extreme undesirability of anything which should narrow down the position of the English Church into that of a mere section. We might, of course, be compelled to take up such a position, in the interests of the Faith, or of morals; but I had rather that it should be done in the interests of the central truths of the Faith rather than of some particular point of doctrine, to vindicate some great moral principle rather than to preserve a particular point of practice upon which, highly as I esteem it, minds after all may differ.

* * * * *

"Whatever the future may bring forth, what I have said only places in clearer relief the fact that the rule of the Church against such marriages is, at the present time, clear and definite; and the rule is one which can be lightly esteemed by no faithful son of the Church.

* * * * *

"I think it is important that we should dissociate ourselves entirely from the language which has been used by some people in this matter, as though

marriage of this description were no true marriages, or even worse. Such an attitude is surely unworthy and unjustifiable, and would seem to be based upon a misapprehension of our message. For here, as elsewhere, the Church is called upon to bless, not to ban; not to deny what others have, but to defend what God has entrusted to us. The function of the Church is not to appraise marriages, but to proclaim the sacredness of marriage in itself, and to set before men the ideal towards which all marriages should be conformed. Moreover, it does not appear to me that it can reasonably be contended that they who have contracted a marriage allowed by the laws of the Christian land to which we belong are 'open and notorious evil livers,' in the sense of the rubric at the beginning of the office for the Holy Eucharist; and I must hold that none are to be rejected from Communion on the ground that they have contracted marriage with a deceased wife's sister."

Bishop Collins did not belong to the school of thought that this magazine attempts to represent, and we are all the more glad in consequence to commend the sanity of his words.

The White Slave Traffic.

We referred in our September issue to the White Slave Traffic Bill, at present in the hands of a Parliamentary Committee, and the topic is of such grave and momentous importance that we make no excuse for renewed allusion to it. Men who differ widely about Tariff Reform, Home Rule, and Welsh Disestablishment, can surely agree on the urgency of the need to stop, at all costs, this infamous and demoralizing traffic. The present situation, in brief, is this: The Bill in its original form made it possible for a policeman to arrest any individual found to be, or suspected to be, tampering with young girls. The amendment in Committee reserves this right of arrest to a sergeant of police only. The ordinary policeman may not lay hands on a procurer when in the pursuit of his loathsome calling. Mr. Harold Begbie has written an impassioned protest against this in the *Daily Chronicle*, and we gladly endorse the closing words of his appeal:

"It is not yet too late. If the clergy in England, the newspapers, and every individual in whom chivalry and courage are not dead, if every virtuous woman to whom the good name of womanhood is more dear than a hundred votes, if every honest man and decent woman in the country will but do their plain duty, we can save the Bill.

"How can we do it? First, by speaking out on every possible occasion against the cowardice of the Committee; secondly, by writing in favour of the original Bill to the Members of Parliament from the constituencies in

which we live; and, thirdly, by urging every public man, every preacher and teacher of our acquaintance, to take up this matter and force it on the slumbering conscience of the nation. We can save the Bill by making ourselves missionaries of national self-respect.

"But unless the nation speaks its mind, be sure the cringing and truckling Committee will have its way, and the Bill will become Great Britain's charter to vice. That is the menace. As a nation we shall declare ourselves powerless for virtue."

On October 14 an influential deputation interviewed Mr. McKenna, and received from him the assurance that he and the Home Office agreed that the clause limiting the powers to special police officers should certainly be restored to its original form. He added, however, the significant reminder that it was impossible to speak for the majority in the House of Commons. Therefore Mr. Begbie's advice about bringing pressure to bear on private members remains as urgent as ever.

First Curacies.

It happens that the Editors of this magazine are both men who are entrusted with the training of those who are presently to be ordained to the ministry. Theological Colleges are frequently the objects of criticism—perhaps deservedly so—but we are not prepared to admit that all the ills of the Church are due to them. They are often the recipients of friendly advice, and we are glad indeed to attempt to profit by it. But we cannot conceal our satisfaction at some recent words of the Bishop of Liverpool, intended for those who receive our students from our hands. The Bishop was thanking an incumbent for his care of his junior colleagues, and added:

"Some Vicars, excellent men though they were, ought never to have a Deacon, entrusted to them. It was a very great help indeed to a Bishop, when young men applied to him for ordination, to be able to send them to a clergyman who would care for them as an elder brother, would teach them all he knew, and would seek to the best of his ability to make them good ministers."

A man's first curacy often makes or mars him, and accepting our own responsibility as we gladly and solemnly do, we are glad to reproduce these weighty words, not to cast our responsibility upon others, but to ask others to help us—may we dare to say, a little more than they sometimes do—to bear it.

"Eternal Life" in the Plan of St. John's Gospel.

By the Rev. T. W. GILBERT, B.D.

THE rationale of the Gospel of St. John lies in the words contained in chapter xx. 30-31: "Many other signs therefore did Jesus in the presence of the disciples, which are not written in this book: but these are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye may have Life in His Name."

Accepting Bishop Westcott's idea of the date of the gospel as "in the last decennium of the first century and even to the close of it," it is conceivable that St. John must have felt his hold on life growing feebler as age produced a weakening of his physical powers. When his face was turned, however, towards the setting sun, and he was reaching out to a fuller life in the Presence of God, he determined to record for others certain facts which would show the reason for the hope that was in him.

Hence his deliberate statement--*i.e.*, certain signs are recorded, out of the "many" which our Lord performed, for the express purpose of producing belief; this resultant belief is to the effect "that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God," and from this belief there ensues life.

The opening chapter of the Gospel contains, by way of introduction, a preliminary statement of St. John's own belief, an affirmation, and a proof. In the first verses there is St. John's statement of the eternity of the Logos with God (i. 1 and 2), followed by the fact of the creative power of the Logos (i. 3). To this is added that in the Logos was Life (i. 4)—thus definitely associating the Logos with God as "the fountain of Life" (*cf.* Ps. vi. 9)—and declaring further that those who received the Logos, or believed on His name, had the competency (ἐξουσία) to become "children of God" (i. 12), and so to attain to the light of life (i. 5, κατέλαβεν).

Following this introductory statement of the possibility of man entering into a filial relationship with God through believing

on the Logos, comes a preliminary affirmation from the lips of John the Baptist. St. John himself had identified the Logos with God (i. 18—μονογενὴς Θεός); the Baptist advances further by linking the Logos with Christ, the hope of Israel (i. 23; *cf.* the statement of Andrew, John's disciple—i. 41); and finally enunciates the world-wide significance of Christ the Logos and Hope of Israel (i. 29).

To this preliminary statement and affirmation are added signs in corroboration and proof—*i.e.*, the dialogue with Peter revealed the latter's character and unfolded his future position. This is followed by the ready obedience of Philip to the simple words "Follow me"—easy of understanding when one remembers the close link between Peter and Philip (i. 44)—and his identification of "Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of Joseph," with the Messiah or Christ, "of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets, did write." This sign is supplemented by that of reading the mind of Nathaniel when brooding under the fig-tree (i. 48); and from the lips of the new disciple come the words of which he hardly understood the full meaning, and which by design are recorded here, "Thou art the Son of God, Thou art King of Israel." It was a full statement of the belief which it was the purpose of the writer of the Gospel to achieve, and which had its fulfilment in the words of St. Thomas later (xx. 28). Hence the significance of the closing words of the opening section—*i.e.*, "Ye shall see the heaven opened and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man," for they enunciate the truth stated in the first chapter and amplified throughout the Gospel—viz., that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah, the Hope of Israel and of the world, that He was "indeed one with God, the source of Life, and that through Him the possession of Life was possible to all men. Truly, therefore, the heaven was opened, space had become annihilated, for now the aspirations of human hearts could ascend direct to the throne of God, from whom Life was made sure to humanity through the person of Jesus Christ.

The whole of the Gospel is now concerned with showing how

this link between earth and heaven became a reality—*i.e.*, how the signs produced belief in Jesus Christ as the Son of God, and how this belief brought Life.

The theme proper of the Gospel begins with the inaugural sign at Cana of Galilee. At the outset of His mission, Christ gives a proof of His sovereign power over the world of nature. The absence of any psychic mediation, possible in a miracle of healing, made this particular miracle a heralding sign, for it proclaimed emphatically the divine power of Christ over the natural world. Concurrent with this, however, went the truth of which the miracle was itself the sign—viz., that in Christ was a transforming power, and that He was able to change the simpler and lower element into the richer and higher. Hence the significance of (ii. 11): "This beginning of His signs did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested His glory; and His disciples believed on Him." The inaugurating sign had done its work at least for them, for they now gave absolute trust to Him who had proved Himself to be the Lord of nature.

By contrast with this complete trust and belief of the disciples is placed the limited belief of the Jews generally. In the cleansing of the Temple and in the prediction of the Resurrection, they had a sign—both actual and verbal—of the revelation of Christ as the fulfilment of the hope of Israel (ii. 13-22), whilst the "signs," performed significantly enough "in Jerusalem at the Passover" (ii. 23), simply tended to emphasize this revelation. The result was a belief "on His name" (ii. 23), a recognition of Jesus as the Messiah, though without any deep trust in Him personally—as verses 24, 25 imply. (The Greek text brings this out significantly—*i.e.*, πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ . . . ὁ Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἐπίστευεν ἑαυτὸν αὐτοῖς.)

Having proclaimed by the preliminary sign at Cana His power over the world of nature, and having also secured the personal belief of the disciples and Jews in their respective degrees, Christ is now shown directing men to the deeper truth, of which the first miracle was a sign. Nicodemus is attracted to

our Lord by the sign (iii. 2), and it is very significant how Christ immediately goes to the root of the fundamental necessities of man by explicitly enunciating what the first sign proclaimed in symbol. In iii. 3 is laid down the prime necessity of mankind —*i.e.*, that "except a man be born from above, he cannot see the Kingdom of God"; if his moral nature is so to develop that he may be fit to stand in the presence of God, then it is necessary to attach his life to a new source, to transfer the inspiration of his being from earth to heaven. This necessity finds its corroboration in iii. 5. Whatever limitation the possible interpretation "except a man be born anew" instead of "be born from above" might have, is nullified by the unequivocal statement of iii. 5: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God." The first phrase "born of water," as the Jewish symbol of repentance, expresses the cutting of one self loose from one's earthly moral aspirations; whilst the second phrase, "born of the Spirit," emphasizes the necessary corollary—*i.e.*, the opening of our nature to the nature of God, the need of life which has its origin in the Spirit of God, the necessity of a new mode of being, different from the life which is "born of the flesh." How such a miraculous birth and life—already mentioned (i. 12)—was possible, is now clearly and definitely stated (iii. 13-16), *i.e.*, the Son of Man who Himself had come "from above" from the presence of God, had been sent by God Himself that "whosoever believeth on Him" could "in Him have eternal life."

This epoch-making statement of One who came from God to be the personal link between God and man, to bridge the gap between earth and heaven, and to secure eternal life for men by belief in Himself, is so striking to St. John that he here introduces (iii. 27-36) the testimony of the Baptist to the truth of the statement. John (the Baptist) first lays down in reference to the attractive influence of Christ (iii. 26) that such power in Christ was "given him from heaven" (iii. 27), that Christ "came from above" (iii. 31), speaking the words of God who sent Him (iii. 34), and that belief on the Son brought with it

eternal life (iii. 36). The whole is in the nature of a parenthetical statement in support of the stupendous truth enunciated by Christ to Nicodemus, the exact bearing of which was to be unfolded in the succeeding narrative.

The interview of Nicodemus with our Lord had been used by the latter to bring out quite clearly the manward side of the problem how man could secure eternal life (*cf.* iii. 3, 5); the interview with the woman of Samaria served to reveal the Godward aspect of the matter. The limitations of sinful human nature, of which Nicodemus had been reminded, are now mentioned rather to prepare the way for the declaration of what God would do to supply human needs. Thus, the irreconcilability of human nature in the person of Jew and Samaritan (iv. 9) heralds the statement concerning the "gift of *God*" to satisfy human needs (iv. 10); then the mention of human wants (iv. 13) merely prepares the way for the offer by Christ in person of "a well of water springing up into eternal life" (iv. 14). Following this comes a clearing up of ideas with reference to God, showing that the essential nature of God is Spirit, and that Spirit, therefore, is the pre-requisite for those who desire worship or union with Him (iv. 23, 24; *cf.* iii. 5). The whole is crowned by the self-revelation of Christ (iv. 25, 26) in which He reveals Himself as the One who will show "all things" of God to man.

The preliminary bearing and influence of the first sign ends here. Our Lord, who had shown his power in changing water into a richer and higher element, used the sign to show that man also needed a change in his nature, and required the source of his life to be fixed "above" if he would see the Kingdom of God and obtain eternal life. He then pointed out how this human need had been met on God's side by the gift of Christ Himself, who had come into the world to reveal to man how this change could take place.

The narrative now proceeds to show how "the gift of God" can be appropriated by man to supply his need and secure to him Life. Thus the writer introduces the second sign (iv. 46-54).

It is noticeable here that the nobleman had a certain faith or belief in Christ, otherwise he would not have made the request "to come down and heal his son." The faith, however, was limited to belief in the personal presence of Christ to achieve a certain end, "come down [Thyself] ere my child die." The request might have involved no more than one's faith to-day in a particular physician to cure a malady, and whose presence would accordingly be necessary at the bedside of the patient. Hence the crucial words of Christ, "Go thy way; thy son liveth:" they were calculated to raise in the mind of the man a deeper sense of the power of our Lord, they were also used to raise in the nobleman profounder ideas of the person of Christ; but their primary purpose was to teach him the real meaning of faith in Christ. So when the father knew that his son's cure "was at that hour in which Jesus said unto him, Thy son liveth, and himself believed," he learned that the blessing of Life is appropriated by faith in Christ.

The sign which follows carries this truth a little further. True it is that Life is appropriated by faith in Christ, but the third sign makes it clear that human nature, though vitiated and corrupted by sin, can also appropriate the blessing of Life through faith in our Lord.

This fact is made clear by v. 14 and v. 6. In the former verse the man is told to "sin no more lest a worse thing befall" him; his sin it was, therefore, which had reduced him to physical incompetency and sapped the spring of his life. Concurrent with this had been a moral turpitude as well; the man had acquiesced so long in his sin and in the result of his sin, that the very unusual question is put as to whether he is willing to be made whole (v. 6). For thirty-eight years the man had abandoned hope, but now, at the command of Christ, his moral sense is roused and he stands upright on his feet, sound in body and mind.

The sign itself brought our Lord into contact with the Jews because of its apparent violation of the Sabbath, but it is significant how our Lord, in the apologia which He put forward,

simply used the sign as an example of the life-giving work which He had come to do. In v. 20 the sign is described as one of the ἐργά, or wonders which God works, it is pointed out that the normal work of God and the Son is to "quicken" or "make alive" (v. 21), whilst the general statement is made that knowledge of the revelation made by the Son and belief in the Father who speaks through the Son, gives eternal life and passes men from death to life (v. 24-26). Humanity debased by sin can appropriate the blessing of eternal life—such is the reading of the third sign.

The enunciation of this particular principle and fact, wide-reaching as it is, had a very obvious difficulty along with it. Granted that man needs linking with "above," that God has given "the gift" of Christ, that the blessing of life can be appropriated by faith in Him, and that even the most debased can be quickened by faith in Him, the question naturally arises, *How* is it possible for man to obtain a new source of Life in Christ? How can belief in Christ "quicken" and give Eternal Life? This is the problem which St. John proceeds to unravel.

Certain signs performed on the sick (vi. 2), and of which no particulars are given, had the effect of attracting a great multitude to the presence of Christ. Lack of food on the part of the people and the questioning as to the possibility of feeding them (vi. 5-9) were simply the prelude to the sign by which our Lord fed to repletion the five thousand men with the five barley loaves and two fishes. The sign made it quite clear that Christ was the Divine Giver of sustenance.

Following immediately upon this comes the sign—limited to the disciples—in which Christ walked upon the sea, overcame the violence of wind and waves, and straightway caused their boat to be "at the land whither they were going" (vi. 16-21). The sign was comprehensive; it showed that Christ's presence was not limited by sensible or material obstacles, and that His power was not conditioned by earthly things.

The application or interpretation of both these signs comes in the succeeding verses. The people who had been the

participants in the sign of the five barley loaves and the two fishes, found Christ at Capernaum, and were greeted with the words, "Ye seek me, not because ye saw the signs, but because ye ate of the loaves and were filled" (vi. 26). They were attracted by the fact that Christ had been able to satisfy a material need, and that He had thus demonstrated Himself to be the Divine Giver of sustenance. Our Lord, however, points them to a food other than material, "work not for the meat which perisheth, but for the meat which abideth unto eternal life, which the Son of Man shall give unto you" (vi. 27). The questionings of the Jews with reference to "Manna" and "bread from heaven" (vi. 31) revealed that they understood the drift of His words, and so our Lord became more explicit and declared that "The bread of God is that which cometh down out of heaven and giveth life unto the world" (vi. 33). When the longings of their souls burst forth in the words "Lord evermore give us this bread," then in response came the unequivocal statement: "I am the bread of life, he that cometh to Me shall not hunger, and he that believeth on Me shall never thirst" (vi. 35). "I am the living bread which came down out of heaven: if any man shall eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: yea, and the bread which I will give is My flesh, for the life of the world" (vi. 51). Christ has shown in the sign (vi. 5-14) that He was able Himself to supply the material needs of men, that He was the Divine Giver of sustenance for daily life; the words following on the sign reveal Him as one who could give a sustenance which should be eternal in its power; in some mysterious way Christ offered Himself, His "flesh" as the "living bread" for "the life of the world" (vi. 51).

It is now, however, that the significance of the fifth sign (vi. 16-21) appears. Our Lord had there shown that His presence was not limited by material obstacles, but rather that His power was manifested through them. So now the same truth appears in His explanation to the Jews as to how they could feed on Him.

It is quite probable that the Jews had no difficulty in under-

standing the meaning of the term "bread from heaven," for it was in the same category as "living water," "wells of water springing up into everlasting life," and the like, all of which were traditionally associated with the Torah (*cf.* "Midrash Shir Rabba," i. 2: "As water refreshes the body, so does the Torah refresh the soul"; "Midrash Sifre," 84*a*: "As water gives life to the world, so do the words of the Torah give life—*i.e.*, eternal life—to the world"; "Bab. Talm. Shabboth," 120*a*, refers to the "bread of the Torah" as "spiritual food"). They were also conversant with the tradition that in the Messianic era the people would feed upon Leviathan and Behemoth (*cf.* "Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch," xxix. 3-8, Ps. lxxiv. 12-15, and Zeph. i. 7). The difficulty for the Jews therefore lay not so much in how one man could be assimilated by another, but rather how "this man" (vi. 52), "the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know" (vi. 62), could, like the Torah, become the vital principle in their lives—that to feed upon Him was to live eternally. Hence followed on the part of Christ a revelation of the mystery of His own life. The previous statement concerning eating His flesh is first of all reiterated (vi. 53), but He then proceeds to demonstrate how those who eat His flesh and drink His blood (vi. 54) secure for themselves eternal life. Christ declares that He has been sent into the world by the living God, and that the life of God is perfectly reproduced on earth in Himself (vi. 57); in other words, Christ is God living as man. From this it results that the man who "feeds" on Christ incorporates into himself the living God, and actually lives as Christ Himself lives (vi. 57).

Thus the symbolism which Christ uses explains itself, even apart from the traditional Jewish reference to the Torah and the Messianic era. To eat and to drink any substance is to incorporate that substance into one's being; and so to believe in Christ, in the full sense of the term, is to incorporate Him, as though by eating and drinking, into ourselves (*cf.* vi. 63, "It is the Spirit that quickeneth"; also vii. 37, 38, "He that believeth"; explaining the expression, "Come unto Me, and *drink*").

Hence our Lord has now made clear how belief in Himself can bring with it eternal life. "Belief" marks "fellowship," and belief in Christ therefore connotes fellowship and contact with the living God. Fellowship with the living God through Christ means inevitably, eternal life.

Thus the influence of the fourth and fifth signs is brought to a legitimate conclusion. In the former of the two Christ had demonstrated Himself as the Divine Giver of sustenance (vi. 1-14); He had now shown that He was the Giver of Divine sustenance (vi. 35, 51, etc.); in the latter of the two He had revealed that His presence and power were not limited by material agencies, and so He had shown that He Himself, the Giver of Divine sustenance, was capable of incorporation into the being of man, bringing life from God, the Source of Life (vi. 57).

The close of the interview brought with it the half-confession of St. Peter "in the Holy One of God" who "had words bringing eternal life" (vi. 68, 69), but it was quite clear that there were strong cross-currents of feeling amongst the Jews generally (vi. 66; vii. 5, 12). It was in answer to this hesitancy on the part of so many of the Jews that our Lord laid down the necessity of experimental knowledge, if the Jews would learn the truth of that to which He had given utterance, and of which the "signs" were token. "If any man willeth to do His will, He shall know" (vii. 17); the inner consciousness of man, as he obeys the voice of Christ through belief in Him, will convince him of the truth of that which Christ declares. But it is insistent that a man shall "will" to act in accordance with the invitation of Christ—that he shall "come" (vii. 37) unto Christ; when the manward side has been performed, then the Godward result will be made clear. This point of view is developed further by our Lord when He renews the acquaintance of His hearers, and declares: "I am the light of the world; He that followeth Me shall not walk in the darkness, but shall have the light of life" (viii. 12). In other words, He would say that just as darkness is not dispelled

and driven away by any mechanical process, but merely by kindling a flame, so life is created within us simply by admitting Him who is the Source of Life. To the difficulties raised by the Jews, Christ replies by referring them to the limitations of their own knowledge and position (viii. 14, 15, 23), and, on the other hand, to the fact that life is absolute in Himself. He declares: "He that sent Me is with Me" (viii. 29). "I came forth, and am come from God" (viii. 42), and, because of this relationship with God, therefore "before Abraham was, I am." Life is, in consequence, absolute and timeless in Christ—a fact which carries with it the result that, "if a man keep His word," the light from Christ will so illumine his being that he will know the meaning of absolute truth, and of absolute freedom, both moral and spiritual (viii. 32), and that, in consequence, he shall never see death (viii. 57).

(*To be concluded.*)

The Nicene Creed and Modern Thought.

By the Rev. F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK, D.D.,
Formerly Donnellan Lecturer, T.C.D., The Rectory, Kinnitty.

WHEN speaking of the Nicene Creed as an expression of the Church's faith, we have to consider whether it sets forth the ideal truth or but a transient aspect of it; whether it is a philosophical explanation of the doctrines of Christianity that may serve for all time, or whether it may be superseded by a new Confession specially adapted to make the profession of Christianity easy for the scientific and the learned.

The questions we have therefore to answer are: Does the spirit of Christianity require to be embodied in a new vesture to keep pace with the advancing inquiry and scientific research of our age? Does it express the eternal truths of Christianity in a manner that can never be improved upon or modified? Before we attempt to answer either of these questions for and against the Creed, it were well to keep before us the fact that if the Creed were thrown into the melting-pot it is very improbable that we would ever see its *disjecta membra* again, or that any other summary of Christian doctrines could take its place in the centre of the Church's worship or in the heart of Christian people. It may very possibly be that the Nicene Creed, as it stands, has little practical bearing upon life, that it is cast in too transcendental and metaphysical a garb, and that its form is too general, too statuesque, too archaic. But it may be all that, and still be the nearest approximation to the Christian truth, the nearest to perfection that a symbol could reach. "Symbols, like all terrestrial Garments, wax old," says Carlyle.[1] But he also says, "Look on our divinest Symbol, on Jesus of Nazareth and His life and His biography and what followed therefrom. Higher has the human thought never reached. This is Christianity and Christendom; a Symbol of

[1] "Sartor Resartus," book iii., chap. iii.

quite perennial, infinite character, whose significance will ever demand to be anew inquired into, and anew made manifest."

Carlyle's words remind us that, after all, human language is but an inadequate vehicle to express the great eternal truths. The Creed is an attempt to body forth the infinite in the finite; its phrasing must therefore be more or less economical. It is an economy, as Newman pointed out, to speak of our Lord as sitting on the right hand of God, as if right and left were possible in Him.[1] It is, moreover, an economy to speak of the Son as ascending into heaven, as if heaven and earth were not full of His majesty. It is an economy to use the illustration "Light from Light." It is an economy to use the word "Son" to express the relation of the First and Second Persons. But it is the nearest word we have to express the ineffable truth. And the Arians saw this, for, they argued, if Christ be a Son, He cannot be eternal *a parte ante*, because a son is younger than his father. But as Athanasius[2] said, "Such illustrations and images are used by Scripture to help us to form ideas of things, however obscurely, beyond our reason." The language of a creed must be, therefore, regarded in the light of an economy, an attempt to bring the incomprehensible within the reach of our finite intelligences. Bearing this fact in our minds, we perceive that there are at least three conditions which a creed must fulfil if it is to be a permanent possession. And these are:

I. It must be drawn up in language that is not liable to a change of meaning.

II. It must be an adequate and balanced summary of the fundamentals of the Faith, so far as in keeping with necessary brevity.

III. It must have points of contact with modern thought.

I. It would be interesting to see how far the Nicene Creed answers these three conditions. In the first place, it has happened very providentially that the language of Greek theology in which the Creed is couched is no longer spoken, and is not, therefore, liable to the vicissitudes of a living language;

[1] Athanasius, vol. ii., p. 91. [2] Athanasius, Orat. ii. 32.

and so the Creed is understood to-day in the same sense as it was understood by the Fathers at Nicæa. There is one obscurity in the English version of the Creed which is caused by this very tendency of a spoken language to modify the meaning of its words. I refer to the expression, "Of the same substance," a rendering of *Homoousion*. The word "substance" is more or less ambiguous. Generally speaking, it is the unknown and unknowable substratum of mind or matter, which may be either spiritual or material, but has only a metaphysical existence. In scientific and popular thought it is generally identified with solid matter, although some scientists are now leaning to an idealistic interpretation of the word, and find in force and its proportions and arrangements the key of the universe. But it is obvious that the word which is associated with such different conceptions is hardly sufficient to body forth the eternal relations in the Godhead, and we are compelled to fall back upon the forced distinction between Divine substance and creaturely substance, by which the former would be regarded as indivisible and the latter as divisible. On the other hand, the word "essence" is free from the suggestion of solid matter, and it is also a more correct equivalent of the *ousia* in Homoousion. For the word "substance" was used by the Schoolmen as a rendering of quite a different word (ὑποκείμενον). What did the Nicene Fathers mean by Homoousion? They certainly did not mean anything material. For in the previous Council of Antioch the word was purposely avoided because it was thought to give a material conception to God. But at Nicæa it was used because it excluded the idea of more than one Divine *ousia* or substance, and because it signified that the Son was co-essential with the Father as touching His Godhead. The Greek expresses that idea; it is questionable if the English conveys it.

The intrusion of one foreign word into the Creed, the Latin *filioque* ("and the Son"), caused a breach between the Eastern and Western Churches. This clause was inserted in the Council of Toledo on account of the turn the Arian heresy had taken there, and without the authority of a General Council. As we

are now contemplating the reunion of Christendom, it might be well to inquire if any mutual arrangement could be arrived at concerning this word, which the Greek Church regards as endangering the Monarchia of the Father, but which the Churches of the West would retain as expressing the Double Procession of the Spirit. I believe a *via media* can be found in the passage of John of Damascus, a Greek theologian of the eighth century, who wrote: "The Holy Spirit . . . proceeding from the Father through the Son" ("De Fide Orthodoxâ," c. xii.), and, "The Holy Spirit is God connected with the Father through the Son" (c. xiii.). Is not the first of these expressions equally true to the words of Christ, "Whom the Father will send in My Name," and less ambiguous than, "Proceeding from the Father and the Son"? for it asserts both the Monarchia of the Father and the Double Procession of the Spirit in a more compact form. While pointing out the fact that the expressions "Of the same substance" and "from the Son" are sufficiently ambiguous to warrant a reconsideration of them, we would again emphasize the fact that the ambiguity is not in the original Creed of Nicæa or in the later additions of Constantinople, but in an English word which has quite other associations, and a Latin word inserted without conciliar authority.

II. We now come to the second requisite of a creed—that it should be a short and sufficient statement of the facts of Revelation. While it cannot contain a philosophy of religion, it must be a complete summary, sufficient to guard the truths it embodies from future misconceptions or misinterpretations. The Nicene Creed safeguards the Church from any approach to error on the subject of the Personality and Nature of the Christ. It asserts His pre-existent glory and existence as God *of* God, Light *of* Light; and it maintains the reality of the humanity of Him "who became flesh" and "was made man." Any dangerous heresy that has arisen or is likely to arise, will be found to assail either of these two facts, which the Creed states without reserve. The Incarnation was not "the descent of a God-man into flesh," was not the descent of the æon Christ upon the man Jesus, as

some of the Gnostic schools taught, and was not simply a Divine interposition at the birth of Jesus which profoundly influenced and completely sanctified His appearance, as Keim suggested in his "History of Jesus of Nazara," or an intensification of the indwelling of God which is in every man (Lodge). For how can such ideas be made compatible with the original condition of the Word, the Personal identity of Jesus and Christ, the dignity of Jesus Christ as Saviour of men, and the reality of His humanity, all of which find suitable expression in the Nicene Creed? That Creed is, therefore, to be regarded, not merely as a negative statement of the truth, but as a positive equipment for future controversy. With it in our hands we can combat every heresy. As we can find an almost exact parallel to, and anticipation of, almost every clause in the Nicene Creed in the writings of Clement of Alexandria,[1] compiled more than a century before the original Creed of Nicæa was formulated, we must regard that statement of the faith as not merely a conciliar decision carried by a small majority, but as the Spirit-taught answer of the growing Christian consciousness to the great question: "What think ye of Christ?"

III. We have now to see how far the Creed can be brought into line with modern thought. A glance at this Creed shows that it is as remarkable for what it does not say as for what it does say. Its omissions are very striking. It stands committed to no theory of creation; therefore the Creed is acceptable to all those who believe that God created the world, whether they hold that it was an instantaneous manufacture or a slow growth; whether they consider that all things were made by the very Hand of the Almighty or were made to make themselves. Its statement of the Creation, "I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible," does not conflict with any presumptions or findings of science. Science does not deny a Creator. "This question," wrote Darwin, "has been answered in the affirmative

[1] See "Clement of Alexandria," by the present writer, pp. 266-268 (S.P.C.K.).

by some of the highest intellects that have ever existed." Science has failed to discover where the principle of life began, whence it comes, and whither it goes; but it has declared that the law of life is orderly growth in one direction. "In science there is only one direction," said a President of the British Association in his inaugural address. The Creed says the same thing in different language. It describes God the Father as a Poet (ποιητής), whose poems are the universe and all that it contains, both the seen and the unseen, material and spiritual, mind and matter. A poem is a harmonious work, obedient to one uniform method, and growing to one great purpose. Again, the Creed would seem to imply that the orderly progress in the Godhead, "God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God," finds its counterpart in the orderly progress of created life.

Again, science, tracing the organic filaments of life, maintains the unity of nature amid its diversity, and, following the development of the species and the descent of man, upholds the unity of humanity. The Creed likewise declares that God is the unifying principle of life, in creation, redemption, and spiritual life and development. "I believe in *one* God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth; and in *one* Lord Jesus Christ . . . and in *one* Holy Catholic Church, and *one* baptism for the remission of sins." In its statement of this unity of origin and spiritual life the Creed is not objectionable to modern science, which believes in *one* origin, *one* purpose, and *one* end of created life.

Again, modern thought is averse from any doctrine of the Atonement that assumes a dualism in the Godhead or presupposes a schism in the life of man. But when discarding the legal and forensic formulæ of the Roman law in which Tertullian first presented the doctrine of the Atonement, what simpler expression could it find for that grand response of the Almighty to human needs than that of the Nicene Creed, "Who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, was incarnate, and made man"? This is a bare but dignified statement

of fact. No theory as to the mode of the Atonement is presented. Therefore the Nicene Creed offers no stumbling-block to those who maintain or to those who deny expiation, substitution, or any other doctrine of the Atonement, but only to those who deny the FACT.

It puts forth no view of the Church, its ministry, or its sacraments, and therefore collides with not one of the many opinions that have been held of the Holy Communion, Holy Baptism, or the Christian priesthood, but is acceptable to all who hold that such things have a right to be.

Modern thought is suspended as to the extent and method of inspiration, but is not opposed to its source—the Spirit—and therefore can find nothing to cavil at in the bare statement of the Creed, "Who spake by the prophets," which gives no view of inspiration, while maintaining the fact of inspiration. Modern thought is baffled by the problems of evil, hell, and the devil. The silence of the Creed on these subjects is eloquent. While in two bright and glorious phrases a light is thrown on that dark and mysterious subject of Christian eschatology—viz., "Whose kingdom is without end," and, "I look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come." No pronouncement on the vexed subject of eternal punishment or eternal death makes the Creed obnoxious to those who do not believe in such.

Thus, while the Creed is singularly free from doctrines peculiar to certain portions of Christendom, it rehearses the facts that are the common property of Christendom in a symbol that has all the charm and life of a Christian hymn, all the grace and endurance of a Grecian temple. And, allowing for a certain amount of economical language which could hardly be avoided in any statement of infinite realities and relations in the language of mortals, we have every reason to be grateful to the ancient Fathers of Nicæa, who, out of a sea of clashing thoughts and shifting views, raised so noble a hymn to heaven because the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.

Nor is it merely a statement of fact; it has a message of

salvation, baptism, remission of sins, resurrection, future life, and a kingdom that has no end. Is not this practical? Does it not touch human life at all its points—its beginning, its sin, its sorrow, its death, and its eternal hope?

The Creed is not a valley of dry bones, for every "bone" is a living link in the chain of immortal Truth when the breath of the Spirit has passed over it. And while every phrase may be charged with new and glorious meaning by each advancing and progressive generation, the whole is bodied forth in a form that is fixed and lasting as the Pyramids. Is it any wonder that we say we love our Creed because it is so ancient; we love our Creed because it is so modern? To what representative body of collective Christendom would we be prepared to commit the amendment or reconstruction of that Nicene Hymn? And would the result of any Universal Council's decision in our day find equal acceptance with the scientific and the learned? These two questions we leave to the serious consideration of those who object to the Nicene Creed as out of date and devoid of life, for—

"That which never dies, for ever must be young."

A True Patriot: Lucius Carey, Viscount Falkland.

By the Rev. C. SYDNEY CARTER, M.A.

JUST over 300 years have passed since the birth of Lucius Carey, Viscount Falkland; and although we know all too little of the details of his short life, he still remains one of the most fascinating and attractive figures in English history. Probably most of us are familiar with the glowing picture of his character painted by Lord Clarendon, his great friend and admirer. In personal appearance he was apparently far from prepossessing. Short of stature, ungraceful of motion, and of a harsh and offensive voice, yet "that little person and small stature was quickly found to contain a great heart, a courage so keen, and a nature so fearless, that no composition of the strongest limbs, and most harmonious and proportioned presence and strength, ever more disposed any man to the greatest enterprise." In spite of his "untuned voice," he was "of an inimitable sweetness and delight in conversation." "His disposition and nature was so gentle and obliging, so much delighted in courtesy, kindness, and generosity, that all mankind could not but admire and love him." "A man," as Clarendon describes him in another place, "of such excellent parts, of a wit so sharp, and a nature so sincere, that nothing could be more lovely."[1] "He was guilty," he declares, "of no other ambition than of knowledge, and to be reputed a lover of all good men."

Born about the year 1610, he spent part of his youth in Ireland, where his father was Lord Deputy, and before he was twenty years old he inherited a considerable fortune from his grandfather. Short as is the period covered by his life (1610-1643), it nevertheless introduces us to one of the most stirring epochs in English history, and it is therefore impossible to form a correct estimate of Falkland's character and position unless we understand something of the circumstances of the

[1] "History of Rebellion," i. 268 (1704).

time in which he lived. The struggle between the Calvinists and Arminians was at its height. The Synod of Dort in 1618 had indeed strongly condemned the new Arminian "heresy," but the strife was carried on in almost every parish pulpit in England with ever-increasing bitterness, until at length, in 1622, a royal proclamation silenced the combatants. Open argument was, however, succeeded by persecution, and proscription, as the Arminian party, secure in the royal favour and urged on by the injudicious zeal of Archbishop Laud, the Court favourite, condemned their opponents as pragmatical or nonconforming Puritans, aiming at the overthrow of the Church system. Every pretext was employed to expel the Calvinistic clergy from their livings. Their lecturers were suppressed and their clergy fined or suspended for refusing to publish the Royal Book of (Sunday) Sports in their churches. The Archbishop divided the Calvinists from the "orthodox" under the opprobrious name of "Puritans," to prevent them obtaining any share of Church patronage. Innovations, ceremonies and ritual were introduced by the triumphant Arminians, which seemed to the older school of clergy perilously akin to the detested practice and worship of the Roman Church, the bitter memories of which the successful persecuting policy the Jesuits were then pursuing in Europe only served to increase. Any attempt to decry or oppose these "novelties" was met by fines, imprisonments, or excommunications, by the all-powerful Court of High Commission, while those presuming to libel the actions of the Bishops were summarily dealt with by the barbarous sentences of the Star Chamber.

To this strife in the Church was added an equally bitter struggle in the State between the supporters of royal prerogative and arbitrary government, and a powerful "popular" or patriot party resolutely fighting for civil and political liberty. In Parliament those who were fighting "absolutism" in the State championed the cause of those who were suffering from "absolutism" in the Church.

It was in the midst of these momentous strifes and controversies that the young Lord Falkland received his education. It is singular that a man of such a peaceable and lovable disposition should have had a natural inclination towards a military career. As a young man, however, he went to the Low Countries seeking for active service, and it was only on account of the peace then prevailing there that he was led to turn his attention to the life of a student. So zealous was he in anything he undertook that Clarendon relates that he refused to gratify his great desire to see London until he had perfectly learned the Greek tongue, and in a very short time he was able to read accurately all the Greek historians. In his quiet country-house at Great Tew, only ten miles from one of the national centres of learning, he pursued his studies with such diligence that his reputation as a scholar of the first order was soon established. "He was of so stupendous learning in all kinds and in all languages, that a man would have thought he had been entirely conversant with books, and had never spent an hour but in reading and writing." He was on most intimate terms with all the learned men of his day, so that, as Clarendon tells us, "the most polite and accurate men" from Oxford found "such an immenseness of wit and solidity of judgment in him" that they resorted to his house as to a "college situated in a purer air," "a University in a less volume."[1] Here all the liberal and enlightened thinkers of the day foregathered for intercourse and fellowship. William Chillingworth, the apostle of the tolerant and charitable views of the later Latitudinarians, found a friend and sympathizer in the cultured young nobleman who was "a great enemy to all passion and uncharitableness." Prominent Restoration divines like Sheldon and Morley sought the advice of the conscientious layman, whose devotion to the Church did not prevent him from vigorously denouncing the serious faults of its over-zealous and high-handed ecclesiastics. He was generous even beyond his means, and Ben Jonson, the celebrated poet, was one of the recipients of his liberal patron-

[1] "History," ii. 271.

age, while many other necessitous cases were secretly indebted to his bounty.

Falkland was, however, no mere literary recluse, and was always ready to place his services at the disposal of his country, whether in the field or in the forum. He served as a volunteer with the Earl of Essex in the war against the Scots in 1639, and sat as Member for Newport in the Short Parliament of 1640. He was returned again to the Long Parliament, and soon became the leader of a party of moderate patriots, whose ultimate adhesion to the King's cause, in all probability, alone made the later contest between the Crown and Parliament possible.

As religious questions from the first played the most prominent part in the history of this eventful Parliament, we are able to form, from the debates which took place on these subjects, a clear estimate of Falkland's attitude as a Churchman. The tyrannical ecclesiastical régime, carried out during the last eleven years by Laud and the Arminian Bishops, had created great discontent in the country, and excited the strong animosity of the members of the Long Parliament. It was certainly not likely to meet with the approval of such a strenuous champion of religious and political liberty as Falkland. There was therefore practical unanimity in Parliament on the necessity of reducing the absolute power and jurisdiction of the Bishops, but there was also a section of extremists anxious to overthrow the Episcopal government of the Church altogether. Such a revolutionary policy in no way commended itself to one whose whole nature always inclined to peaceful compromises, and was greatly averse to violent and radical changes in old-established institutions. The fact that Episcopacy was the ancient form of Church polity in England was sufficient for Falkland to wish for its preservation, unless it could be proved absolutely harmful to the cause of religion. "He had in his own judgment," says Clarendon, "such a latitude in opinion, that he did not believe any part of the order or government of it to be so essentially necessary to religion, but that it might be parted with and

altered for a notable public benefit and convenience." But "he was never in the least degree swayed or moved by the objections that were made against that government (Episcopacy) in the Church, holding them most ridiculous."[1]

The Parliament met in November, and voices were soon raised for reformation in the Church. In February a petition from the citizens of London was presented, praying for the "utter extirpation of Episcopacy," and it is from the report of the debates occurring on this "Root and Branch" petition that we get a clear view of Falkland's attitude. The tempers of all men were inflamed by the recent policy of the Bishops, and the speech of Falkland, in its calm impartial review of ecclesiastical affairs, probably gives us the best view of the average Churchman's opinion of the reforms that were needed. He adopted the attitude of the moderate or "central" Churchman of his day. Falkland was certainly neither a Puritan nor an Arminian, and not even a Calvinist in any party sense of the term. As we read his speech we feel that he well represents the ecclesiastical position of the Reformers, of Cranmer, Latimer, and Jewel, and all the great Elizabethan divines. He was a resolute and intelligent opponent of Popery, for he had carefully studied the whole controversy from the writings of the Fathers. Personal considerations had also increased this hostility. His mother was a zealous Romanist, and every effort had been made to shake his faith in the Anglican Church. His two young brothers, to his great indignation, had by "sinister arts" been corrupted by Romish teaching, "stolen from his house and transported beyond seas," and his two sisters had also been perverted. On the other hand, he had no sympathy with those "glorious and unquiet spirits" whose narrow and overscrupulous consciences turned them into factious Puritans refusing to conform to the simple discipline of the Reformed Church. The principal cause of the oppressions and distractions of the kingdom was, Falkland told the Commons, "that some Bishops and their adherents under pretence of uniformity have brought in super-

[1] "History," ii. 275.

stition and scandal under title of decency, have defiled our churches by adorning them, and slackened the strictness of that union that was between us and those of our religion beyond sea, an action both unpolitic and ungodly." He complained that Laud and his party had been more eager to condemn men who went to a neighbouring parish to hear a sermon than to suppress "obstinate and perpetual (Popish) recusants." Conformity to ceremonies was rigorously enforced, while notorious evil-livers had gone unpunished. He accused them of suppressing all Gospel preaching, and encouraging political sermons in favour of absolute government or the "*jus divinum* of Bishops and tithes and the sacredness of the clergy." "Their work had been," he declared, "to try how much of the Papist could be brought in without Popery." They were betrayers of our rights and liberties, and had been the principal cause of the recent Scotch Rebellion. Yet, in spite of this strong denunciation, Falkland did not allow his just indignation to obscure his calm and impartial judgment. "This charge of guilt," he carefully pointed out, "does not lie against Episcopacy, but against the persons who have abused that sacred function." The early propagators of Christianity had been Bishops, as well as our Reformers; Bishops therefore have been, and may be, good men, and let us then, he concludes, "but give good men good rules, and we shall have good government and good times." "If it is found that they oppress their weaker brethren with unnecessary ceremonies, let none which any number count unlawful be imposed, but let us not abolish after a few days' debate an order that has lasted in most churches these 1,600 years." "I do not," he declares, "believe the order of Bishops to be *jure divino*, nor do I think them unlawful; but since all great changes in government are dangerous, I am for trying if we cannot take away the inconveniences of Bishops and the inconveniences of no Bishops."[1]

There is little doubt that this wise and moderate counsel expressed the general sentiment at the time; and if only the proposals, which Falkland cordially approved, for moderate

[1] Neal, "History of Puritans," ii. 365-367 (1822).

reform and reduction of Episcopal authority, put forward at this time by Archbishop Williams and Archbishop Usher, had been adopted, the civil strife and religious confusion which so soon followed might have been altogether avoided. Archbishop Williams had proposed that the diocesan Bishops' supreme authority in jurisdiction and ordination should be shared between twelve assistants besides the Dean and Chapter; while Archbishop Usher advocated the appointment of Suffragan Bishops for each rural deanery, who should be advised by monthly synods of their clergy. Diocesan synods of Suffragan Bishops and a select number of clergy should assemble twice a year, while a provincial synod consisting of all Diocesan and Suffragan Bishops and elected representatives of diocesan clergy should be called together every three years. The opportunity for such compromises was, however, thrown away, for, as Fuller quaintly observes: "Some hot spirits would not have one ace of Episcopal power or profit abated, and, though since confuted by their own hunger, preferred no bread to half a loaf."[1]

Falkland was wise enough to perceive that some reforms and concessions were absolutely necessary if the Church itself were to be saved from the destruction threatened by the more rabid spirits. Realizing this, some two months later he gave his vote in favour of removing the Bishops from the House of Lords, not only because he thought that, removed from all secular and State duties, they would more zealously carry out their spiritual functions, but because he believed, and was also strongly persuaded by others, that this step was necessary for the preservation of Episcopacy itself. "Many men," says Clarendon, "of excellent judgments and unquestionable affections" believed truly at that time "that the passing of this Act was the only expedient to preserve the Church."[2] Six months later, however, when Falkland discovered that this concession was merely regarded by the extreme Puritan faction as the first step towards the complete overthrow of the Church, he voted against the same proposal, although Clarendon implies that he

[1] "Church History," iii. 417 (1837.) [2] "History," i. 185.

would have done so before if he had then fully understood the ancient indubitable title which the Bishops possessed to their places in the Upper House.

It was the rejection of the tolerant and enlightened policy of men like Falkland at this critical juncture which brought such disaster and suffering on the country during the next twenty years, and we cannot doubt that had his spirit of moderation and compromise been displayed at the Restoration, a far different, or at least more national, religious settlement might have been obtained. Falkland's position as a patriotic statesman, with his liberal principles and his love of compromise, was pathetically tragic, at a time when few men on either side shared his opinions or comprehended his attitude. He was fighting for the constitutional and religious freedom of his country against royal and ecclesiastical tyranny. He loved both the Crown and the Church as ancient and venerable institutions, but he had no sympathy with the *jus divinum* of Bishops or with the divine hereditary rights of Kings. He greatly reverenced Parliamentary government, "believing Parliaments most solicitous for justice," and did not consider the country could be prosperous or happy under the personal rule of an irresponsible monarch; and yet he was fated in the end to throw in his lot with the Court party, whose policy he disapproved and distrusted, and to abandon the popular cause which lay nearest his heart. The march of events proved too strong for him, and he had to choose, as Bolingbroke expressed it, either to have "the Constitution destroyed under the pretence of prerogative or under the pretence of liberty." He preferred to fall "under absolute monarchy" rather than face the dangers of "absolute anarchy." He could not fight, as Matthew Arnold said, "for a sound cause," but only for what he considered "the least bad of two unsound causes." There was no possibility of compromise, and it was largely due to the attitude which the Commons finally adopted on Church questions that led Falkland to throw in his lot with the Crown. Clarendon tells us that at the commencement of the Parliament "the major part of the members consisted of men who had no mind to break

the peace of the kingdom, or to make any considerable alteration in the government of Church or State;[1] but only a year later a clause in the Grand Remonstrance seemed to show that Parliament was determined to substitute Presbyterianism for the Episcopal government of the Church. This led to the alienation of Falkland and the moderate party. The King was only too pleased to obtain the services of a man of such known integrity, the sincerity and honesty of whose convictions were universally acknowledged. Falkland was therefore reluctantly persuaded to become the King's Principal Secretary of State, and carried out his duties with that scrupulous regard for truth and honour so characteristic of him. He could never be induced, says Clarendon, in the conduct of the Civil War, to give any countenance to the employment of spies who by false representations contrived to learn important secrets, and he considered "no qualification by office" could justify him in so far violating the law of nature as to open private letters on suspicion of their dangerous contents.[2]

Falkland believed, like many others at that time, that one engagement would end the dispute, and the failure of this expectation was a terrible blow to him. "From the entrance into this unnatural war his natural cheerfulness and vivacity grew clouded, and a kind of sadness and dejection of spirit stole upon him, which he had never been used to."[3] He became absent and morose, careless in his appearance and habits, and his health soon began to be affected. It is pathetic to think of the sufferings which this peaceable and high-souled nature endured from the continuance of this fratricidal struggle. Great was his joy at any proposals for peace, and great his dejecton at their failure. "Sitting among his friends often, after a deep silence and frequent sighs, he would with a shrill and sad accent ingeminate the word Peace, Peace, and would passionately profess that the very agony of the war, and the view of the calamities and desolation the kingdom did and must endure, took his sleep from him and would shortly break his heart."

[1] "History," i. 147. [2] *Ibid.*, ii. 274. [3] *Ibid.*, ii. 275.

He was, however, not destined to endure this mental agony for long, as the Battle of Newbury in September, 1643, put an end to his short but sad career. He had a presentiment of his fate on the morning of the battle, as he put on a clean shirt, remarking that "he would not be found in foul linen among the slain." Vainly his friends sought to dissuade him from joining in the fight. "I am weary," he replied, "of the times, and foresee much misery to my country, and believe I shall be out of it before night." He placed himself in the front rank, and was killed at the very commencement of the day's engagement. "Thus fell," observes Clarendon, "that incomparable young man, in the four-and-thirtieth year of his age, having so much dispatched the true business of life, that the eldest rarely attain to that immense knowledge, and the youngest enter not into the world with more innocency. Whosoever leads such a life needs be the less anxious upon how short warning it is taken from him. If there were no other brand upon this odious and accursed Civil War than that single loss, it must be most infamous and execrable to all posterity."[1]

Only two months before, his friend Richard Hampden, a patriot whose championship of the cause of liberty was equally as sincere as his own, had been killed at Chalgrove Field, fighting on the side of the Parliament, and died, like him, deploring the unhappy condition of his country. Falkland's hopes and aspirations had been shattered because he, and the few liberal and tolerant thinkers who shared his principles, were far ahead of the spirit of their age. They were the advance-guard of a future generation. They "laboured, and others entered into their labours." It was the stern age of repression and the sword rather than Falkland's more excellent way of toleration and compromise. Another fifty years of suffering, of persecution and animosity, of narrow prejudice and suspicion, had to be endured before the enlightened ideals of Falkland and the Cambridge Platonists found expression in the Bill of Rights, the Toleration Act, and in the teachings of men like Burnet and Tillotson.

[1] "History," ii. 270-277.

An Unwritten Chapter by Anthony Trollope.

By T. H. S. ESCOTT, Esq.

IN 1857, the publication of "Barchester Towers" made the most important of additions to Anthony Trollope's literary fame, only established two years earlier by "The Warden." During the earlier sixties, Bishop Proudie, his wife, and Mr. Slope (his chaplain), became real personages to scores of English households. "Barchester Towers" appeared two years before the episcopal assistants, known as Suffragans, and the Act of Henry VIII. creating them, were revived from the seventeenth century; but the subject had already begun to attract attention, and was one of the few ecclesi astical topics that really interested the novelist. Among those disposed to complain of a tendency to caricature in the Barchester portrait-gallery was the learned and amiable publisher William Longman, who had given Trollope his first real chance with the public by bringing out "The Warden" in 1855. "A dozen years hence," rejoined the author, "you will admit what you to-day call the exaggeration, to have been a pretty close forecast of the facts. As for Mrs. Proudie being burlesque, detach her from cathedral surroundings, and you will find her the not overdrawn personification of feminine attributes, equally familiar to lay and to ecclesiastical households. I have never been inside the palace of a prelate, and can only guess how his lady looks and feels when she finds her husband my lorded by everybody, and herself on much the same footing as the governess, who comes in with the children after dinner. In secular circles the wife is far more often jealous of the husband's notoriety than the husband of the wife's attractions. That jealousy is incarnated in my bishopess."

In one of Chaucer's prose tales you find the question asked, "What is the strongest and most universally ruling passion of the petticoated race?" The love of power is the answer adjudged correct by the poet, whose knowledge of human nature shows itself in every line of "The Canterbury Tales."

The Bishop of Barchester's wife, therefore, only shows herself very woman of very woman, as in resenting the marital precedence as a wrong to herself. For her it is to prove that if her husband glories in the gaiters, it is she who wears the breeches. A conspiracy of two against the world, or a duel of one against one, is the alternative description of the married state given by a cynical Frenchman. "Mrs. Proudie," said Trollope, "exemplifies the second view. Wedlock, as a life partnership, is the conventional theory cordially despised by the intrepid lady, who would substitute for it wedlock as a tyranny for the stronger party over the weaker. And," warming to his theme, Trollope continued, "as the Duc de Sully puts it, James II. of England would never have gone so hopelessly to grief, but for the inveterate habit of doing the second thing before the first. That is a weakness which all women share with most clergymen. This feminine peculiarity gives a new sting to domestic life by keeping entire households, not less than individual husbands, on the tenterhooks of an exhausting anticipation. To mistake worry for work, fuss for energy, and incorrigible meddlesomeness for reforming zeal, gratifies Mrs. Proudie's lust of domination in exactly the same degree as it does that of her lay sisters. Lord Beaconsfield," he went on, "in his last novel, 'Endymion,' represented himself, not by the hero, but by his sister, Myra Ferrars. Very good. Without pretending to be an episcopal prophet, I have a presentiment that the essential type of the Bishop's curate, who will soon begin to increase and multiply, may be found in Mrs. Proudie rather than in her husband."

Before, however, proceeding to the historical points of the unwritten Trollopian chapter, something must be said about the prose realities that provided material for the novelist's imagination. A primitive institution, Suffragans were known in early times as *chorepiscopi*, or Country Bishops, to distinguish them from the City Bishops in chief. During the Norman Period, the political prelates, who conducted the secular affairs of the realm, were, necessarily so often in the capital or on foreign

embassies as to be strangers in the dioceses whose name they bore. During their absence substitutes appointed for that purpose performed the spiritual work of the sees.

From the fourteenth to the middle of the sixteenth century may be traced, in most ecclesiastical districts, a tolerably regular succession of Suffragans. A clause in the statutes for shaking off the Papal supremacy (24 Henry VIII.), added to their number on the express plea of the nation's spiritual needs. This provision ran as follows: for the more speedy administration of the Sacraments, as for other good, devout things, and laudable ceremonies. Suffragan sees were to have their centres at Thetford, Ipswich, Colchester, Dover, and Guildford. The Bishop's curates thus created gradually began to dwindle in number till, under the first Queen Mary, they disappeared. They were reintroduced by Elizabeth in 1558, but only with short-lived results. The twenty-four years of James I. only yielded one Suffragan, Sterne of Colchester. At the Restoration, Charles II.'s manifesto on ecclesiastical affairs shows the Court to have meditated new Suffragan appointments. Nothing, however, was actually done. The Stuart Suffragans are necessarily rather shadowy persons. It is not till the nineteenth-century revival of the Order that the pro-Episcopal names become historical personages.

The modern list opens with a man whose promotion was at least an attempt at the infusion of new blood into the Diocesan system. St. Paul, that he might not be chargeable to any, laboured with his own hands, entering into an industrial partnership with his fellow-tentmakers, Aquila and Priscilla. The precedent thus set has been followed more extensively than most people may know by those who have worn the mitre, not only in the Colonies, but in the Old Country. It seemed in accordance with the fitness of things that, at a clerical meeting held some years since, the Bishop of New Caledonia should speak of being his own, and a first-rate, cook; that the Bishop of Delaware should support himself on his diocesan tours by mending the clocks and umbrellas in return for a night's lodging;

that the Australian prelate of Grafton and Armidale should delight in grooming his own horses; and that the Bishop of Selkirk should exercise his skill in dentistry for the relief among his flock of sufferers from their teeth. It will, however, be generally heard now for the first time that the greatest of recent historians who has worn the lawn sleeves, Dr. Stubbs, knew practically only less of cabinet-making than of charters, actually patenting a special discovery in armchairs. So, too, Dr. Diggle of Carlisle has knitted pairs of socks and stockings by the hundred, and can make a shirt whose front does not bulge out.

These accomplishments were not, indeed, rivalled by the earliest of the nineteenth-century Suffragans; but Henry Mackenzie, who during the seventies acted as his lordship of Lincoln's sub. in the Nottingham district, had learned at Merchant Taylors' to put his hand to anything, and, to the great advantage of his household, retained so faithfully the accomplishments acquired by public school fagging, that he always counted for one specially skilled maid-of-all-work. From Merchant Taylors' he went to Pembroke, under Jeune. Then, after an apprenticeship to a commercial desk, he took Orders, and held two curacies, one in the City and the other in the East End, before being appointed to an English chaplainship at Rotterdam. That position was held for a little more than a year; then, on his return to England, 1836, there began a course of preferment, including the Bank Cross mastership, Mile End, and a canonry with the subdeanery at Lincoln. Amongst the benefices filled by Mackenzie at different times was that of Tydd St. Mary, Lincoln. His promotion thence connects itself with historic incidents in the Anglican history of the Victorian age. Tait's elevation to the Primacy, 1868, left London vacant. Bishop Jackson was translated thither from Lincoln, where his place was filled by Christopher Wordsworth, of Latin Grammar fame. Within the Lincoln See lay the district of the dukeries. The help that proved necessary to Wordsworth was forthcoming from the Lincoln parish clergyman who thus became the Nottingham Suffragan.

The most noticeable, if not the only, appointment made during this period was that of Edward Parry (1830-1890) at Dover, eldest son of Sir William Parry, the Arctic explorer, and himself one among the most interesting, as well as self-regardless, public servants in the Church and State of his time. He was also the earliest Englishman having Colonial association to bear an Episcopal title in this country, for his senior as regards years, Alfred Barry, the architect Sir Charles Barry's second son, successively head of Cheltenham College and of King's College, London, eventually Bishop of Sydney, was born in 1826. After his return to England Parry obtained, indeed, clerical preferment, but never filled any place in the English Episcopate; while the present Bath and Wells prelate, Dr. Kennion, an ex-Adelaide Diocesan, did not receive his Somerset mitre till 1894. Born seven years before the Victorian era, Edward Parry was prevented from standing for a Balliol scholarship by ill-health. As it was, having been head of the school at Rugby under Tait, whose examining chaplain in London he subsequently became, Parry stood high among Balliol commoners in the good books of Jenkyns. Before taking his degree he had won a classical first in the pre-Moderations period. A tutor at Durham University, he proved his pastoral earnestness by passing a long vacation amongst the Norham pitmen, whose social and spiritual benefactor he always remained. When, in 1870, he exchanged the Canterbury archdeaconship for the place of Dover Suffragan, he succeeded to an office unfilled since 1597.

Anthony Trollope, apropos of Edward Parry's career, confessed, it is interesting to recall, that he must change his anticipations about "Bishop's curates" should many more of Parry's calibre appear. They did not. Quantity, however, there was, if not quality. Between 1869 and 1889, the nine Suffragans called into existence contained none on whom Parry's mantle had fallen. And so it continued. In 1892 the Suffragans numbered sixteen; in 1898 they rose to twenty-three; at the present moment they amount to thirty, one of the latest appointments being Bishop Ridgeway's assistant in the Chichester See, Dr. Burrows, son of one of Goulburn's assistant masters at Rugby,

and nephew to Captain Hedley Vicars, whose biography by Miss Marsh long took rank as an evangelical classic.

The dignitaries now dealt with are the nominees, not of Court patronage, but of Episcopal selection. The overworked Diocesan submits two alternative assistants to the Crown, picked out because of their fitness to advance his particular views in local developments of discipline and ceremonial. The selected candidate receives consecration from the Primate and two Bishops. The Suffragan figures already given will probably soon receive considerable additions; thus, while these lines are being written, the Oxford See contemplates two, or even three (though, of course, these projects may be defeated by the sub-division of the Oxford Diocese into three smaller sees, just as Dr. Gore contrived to carve Birmingham out of the Worcester —a precedent whose adoption is now agitated both in Yorkshire and in the Home Counties) Suffragans, one, that is, for each county—Oxfordshire, Berks, and Bucks—which the diocese includes. Socially, predicted Trollope, the "Bishop's curate" will prove more of a stickler than the Bishop himself for the titular honours of his office, because, being only a reflection of the Episcopal authority, he can never be quite easy about his position. And yet, even more than his official employer, he will personify the ecclesiastical temper and needs of his time. First, his very existence is due to fussy churchmanship's periodical demand for smaller dioceses; secondly, he would not have been heard of but for the lasting impetus given to Church organization by the Oxford Movement of the thirties. Pledged, therefore, by his nineteenth-century origins, to instigate or support the clerical law breakers against the Privy Council, the Vice-Diocesan shows his breadth of mind by an appreciative tolerance of the excesses of the six-point men, and by an almost Mephistophelian adroitness in manipulating, when it seems more politic than snubbing, any stray evangelicals. Dr. Johnson, one knows, so redacted the Parliamentary speeches in the pre-verbatim report period, that the Whig dogs should have the worst of it. Thus, as the author of "Barchester Towers" foresaw, the Suffragan inevitably becomes *episcopalior episcopo ipso.* Never, for instance, did the palace of

the Snobbleton prelates harbour so astutely intriguing a promoter of decorative sacerdotalism as the present Bishop's deputy, his brevet lordship, who derives his Suffragan style from the local metropolis of Mozambique. During much of the Victorian age, this place was a modish Low church centre. Then came to one of its chief churches an earnest and accomplished literary incumbent, whose discourses exhaled poetic taste, together with a spirit of Christian charity and toleration. "Preaches agnosticism to young ladies and servant girls, does he?" murmured the Bishop of Snobbleton, "well, we shall see." His lordship did see, and led the peccant homilist such a life of it that, having a weak heart, weak lungs, morbidly brooding temperament, the eloquent offender delivered his last discourse on the poetry of the Scriptures. Before another year was over, he had been worried into his grave. Slowly the day of religious man-millinery dawned. The Court, from being partly Puritan and partly latitudinarian, became ritualistic. The heir-apparent, with the assistance of some maids of honour, designed sacrificial robes, of striking cut and colour, to be worn at the services which royalty frequented. Mozambique, or rather the fine flower of fashion which gave laws to the district, recalling a traditional connection with the palace, set to work on smartening up its places of worship, turned its back on those who wore the Genevan gown, waxed zealous for the ornaments rubric, and the ecclesiastical vocabulary, as amended by A. Welby Pugin, came once more into vogue. The Mozambique young ladies prattled pleasantly about matins and compline. What with early service, nocturns and watch nights, they appeared but little in the home circle, and had no time for subscription balls. The wealth of Mozambique went, of course, with the fashion, and the local landlords worked like one man at embellishing their town with fresh spiritual attractions, just as they had previously opened their purses for crowning its mineral spa with a spick and span new kursaal. Old fashioned churches were first deserted, then pulled down; Benjamin Disraeli's "Mass in masquerade" drew increasing crowds of all classes to temples gleaming with marble gilt, with rainbow tints, peopled by unfamiliar saints in statuary,

in an atmosphere heavy with the censer's ascending fumes. Beneath some consecrated roofs the new régime, however, established itself so slowly that the Snobbleton Diocesan sent his right hand man, the Rev. Cyprian Molineux, with instructions to quicken the pace. "You may find," were his lordship's parting words, "the old fashion Evangelical rump a little obstinate." "I think," was the modest rejoinder, "the pauper and peasant incumbent, the only Evangelical champion known at Mozambique, and his wife, will be too gratified by any personal attentions of Mrs. Molineux and myself not to give up anything that may seriously stand in our way. Snobbery is the besom with which to brush Puritanism away. Give me two years, and every Protestant curate shall be a sucking Jesuit."

No anticipation could have been more correct. The religious soil was soon weeded of such offensive clerical growth as remained. Not a "sim" or a Recordite but that within two years had recanted his errors and had been flattered or fooled into parting with his independence, to wear the Mozambique Suffragan's livery. Yet even this success was not without its shadow. The shopkeepers, and working classes generally, at Mozambique, unlike other places, had formerly been churchgoers. One after another they now gave up their Anglican sittings, and dribbled off, not in isolated cases only, but in groups, to the chapel. On the other hand the Mozambique *élite* thronged Suffragan Molineux' Sunday music halls, and socially cold-shouldered all the Evangelical dissidents. The triumph of the Bishop's curate was therefore unimpaired.

"If," to the present writer once said Bishop Proudie's creator, "I were to do another 'Barchester Towers,' I might have something to say concerning the irresistible attraction of sacerdotalism to a clergy which, recruited largely from the lower-middle class, has none of the position given by birth, learning, or wealth, and sees in the doctrines and displays which are the relics of Rome, the one way of effectually magnifying its apostleship and gaining the same sort of ascendancy that in the British Isles has so long only been enjoyed by the Irish priest."

The Making of Modern Wales.

By the Rev. J. VYRNWY MORGAN, D.D.

NO nation presents a permanent picture; this is eminently true of Wales. Old Wales has practically disappeared. Traces of ancient local usages, customs, and traditions are becoming fainter as the years pass; most of them have perished unrecorded. Since the country—thanks to the Act of Union—has become a cosmos in itself, the people have been brought into correspondence with new environmental conditions. The change has produced a new type of civilization and a new type of Welshman. Not that there is, or likely to be, a total reversion in mind and in temperament; for the Welshman, under certain circumstances, will always reveal, more or less, the impetuosity and lack of the sense of responsibility so characteristic of his nature, and he may, when really tested, exhibit his traditional dislike of constituted authority. But the troublesome special tendencies and angularities of the typical Welshman are being toned down and modified. If I were asked to explain the traditional backwardness of the people in material civilization, I would attribute it to the lack of educational facilities; the want of contact with other nations, with whom they might have shared the qualities they have not; the exaggeration of their religious consciousness; the undue dominance of the emotive element; the self-centred disposition of the people, and their language, which has withheld them from contributing to, and benefiting by, British life and thought.

It is sometimes assumed—erroneously assumed—that the fundamental character of a people is of itself a sufficient guarantee of their ultimate development. Environment is of equal, often of greater, importance. For centuries Wales was but another name for obscurity; nowhere on the map of Europe could there be found a duskier community. It was like a candle, consuming its own wick, a light only to itself, and poor light at

that. The dreary period coincided with the period of its sullen exclusiveness and morbid introspectiveness, when it fed itself on its own local prejudices, and lived on the limited reserve of its own blood and intellect. How could a people existing under such conditions produce anything of real merit? Ignorant, morose, and unpractical. What they needed was an environment that would divert the current of their life, change their outlook, and modify their ancient characteristics. Something, though very little, was done in that direction through the liberalizing influences of a few of the more advanced Welshmen who had travelled abroad. The renaissance of the Tudor period marked a new epoch. So did the religious awakening of the eighteenth century. The rise of industrial Wales, the introduction of modern English journalism, the influence of the new learning and of British life and thought, touched the whole strata of Welsh society. Among none of the smaller nationalities has there been such a transformation in the life of the people, and in their social and political prospects, in so short a time. Many of the better qualities of the people are coming to the front, and their power illumines more and more as it is manifested in the corporate life of the community, and in the career of those Welshmen who are distinguishing themselves in the various branches of industry and learning. Indeed, Wales just now is receiving a measure of attention which is out of all proportion to what its size, its population, its contribution to general culture, or the capacity of the people for political administration would warrant.

In analyzing the forces that have operated in the making of this modern life of Wales, through the education of the moral and mental capabilities of the people, there are two factors that must be taken into account—viz., Anglicanism and Nonconformity. Their mutual activities embrace all that is best and highest in the ethical, religious, and educational development of the nation. True, it has become the fashion in some quarters to deny to Welsh Anglicanism any real share or lot in the work of social and spiritual regeneration. Heroic attempts are being

made through the Radical Press, on Radical platforms, and even in the House of Commons, to associate this Welsh awakening, and even the preservation of the language, and of the traditions of the race, almost entirely with the rise and influence of Nonconformity. The matter has assumed considerable political significance. It is one of the stock arguments advanced in favour of Welsh Disestablishment and Disendowment. Mr. Lloyd George has gone farther than that; he told a convention of Nonconformists that "if we have any freedom in this land to enter any place of worship, it is because its doorstep and lintel are sprinkled with the blood of Nonconformists." The statement was vociferously applauded by ministers and laymen, whose political passion was as violent, and their reading of history as perverted, as his own. That branch of Protestantism —to exclude altogether the Church of England—from which Nonconformity descends, was Puritanism. What Puritanism, in its most militant form, did, is known to all who are conversant with general history. The story is told in the penal laws imposed by Cromwell's Puritans, in the commission issued by the Long Parliament to deal with witches in Suffolk, and which hanged no less than sixty persons. Baxter quoted it with approval. In Sweden all who dissented from the Articles of the Augsburg Confession were at once banished. In Protestant Switzerland many Anabaptists perished by drowning. It may be that Mr. Lloyd George never read the story of Servetus, or the books written by Luther, Calvin, Beza, and Melanchthon on the lawfulness of persecutions. Does this champion of liberty, and the proclaimer of Nonconformity as the sole purveyor of toleration, know, or has he conveniently forgotten, the distress and the wanton cruelty which prevailed even in Wales, the land which he says he so dearly loves, under the Commonwealth? Every clergyman known to be a loyalist came under the ban of the Parliamentary men. The use of the Book of Common Prayer was regarded as an indictable offence. Churches were turned into stables for the convenience of soldiers; they drank the whole of the communion wine one Easter Day in

Llandaff Cathedral, the contents of the library were burnt publicly in Cardiff, and the wives of the ejected clergy were invited to witness the deed.

This habit of reviling the Welsh clergy, and the Welsh Church, has become offensive to cultivated men. That the Church in Wales has not always been equal to its opportunity is a mere truism. One could pull down the Monarchy for similar reasons. The Church is not the only institution or organization against which the historical argument could be used with deadly effect. The one supreme fact in the history of present-day Wales is that the Church of England in Wales has within it all the elements that are essential for a great moral and intellectual expansion. Sixty years ago the Church was not in a well-organized condition, at present it is the only progressive religious force in Wales; foremost amongst the various religious bodies in numbers, foremost in all humanitarian work, and foremost in the creation of a spiritual atmosphere in every department of Welsh activity. To write the history of Welsh elementary education, without taking into account the heavy part played by the clergy and the Church, would be like writing "Hamlet" with the Prince of Denmark left out. Long before the State, in 1870, began to interest itself in the matter of Welsh education, the Church had planted her National Schools, where all children, without distinction of creed or class, could be trained and educated. Griffith Jones (1683-1761), around whose honoured name the history of Welsh elementary education so thickly clusters, and who was the one landmark in the Principality during the Georgian period, was a clergyman, and the Rector of Llanddowror. The landmarks of the Victorian era were Bishop Short and Dean Cotton; the former in the Diocese of St. Asaph, and the latter in the Diocese of Bangor. Dean Cotton established schools all over the diocese by means of private subscription, discovered and instructed teachers; he himself acted the part of teacher and inspector. He was the prime mover in the founding of the Training College at Carnarvon in 1846. Since the date of its foundation to the present

day the number of teachers trained in this college is over 1,100. Many of his pupils became distinguished clergymen. How his heart would have rejoiced had he been permitted to live to see the magnificent block of buildings standing on rocky eminence overlooking the city of Bangor, and in which he toiled for upwards of half a century in the work of elementary education!

One of Dean Cotton's most distinguished scholars—or "Old Boys," as he used to call them—was the late Rev. Owen Thomas, D.D., of Liverpool, the eminent Welsh Methodist minister. Mr. Lloyd George himself was brought up in one of these Church schools. Dr. Thomas publicly acknowledged his obligation.

By the year 1847 the Church had 279 schools in North Wales, where 18,732 children were trained; and in South Wales 312 schools, with 16,868 children. The increase was such that by 1902 they numbered 677, in which 91,603 children were being educated. Under the Act of 1902 the managers of the Church, or National, Schools were relieved from the cost of secular education, the Church lending its buildings to the education authorities for secular education, the Church being granted permission to impart religious instruction in them during school hours. No attempt was made in Wales to found any institution which could be considered of University rank until the year 1827, when St. David's College, Lampeter, associated with the Church of England, was established by Bishop Burgess.

It would be more than difficult, with the space at our disposal, to give an adequate idea of what the Church in Wales has done for Welsh education or to show the many-sided religious, ethical, and philanthropic work which has been accomplished through her agency before and after the great religious Revival. The fame of the celebrated school at Llandovery has gone far and wide, and to every student in Wales one need only mention the grammar schools, ancient and modern, erected under the patronage of the Church in Wales, and the training colleges of Carmarthen and Carnarvon, now

removed to Bangor, and later in her history the establishment of St. Michael's College, Aberdare.

The oldest and most distinguished patriotic institutions Welshmen can boast of are the Society of Ancient Britons, established in 1715; the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion, 1751; the Eisteddfod, 1819; and the Cambrian Archæological Association, 1845; and it was by the efforts of Welsh Churchmen all four were started, and at a time when the Church in Wales is said to have been at its lowest ebb.

It is one of the stock arguments of the Liberationists that the Church has done nothing to foster the Welsh language or to preserve it. On the contrary, the Church, before and after the Reformation, was *the* means of preserving the native language from extinction. Welsh lost considerable ground in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but it obtained a new lease of life through the use of the Prayer-Book, the Metrical Psalms of William Middleton and Edmund Prys. After its expulsion from the monasteries it was fostered afresh in the service of the Church, and at the beginning of the eighteenth century it was in a flourishing condition. It is true that the Church has provided English services for non-speaking Welshmen and for English residents in Wales, and especially for the thousands of workmen who came into Wales after the opening of the coal-pits in the south. This Nonconformity neglected to do, and charged the Church with being an Anglicizing institution.

The greatest lexicographer Wales ever produced was a Churchman in the person of Chancellor Silvan Evans. The Church gave Wales one of the most masculine, powerful, and luminous intellects that had for generations been known among the Bishops of England — that is, Bishop Thirlwall. Archdeacon Prys, of Merioneth, gave the Church her rhymed version of the Psalms. The renowned Vicar of Llandovery gave her his moral aphorisms and sermons in verse. Bishop Morgan gave Wales her Welsh translation of the Bible, the greatest gift, next to the gift of the Cross, ever bestowed upon the Welsh nation. It need hardly be said that it has

profoundly affected the whole course of the nation's life. It preserved the Welsh language from extinction and gave impetus to the literature of the people. It proved a restraining force upon the vicious and lawless, and acted as a bond of union between the respective communities. In brief, the translation of the Bible into Welsh paved the way for the nationalization of the nation. As it is the inherent necessity of evil to breed evil, so it is the inherent necessity of goodness to spread goodness, and the Church at this hour is producing and distributing that which is the inherent quality of her character. Her moral tone is excellent. She is daily coming into closer touch with the people, and making herself more and more a necessity to the social and spiritual well-being of the community. She is daily teaching the high principles of life and religion, and her clergy are the most excellent examples of those principles. Some of the most beautiful hymns sung to-day in the Nonconformist chapels of Wales, as well as in the Church, were composed by Churchmen like Vicar Prichard of Llanymddyri, Edmund Prys, and William Williams of Pantycelyn. It was in the Church that the great Welsh Revival began. Her fine comprehensiveness, her tolerant spirit, her wealth of learning, the activity of the Welsh clergy in all humanitarian work, and their devotion to their high calling, appeal more and more both to the native Welsh, and to those from across the border who have made their home in the Principality.

Reverence.

By the Rev. J. WARREN, B.D.

TRUE reverence is a quality which belongs to those alone who have savingly embraced the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. It is a grace which is begotten only in hearts that are renewed and reconciled to God. It is what the Prayer-Book calls "holy fear." It is the believer's awe-inspiring recognition of the ineffable almightiness and majesty of God, which might have been justly operative, in view of his sinfulness, to his destruction, and yet in Christ has proven operative to his present and eternal salvation; and, following from that, his sensitiveness at the possibility of occasioning grief and displeasure by any act or word or thought of his to such a holy, gracious, and loving Heavenly Father.

Love blends itself with this reverence, as a constant, unfailing complement. Very beautifully in several places the Prayer-Book weds them together. The two exhibit a choice equipoise. Indeed they invigorate each other. Both alike are kindled by the blissful contemplation of our God as He shows Himself in Christ to be both Just and the Justifier.

The ancient Greeks had in their vocabulary an inspiring word, for which ours presents no equivalent, descriptive of a certain rare and admirable type of character. The *semnos* man was one who, in virtue of his lofty qualities, evoked a feeling of respectful awe among those with whom he came in contact, and nevertheless, along with that, was an engaging and attractive personality, and not in the least repellent. The New Testament uses the word repeatedly in the Pastoral Epistles, where our words "grave," "gravity," furnish a poor approach to it. Now our covenant God is the ideal *semnos* Being. "There is forgiveness with Thee, that Thou mayest be feared." "After the fire a still, small voice; and it was so, when Elijah heard it, that he wrapped his face in his mantle." Hence we find so often the Scriptural "fear of the Lord" represented as keeping company

with joy and trust. Yea, mention is made in Eph. v. 21 (R.V.) of "the fear of Christ."

Bishop Butler thus enunciates the matter: "The particular feeling towards good characters—reverence and moral love for them—is natural to all those who have any degree of real goodness in themselves. This will be illustrated by the description of a perfect character in a creature, and by considering the manner in which a good man in his presence will be affected towards such a character. He will, of course, feel the affections of love, reverence, desire of his approbation, delight in the hope or consciousness of it. And surely all this is applicable, and may be brought up to that Being who is infinitely more than an adequate object of all these feelings, whom we are commanded to love with all our heart, soul, and mind."

Now this sanctified fear must needs be distinguished from a fear of a lower kind. For there is the fear which "hath torment" and which, so far from being a permanent co-efficient, has to be "cast out by perfect love" (1 John iv. 18). This is the innate terror of mind which the sense of unpardoned guilt before God awakens. It is the apprehension of His righteous retribution, which, if not happily transmuted into the higher kind, can collapse like steam under cold water, as with Pharaoh of old, whenever the hope is caught at that the divine Judge looks listlessly upon the guilt of men.

The true filial fear, to be unshakeable, must be socketed, as it were, in the evangelical knowledge and personal realization of Christ's all-sufficient and alone-sufficient righteousness, imputed and transferred to His believing people, in virtue of the mystical union between Head and members. A finished work of justification with God there must needs have been, wrought out for us, and to be applied by the Spirit to our souls, or else the reconcilement and acceptance could not be complete. It would be as when David, blinking the strict claims of justice, released his fratricide son, Absalom, from under the ban of outlawry, and still forbade him access to the royal presence.

The truly regenerate and Spirit-taught Christian, in due

accord, will be reverentially minded towards God at all times and hours. This filial attitude of soul will be as real, if not as intense and concentrated, with him in work as in worship. In striking harmony with this, it is worth noting, the Greek verb *sebomai*, from which the above word *semnos* springs, appears regularly in the continuous present form in the Acts of the Apostles, without any restriction to devotional exercises in its reference. Yet we find that among the generality at the present day reverence is an idea unthought of except in relation to worship. This is surely a very sinister circumstance. What is the explanation of so artificially circumscribed and externalistic a conception of reverence?

The cause must be sought for and will be found in the confusion of the two kinds of fear towards God. They who will not avail themselves of the true and divinely provided panacea for the lower, conscience-disturbing, unfilial fear, will adopt one or other of two courses. Multitudes choose to stifle that fear by plunging into the pursuit of "worldly lusts," and shutting out God as completely as they can from their thoughts. But another multitude essay to satisfy violated justice, and to earn for themselves a discharge, with meritorious performances of their own, and it is this class we are concerned with here. Many of them are eventually led to see the futility of their course, and to claim and lay hold on the righteousness that is by faith in Christ Jesus. But such as do not arrive at this desirable conviction, are all too frequently found predisposed to relieve the situation for themselves by minimizing the depth and inwardness of divine morality, the sternness of divine justice, the grounds for serious apprehensiveness, and, consequently, the amount of compensatory performance supposed to be requisite on their part. This last has a tendency with them, as a class, to diminish in the direction of a bare rendering of homage, in the form of external worship.

A Hebrew poetical word comes to mind here. *Kachash*, when descriptive of a cowed enemy, signifies "to come cringing" (Ps. xviii. 45, lxvi. 3, lxxxi. 15), and in its more

general use "to put on an insincere appearance." Bishop Dowden was well warranted in sounding the warning that "reverence, like many another grace of the soul, has its counterfeit—a counterfeit that assumes its name, apes its manner, and successfully passes itself off as the authentic virtue."

At the same time, it is not at all essential on our part to assume that the offerers of this transient appearance of deference at the outset fancy for one moment that they are actually hoodwinking Deity, or even their fellow-worshippers. But they see every day a hugely disproportionate emphasis being laid, in the Roman manner, by a large and increasing number of their teachers, on external aspects of worship in other directions—such as the adornment of sacred buildings or the frequency of Communion attendance. They seize upon the elementary fact also that no one, not even the saintliest, abides at the same level of concentrated fervency and solemnity outside his worshipping moments (public or private) that he attains to within them. From some such considerations it may readily appear warrantable enough to many a one, be he never so frivolous and graceless in ordinary life, to deduce the feasibility of summoning up "reverence" on and for a given occasion, sufficient to be palliative of and prophylactic against fear of Divine judgment, and even meritorious of Divine good-will, through a passing recourse simply to a certain approved set of countenance or posture of body.

Whilst with some the mere outward pose or mannerism itself, independently of thought or feeling, is believed to constitute reverence, the major part would build on the superinducing therewith of a real mental attitude. Experts in mind-science (psychology) have taught, it is claimed, that one can call up, partly at least, by adopting or simulating the outer expression of a given feeling, the actual feeling itself. How some such effect is brought about can be gathered from the treatises of Titchener, Hiram Stanley, and others. It is through association of ideas—ideas, however, based upon and taking shape from real experience. One assumes the regulation

posture, movement, or expression understood to be identified with the desired mental state. This bodily action or play of feature, having been so often on past occasions the natural, unaffected, uncontemplated resultant of a strong mental concept or conviction, jogs the recollection into motion, resurrecting in the mind an amorphous idea of one's having some cause to be cheery, say, or merry, or sorry, or angry. The idea, to be sure, on this occasion is merely imaginative, and of a vague, indefinite content; nevertheless, having had a basis of definite actuality when apprehended and entertained on previous occasions, it now, on receiving no more than a factitious harbourage, overcharges the mind as before. Thence also instantaneously the motor or efferent sensibilities (the infinitesimally fine nerves operating outward from the mind or brain towards the body's surface) are stimulated into action, and the resonance produced is consciously felt.

But the ascendancy is only momentary. The mind's own native and substantiable ideas promptly reassert again their due dominant position, and dispel the illusion. And if the mechanical process of resuscitation be persisted in, the imaginative idea will grow fainter, and also the mind's own proper ideas will more stiffly yield a place, till at length the transient illusion will cease to recur.

Hence it follows that, even if it were but a mental concept (and not something spiritual, transcending the mental plane), true reverence could not be reckoned producible by any physical stimulus. An antecedent feeling of reverence, vivid and unaffected, would have to be postulated, but even the semblance of such does not appear ever to be thought of; and a genuine feeling of this kind could not be intermittent. Love, which, as we have seen, is the unfailing complement of true reverence, cannot be switched on and off, even when it is centred on a human object only. It cannot be put to sleep for the week between Sundays. And divinely inspired love in the soul would insist on more than periodic opportunities of dwelling upon the celestial qualities and the gracious dealings

which primarily evoked it. "Happy is the man that feareth always." "I have set the Lord always before me."

Before passing away from this point, something may be said with reference to children, and how far the conspicuous emphasis laid by most teachers, designedly in the interests of reverence, upon appropriate external demeanour during united devotional exercises, is efficacious. The Sunday-school superintendent on his platform, uplifting his hand, and solemnly enjoining "Now, children, be reverent," is a familiar spectacle, and one endeared to the recollection of many. And some such words sound pretty regularly also on the ears of a Boys' Brigade or juvenile portion of a choir.

The question turns on the nature of the ideal that is before the instructor's mind. If an intermittent reverence for the occasion, such as has been analyzed, and, it is to be feared, is nowadays frequently enough entertained, be the end he aims at in itself, the efficacy of his monition may be fairly doubted. "We soak our children in habits of contempt [of matters of sacred associations], and yet are confident that we can always teach them to be reverent at the right place," is an utterance, which has some point here, of a notable character in fiction. Reverence cannot be injected like morphia. But, given a truly godly teacher, the monitory usage is, so far as it goes, most appropriate and conducive to edification at this formative period. It bespeaks deference towards the Unseen One, self-restraint, heedfulness, detachment, and concentration of thought, and the facilitation of the same things for one's neighbour, all which are calculated, positively or negatively, to prove ancillary to up-springing devoutness, if the true reverence be in the heart in never so rudimentary a measure.

The word "reverent" may not be an exactly perfect one for use in the particular connection, but a better is not ready to hand. The teacher, however, ought not to forget that there is a stolid passivity which must not be mistaken by him for the outer demeanour of true reverence; and, in view of the ceremonialistic trend of the age, he should see the necessity of

dropping, from time to time the caution that, while man may judge from outward appearance, "God looketh on the heart."

There are many things, finally, to make us pause ere we accord the palm for superiority in real reverence to the particular section in the Church which is most vocal and visibly fastidious on the subject. Within its circle there are large numbers, clerical and lay, who are all too compliant in accommodating holy things to the dubious standards of "the spirit of the age"; who lend their practical sanction to the superlatively irreverent principle of "will-worship"; who acquiesce in the most unedifying modes of money-raising for sacred purposes; who are by no means sensitive to the absoluteness of the Spirit's guiding voice, speaking from the written Word. They are prepared, by implication, to represent our Lord as choosing an unsuitable hour for the first Supper. A favourite liturgical authority of theirs, who has been suggesting "enrichments" for the Prayer-Book recently, does not contribute to the deepening of reverential awe when he recommends for (the more or less mythical) St. Faith's Day "a skilfully-framed Collect playing on the meaning of the Saint's name"! Archbishop Benson, in his "Minutes," acknowledged from observation that reverence had not kept pace with advance of ritual in the English churches.

The "fear towards Me" which is "taught ["learned by rote," R.V., marg.] by the precept of men" merely is a "vain" thing. "My son, if thou wilt receive My words and hide My commandments with thee, so that thou incline thine ear unto wisdom and apply thine heart to understanding . . . *then* shalt thou understand the fear of the Lord" (Isa. xxix. 13; Prov. ii. 1 *f.*).

The Woes of Galileo.

By MARY BRADFORD WHITING.

"In Santa Croce's holy precincts lie
Ashes which make it holier, dust which is
Even in itself an immortality,
Though there were nothing save the past and this,
The particle of those sublimities
Which have relapsed to chaos—here repose
Angelo's, Alfieri's bones, and his
The starry Galileo with his woes;
Here Macchiavelli's earth returned to whence it rose."

THERE are some among those who visit the tomb of Galileo in the Church of Santa Croce—the Westminster Abbey of Florence—who have blamed Byron for making his woes his distinguishing mark, instead of the splendid abilities and the marvellous achievements that are recorded upon it Yet to those who have made a study of his life, and who have journeyed in reverent pilgrimage from his birthplace at Pisa to his lecture-room at Padua, and from Padua to his observatory at Arcetri, it is difficult not to feel that he was one set apart by fate—

"A soul by nature pitched too high,
By suffering plunged too low,"

for the struggle between truth and error, which characterized the whole of his career, though it could not stifle the truths that he discovered, yet retarded their dissemination and rendered miserable the life of their discoverer.

The circumstances of his life are so well known that they need only be lightly touched upon here. He was born on February 18, 1564, in a small house in the city of Pisa, near the famous gardens of the Palazzo Scotto. The house still stands and is visited by tourists, but it is not specially interesting in itself, and it is in the Duomo that the spirit of Galileo still seems to hover, where the vibrations of the great bronze lamp first roused his mathematical perceptions, and where from the Leaning Tower he made some of his first experiments.

Vincenzo Galileo, his father, was descended from a noble Florentine family, but being himself very poor, he made his living by teaching music and mathematics in Pisa, and was so disgusted with his scanty returns that he determined that his son should pursue neither study, but should devote himself to the more lucrative profession of medicine. As far as his means allowed, he had the boy well educated, sending him first to the monastery school of Vallombrosa and afterwards to the University of Pisa. But Galileo took no interest in medicine; his mind dwelt continually on the subjects that had been forbidden to him, and happening one day to overhear a lesson in geometry given to the pages of the Grand Ducal Court, he entreated his father with such vehemence that he at last obtained leave to throw over his medical course and devote himself to mathematics.

The next few years were the brightest of his life, for while his father lived he was free from family cares, and now that he had attained his heart's desire he was able to immerse himself in his beloved studies. His progress was so rapid that in 1588, when he was only twenty-four, he was appointed Mathematical Instructor in the University, and students flocked from all sides to hear his lectures.

But, unfortunately for Galileo, he lived in an age of Court tyrants, and having imprudently criticized a machine invented by Giovanni dei Medici for dredging the harbour at Leghorn, he was deprived of his post. In 1591 his father died, and he became head of an extravagant and ungrateful family of brothers and sisters, whose demands upon him hampered the whole of the rest of his life. In the next year he was elected to the post of Professor of Mathematics in the University of Padua, and it was here that he reached his greatest success as far as his worldly fortunes were concerned. No visitor to Padua leaves the city without seeing the great hall in the Palazzo della Ragione, which is said to be the largest lecture-room in Europe, and is capable of seating two thousand persons. In this splendid building, with its vaulted roof and frescoed

walls, Galileo held his classes, and the story goes that it was not only crowded, but that students were turned away from its doors. It was in Padua that he made his first telescope, an instrument which was modelled on the invention of a Dutch optician, but which he so improved that he was able to apply it to the observation of the heavens, a new method which not only resulted in such discoveries as that of the satellites of Jupiter, the rings of Saturn, and the stars of the Milky Way, but which eventually revolutionized the whole of astronomical science.

That a man possessed of such a genius as this should have been subjected to opposition and bitter persecution seems to us in the present day a fact so outrageous that it fills us with amazement, no less than with indignation. But before judging Galileo's judges, we must endeavour to put ourselves into their place, and to consider the matter from their point of view. When we remember that fifty years after Galileo made his discoveries such a master mind as Milton's—a mind, moreover, which had been brought into actual contact with that of the great astronomer—still clung to the Ptolemaic system, it can hardly surprise us that the first publication of the discoveries raised a storm of fury. Here and there in "Paradise Lost" we find traces of the influence of the doctrines of Copernicus, but if we would make a map of the scenes in which the action takes place we must take the earth for the centre of the universe, and show that the souls of its occupants on their journey to heaven

> "Pass the planets seven and pass the fixt,
> And that crystalline sphere whose balance weighs
> The trepidation talk'd, and that first moved.
>
> *Book III.*

The system of Ptolemy exactly fitted in with the religious belief of the age: The earth was the most important part of the universe, and its inhabitants were the crown of creation and the unique objects of the Almighty care and protection; the sun and moon were made to give it light, the atmosphere was made to provide it with air, the seas to wash its shores.

The statements of the Scriptures were considered to bear out this belief in every particular, and it is not difficult to understand that with the words before them—"He hath made the round world so fast that it cannot be moved"—good men were filled with horror when they heard the audacious doctrine that the world was not fast at all, but that it revolved round the sun, and that, far from being the centre of the universe, it was not even so important as Jupiter, since Jupiter had four satellites to revolve round him, while the earth was obliged to content herself with one.

It is easy for us at the present day to sneer at these men and speak of them as blind bigots; but is it not possible that some of those to whom Galileo's discoveries are commonplaces, and therefore indisputable, have taken up quite as unscientific an attitude towards the discoveries of their contemporaries?

Some surprise has been felt at the fact that while Galileo was signalled out for persecution, Copernicus, the first propounder of the new astronomical system, was left unmolested. His great work—"De Revolutionibus Orbium Cœlestium"—in which he states that the sun is the centre of the universe round which the earth and the other planets revolved, was actually dedicated to Pope Paul III.; but the year of its publication (1545) was also the year of Copernicus's death, and though the book was brought to him on his death-bed, he did no more than just recognize it, nor was he ever conscious of the fact that his friend, Andreas Osiarder, had written an introduction to it. This introduction it was that saved his reputation with the Church, for Osiarder guarded his position by saying that the new theory need not be considered possible, nor even probable, since it was no more than a theory, and had been merely suggested by Copernicus as a facilitation of astronomical studies. This explanation satisfied the authorities, and the startling statement slept on quietly and undisturbed for the next sixty years, when Galileo's application of the telescope to the study of the heavens brought such sudden and marvellous

proofs to bear upon it that it could no longer be ignored. The discovery of the moons of Jupiter in 1610 was the turning-point in the matter. If they were really there, revolving round the planet, the Ptolemaic system could not stand. The best thing to be done, therefore, was to deny their existence, and the objectors in consequence refused to look at them through the telescope, declaring it to be an impious invention.

A letter written by Galileo to his friend Kepler in the August of this year shows the despair with which he regarded their attitude :

"What is to be done? Shall we side with Democritus or Heraclitus? I think, my Kepler, we will laugh at the extraordinary stupidity of the multitude. What do you say to the leading philosophers of the faculty here, to whom I have offered a thousand times of my own accord to show my studies, but who, with the lazy obstinacy of a serpent that has eaten his fill, have never consented to look at planets, nor moons, nor telescope. Verily, just as serpents close their ears, so do these men close their eyes to the light of truth. These are great matters, yet they do not occasion me any surprise. People of this sort think that philosophy is a kind of book like the 'Æneid' or the 'Odyssey,' and that the truth is to be sought, not in the universe, not in nature, but (I use their own words) by comparing texts! How you would laugh if you heard what things the first philosopher of the faculty at Pisa brought against me in the presence of the Grand Duke, for he tried, now with logical arguments, now with magical adjurations, to tear down and argue the new planets out of heaven!"

But worse was to follow. In September, 1610, Galileo left Padua and entered the service of the Grand Duke of Tuscany, taking up his residence in Florence. He had no sooner arrived than he made public his two new discoveries—firstly, that Venus and Mercury revolve round the sun, and not round the earth, as had previously been believed; and, secondly, that by observation of the spots on the sun it was possible to prove

that it revolved on its own axis. Far from recognizing the danger of this proceeding, Galileo was anxious to convince the authorities of the truth of his discoveries, and in the spring of 1611 he obtained permission to go to Rome, taking his telescope and other instruments with him.

His courage seemed at the time to find its reward, for he was not only patiently listened to, but was loaded with praises and flattery; all the while, however, a plot was being formed against him. Later on in the year the storm broke, and from that time until the end of his life he was harassed by perpetual persecution. To trace every step in the proceedings would be to fill many volumes, but the point at issue was that the authorities wished him to confess that his doctrines were contrary to Scripture, and therefore could not be true; while he, on his side, refused to admit that they were contrary to Scripture, since the astronomical statements in the Bible were not intended to be taken literally—"The Holy Spirit intends to teach us how to go to Heaven, not how the heavens go."

He makes his position very clear in a long letter written in 1613 to his friend, Father Castelli, the Professor of Mathematics at Pisa:

"I am inclined to think that the authority of Holy Scripture is intended to convince men of those truths which are necessary to their salvation, and which, being far above man's understanding, cannot be made credible by any learning, or any other means than revelation by the Holy Spirit. But that the same God who has endowed us with senses, reason, and understanding does not permit us to use them, and desires to acquaint us in any other way with such knowledge as we are in a position to acquire for ourselves by means of those faculties, that, it seems to me, I am not bound to believe, especially concerning those sciences about which the Holy Scriptures only contain small fragments and varying conclusions: this is precisely the case with astronomy, of which there is so little that the planets are not even all enumerated."

This letter was made public, and it was in answer to it that Father Caccini, a Dominican monk, was engaged to preach against Galileo in Santa Maria Novella in the Advent of 1614, when he based his discourse on the text: "Viri Galilei, quid statis aspicientes in cœlum?"

If Galileo would have ceased to uphold the Copernican system, the authorities would have been willing to sink their opposition; but this he would not do, and the natural consequence followed. Believing that it was their duty to prevent the dissemination of false doctrine, they warned him that if he would not obey he should be imprisoned; and, submitting to this threat, he lived for seven years in his villa near Florence without publishing anything. At the end of that time a gleam of hope came to him, for, at the death of Gregory XV. in 1623, Cardinal Barbarini, who had always treated Galileo with marked consideration, became Pope under the title of Urban VIII., and, hoping to have the decree rescinded, he went to Rome to present his petition. The Pope received him kindly, and made him many handsome presents, and though he would not promise to rescind the decree, Galileo was tempted to believe that it would no longer be enforced, so that after his return to Florence he set himself to the composition of his great work, "Dialogues on the Two Principal Systems of the World: the Ptolemaic and the Copernican."

It is clear that Galileo intended to obey the Papal prohibition in the letter, whatever he may have done in the spirit, for he is careful to speak of the doctrine of Copernicus as an "hypothesis," and to add the word "possibly" when he ventures on any daring statement; but such precautions as these were no more than a child's barrier of sand against the inflowing ocean; and when, after innumerable difficulties and delays, the book was at last published in 1632, Galileo found that, in spite of the fact that he had obtained permission to print it, a mandate from Rome forbade its sale, on the ground that he "had transgressed orders in deviating from the hypothetical treatment by decidedly maintaining that the earth moves and the sun is

stationary," and that he must therefore be brought before the Inquisition.

The unfortunate astronomer was now nearly seventy years old; he suffered from severe physical ailments, and his sight was failing. But though his friends and his physicians entreated for him, there was no redress, and in the January of 1633 he set out on his journey.

Much has been written about his trial in Rome, but the best authorities unite in declaring that, though he was examined under threat of torture, no torture was actually administered; the fact, however, remains that he was compelled by moral, if not by physical, force to sign a recantation and submit to punishment. In the midst of the assembly of Cardinals, humbly kneeling upon his knees, he was made to confess his fault as follows:

"After an injunction had been judicially intimated to me by the Holy Office to the effect that I must altogether abandon the false opinion that the sun is the centre of the world and immovable, and that the earth is not the centre of the world and moves, and that I must not hold, defend, or teach in any way whatsoever, verbally or in writing, the said doctrine, and after it had been notified to me that the said doctrine was contrary to Holy Scripture, I wrote and printed a book in which I discuss this doctrine already condemned, and adduce arguments of great cogency in its favour, without presenting any solution of these, and for this cause I have been pronounced by the Holy Office to be vehemently suspected of heresy—that is to say, of having held and believed that the sun is the centre of the world and immovable, and that the earth is not the centre and moves."

The often-repeated story that, on rising from his knees, the old man stamped his foot on the ground and exclaimed "E pur si muove!" ("And yet it moves!") has been repudiated by the critics; and in this they are doubtless right, for if Galileo had made such a declaration he would certainly have been consigned

to the dungeons of the Inquisition, whereas he was allowed to return to his own house at Florence.

Whether he was justified in making his recantation is a more difficult question, and one which we, at this day, are perhaps not qualified to decide; his woes, at any rate, were heavy enough to satisfy even those who are loudest in his condemnation. His bodily ills were great. His beloved daughter, the very light of his eyes, died at the early age of thirty-three; his relations were both rapacious and ungrateful; his friends, though faithful, were watched by the Inquisition, nor was he allowed to go to their houses. His villa at Arcetri was, in fact, a prison. It was here that Milton visited him, and it was here that he made those observations of the moon which are alluded to in "Paradise Lost"—

> "whose orb
> Thro' optic glass the Tuscan artist views
> At evening from the top of Fiesole,
> Or in Valdarno, to descry new lands,
> Rivers, or mountains in her spotty globe."

His health was now so bad that he begged to be allowed to move into Florence that he might be near his physicians, and this boon was at last granted on condition that he spoke to no one of his opinions. In a letter dated March 10, 1638, the Inquisitor Fanano writes to Cardinal Barbarini in Rome: "I have ordered him not to go out into the city under pain of imprisonment and excommunication, and have forbidden him to discourse with anyone on his condemned opinion of the earth's motion. He is now seventy-four years of age, and brought so low by his blindness and other complaints that we may easily believe his promise not to transgress this command."

But, in spite of his bitter persecution, Galileo never lost his reverence for religion; the little Church of San Giorgio is only about twenty yards distant from the house that he occupied in the Costa San Giorgio, and he was careful to ask for permission to attend it, as a letter from the Vicar of the Holy Office, granting him leave to be present at the Easter services in

1638, attests. One other consolation was not denied him, and that was the knowledge that his discoveries were making their way in spite of all attempts to stifle them, for his condemned book was not only printed in Holland in the Latin tongue, but translations soon appeared in Italian and English. All through the closing years of his life he continued his studies, although his blindness had now become complete; but his woes were soon to end, and on January 8, 1642, he passed away at the age of seventy-eight. Even after his death the authorities continued to persecute him, for his remains were not allowed to be buried in consecrated ground; but in 1737, when a member of the Florentine family of Corsini reigned as Pope under the title of Clement XII., permission was given to remove them into the Church of Santa Croce. His books, however, still remained on the Index, nor was it, incredible as it may seem, until August, 1820, that a decree was passed permitting the faithful to renounce their adherence to the Ptolemaic system.

"E pur si muove!" The words may not have been uttered by Galileo of the motion of the earth, but they are eternally true of the advance of knowledge. In the same year that the Tuscan astronomer died, Newton was born in England—Newton who, by his discovery of the law of gravitation, perfected the theories which were started by Copernicus and carried on by Galileo.

The woes of Galileo are over, yet, as we dwell upon them, it is impossible not to ask ourselves why such blind and cruel injustice should be permitted in the world. The problem is one to try the faith of men; but is it not the law of life that new truths, intellectual as well as spiritual, must always be crucified? Nor need we fear that the crucifixion of new truths will be their destruction, for it is invariably followed by their resurrection, and in the power of that resurrection they enable the minds and souls of men to ascend to heights as yet undreamed of and unknown.

The Missionary World.

IN his speech at the recent Church Congress, the Rev. A. G. Fraser made a statement which is full of arresting force. Dealing with the response of India to the Gospel, he said (we quote from the *Record* of October 11):

"The last census showed that after deducting Christians of European origin, and then again deducting the natural increase by birth-rate, there was still left an increase of 720,000 on the figures of the previous census, or 72,000 a year. That is, through baptisms the Christian Church has increased during the last ten years in India every fortnight by about the numbers of Pentecost, or nearly 3,000."

We are apt to speak with bated breath, apologetically, of the "small results" of missions; how many of us have realized this fortnightly repetition of the miraculous result of Pentecost in India alone? And the record of it meets us not in a missionary magazine but in the columns of the census returns of the Indian Government. True, the power of the Day of Pentecost does not dominate all these Indian Christians as it should—and herein lies the deepest lesson of these striking figures—yet Mr. Fraser points out that—

"All Hinduism, with its 240,000,000, all Mohammedanism, with its 60,000,000, and all Buddhism, with its 15,000,000, are seeking to defend their faiths, not from the inroads of each other, but from the 3,500,000 Christians—that almost invisible handful amongst the millions of India."

* * * * *

The Educational Committee of the C.M.S. have just issued a cogent and attractive illustrated statement (price 1s.) called "Some Educational Projects of the C.M.S., 1912-13." The Bishop of Madras contributes an article on "The Open Door amongst the Outcasts of India," and Miss M Dougall, Classical Lecturer at Westfield College, writes "A Plea for the Education of India's Girlhood." Of the sixteen educational projects put forward last year, only two remain as outstanding claims—the proposed Training Colony in Ceylon, for which the Rev. A. G. Fraser pleads, and the rebuilding of St. John's College, Agra, of which the Rev. A. W. Davies, Vice-Principal, writes. A prelim-

inary statement concerning the proposed Galilean Training Colony, and details concerning two educational "tasks" in China, come at the close of the book; for the rest, the Committee have wisely adopted the policy of seeking to secure "better training and more adequate provision of Christian teachers in elementary village in India and Ceylon, with special regard to districts where there is a mass movement towards Christianity." Attention is therefore concentrated upon the "task" before five of the C.M.S. Missions—in Travancore and Cochin, the Telugu country, Tinnevelly, the United Provinces, and the Punjaub and Sindh. Sober facts and great ideas combine in a striking statement which is far more than a mere appeal. From a synopsis of studentships in C.M.S. institutions on p. 107, we see that a period of ten years' training for boys and eight years for girls is considered necessary. This, of course, includes the ordinary school course. The fatal tendency to regard educational and evangelistic missions as alternative or even antagonistic agencies is slain at one blow by this able booklet. The imperative need for Christian education as the only means of raising up an efficient Indian evangelistic force is established once for all.

* * * * *

The former principal of St. John's College, Agra, has an article on "The New Idealism in India," in the *C.M. Review* for October. Mr. Haythornthwaite discusses the present situation in the light of five great Indian aspirations—political, industrial, social, educational, and religious—closing his fine paper with a striking extract from Principal Rudra's "Christ and Modern India." Men who, like Mr. Haythornthwaite, combine long experience with modern sympathies, have much to contribute to our missionary thinking at the home base just now.

* * * * *

The complexity of the race problem, which still eats like a canker at the heart of the Christian Church, is accentuated by two articles in the current number of *The East and the West*. Archdeacon Latimer Fuller, who has had considerable experience on the Rand, and writes with evident sympathy for the

Bantu Church-people of South Africa, supports the rule of segregation which at present prevails in Church matters between black and white. He does so from a desire to safeguard essentially Bantu characteristics, to insure opportunity for the expansion of native congregations under proper supervision, and to secure the full development of the African. The Rev. C. F. Andrews, of Delhi, immediately follows on "Race within the Christian Church," taking a line which leads him to opposite conclusions. Some of the facts which he adduces make one hot with shame. There is, as both writers recognize, a wide difference in questions of expediency between South African and Indian conditions, but the Christian Church can have but one principle in such a vital matter as this. The whole subject touches feeling deeply, and for that reason its full consideration has so far been shirked. But if the world-neighbourhood of the nineteenth century is to become a world-brotherhood in the twentieth century, East and West and black and white must deal with these racial problems side by side in the light of the liberty and self-sacrifice of the Cross. A third article, which may well be grouped with the other two, appears in the current number of the *International Review of Missions*, in which Principal A. G. Fraser, of Kandy, records his impressions of the remarkable training-work done at Hampton Institute, Virginia, amongst American Indians and negroes.

* * * * *

The *Hibbert Journal* for October contains an article of singular interest for those who study the impact of Christian truth upon partially educated pagan minds. An essay by a native Fijian, translated by a European into whose hands it accidentally came, shows how curiously Christian truths and partial understanding of social organization and of colonial government can, when blended with deep-seated belief in ancient national gods, produce a strange new cult, pathetic in its ingenuity. The line of argument in the essay is too complex for reproduction here, but the writer endeavours to prove, partly by distorted interpretation of Scripture, that

Jehovah is a God of the spirit, whereas the old Fijian deities are gods of the flesh. By leading Fijian converts to refer all matters, both of flesh and of spirit, to Jehovah, thus ignoring the national gods to whom He had committed all bodily matters, the missionaries are supposed to have brought about the rapid decline of population in the islands. A combination of the new and old worship would redress the balance, and make bodily and spiritual welfare parallel. The writer in all sincerity appeals to the missionaries to recognize this, and not to be "ashamed to change the rules of the Church if the country and its inhabitants will thereby be saved."

* * * * *

The political situation in the Near East adds present interest to any fresh discussion of Islam—a subject of perennial import for the Christian statesman and the missionary worker. Two distinctive articles in the October number of the *International Review of Missions* are worthy of careful reading. One is a singularly clear-sighted interpretation of Moslem thought and life, by Professor Crawford, of Beirut College, based on intimate personal knowledge of educated, thinking Moslems. The other, a much longer article, by the well-known Professor Diederich Westermann, of Berlin, is a scholarly survey of all knowledge at present available concerning Islam in the West and Central Soudan. For accuracy and extent of research it is almost unrivalled amongst magazine articles. It was prepared as the basis for further investigations by the Special Committee for Work amongst Moslems, which was formed by the Continuation Committee. A good analysis and an excellent coloured map add to the value of this remarkable paper.

* * * * *

The marked growth of a general interest in missions is shown not only by the increase in missionary publications, but by the way in which a book now and then lays hold of the minds of men and forces them to think. For instance, "Missionary Methods: St. Paul's or Ours?" by the Rev. Roland Allen, is being discussed and reviewed everywhere. Few people agree

entirely with its brilliant but one-sided arguments, yet inasmuch as its criticisms arrest the attention of the reader and its high ideals inspire him, the most conservative of missionary leaders may hail the book as friend, not foe.

❁ ❁ ❁ ❁ ❁

A need has long been felt for a well-written, inexpensive book dealing ably with the facts of missions, and likely to find favour with men not yet interested. Such a book has just come out in the Home University Library. "Missions: Their Rise and Development," by Mrs. Creighton, is likely to do lasting work. It is sane and convincing; its facts—only a small percentage out of the vast mass available—are well chosen and well arranged; the literary style, of course, is clear and forceful, and if one misses a touch of spiritual warmth one finds a sincere and well-based belief in the cause of missions which will carry conviction to many. It would not be easy to make a better missionary investment of a shilling than by buying a copy of this book to give to some friend as yet unenlisted amongst the supporters of the work. G.

❁ ❁ ❁ ❁ ❁

Discussions.

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

ASTRONOMICAL EVIDENCE FOR THE DATE OF THE CRUCIFIXION.

(*The "Churchman," June, 1912, p. 469, and September, 1912, p. 703.*)

I REGRET that I have been unable to write on this subject for some months, as I have only lately recovered from the effects of a severe operation. The astronomical reasons adduced by Mr. Maunder in the June number of the CHURCHMAN appear to me to be very sound and clear, and thoroughly to meet the Rev. D. R. Fotheringham's objections to the visibility of the new moon of March 4, A.D. 29, at Jerusalem. Mr. Maunder is a trained astronomical observer, and one

accustomed to make practical use of the results of observations, one fundamental principle which he employs being to base results upon a large number of observations, not rejecting any of them unless there is proof of error. I fail to see how anyone with astronomical knowledge could follow Dr. J. K. Fotheringham in his attempt in the September CHURCHMAN to refute Mr. Maunder's arguments. Consequently it cannot be maintained that March 18, A.D. 29, is an impossible date for the Crucifixion from astronomical reasons.

Mr. Maunder, however, finished his communication by stating that, in his opinion, it is a serious difficulty to the acceptance of this date—March 18, A.D. 29—for the Crucifixion, that it makes the Passover come at a very early season—before the vernal equinox. The Rev. D. R. Fotheringham agrees with him on this point (CHURCHMAN, September, 1912), giving a simple assertion that this early date in the year is impossible.

But let us consider the evidences and the circumstances. The late Rev. H. Grattan Guinness[1] wrote: "It has been objected by some that if the Passover in A.D. 29 coincided with the full moon of March 18, it preceded the equinox by about three days. 'This objection will be seen to be of no moment, when it is considered that this very day, March 18, was regarded by the Western Church, prior to the Council of Nice, as the anterior Paschal limit.'[2] 'It is no insurmountable objection that this [date] was three days before the equinox, for we have seen from the preceding testimonies that a Jewish Passover was sometimes celebrated before the equinox, and, as Mr. Benson properly remarks, in the Mosaic law there is no injunction which refers to the equinox at all.' "[3]

The Hebrew method of determining when to insert the necessary extra or intercalary lunar month was an exceedingly simple one, being dependent upon the condition of the crops in early spring. The year began at a new moon, and the particular new moon which was to be the first was determined as follows:[4] On a certain day in the twelfth month of the year specimens of the earliest crops were sent to Jerusalem, when they were examined by a committee of three, appointed by the Sanhedrim; if the specimens were found to be forward, the next new moon was made the first day of the first month of the new year; if, on the other hand, the specimens did not give promise that the necessary barley in the ear would be furnished by the middle of the following month (Lev. xxiii. 10, 11), an extra or inter-

[1] "The Approaching End of the Age," pp. 534, 535. 1881.
[2] "Ordo Sæculorum: a Treatise on the Chronology of Holy Scripture," p. 55. H. Browne, M.A.
[3] "An Epitome of the Civil and Literary Chronology of Rome," etc., pp. 525, 526. H. F. Clinton, M.A. He mentions that Epiphanius and the author of a Paschal homily on the works of Chrysostom state that the Passover was sometimes observed before the equinox.
[4] "The Temple," etc., p. 200. Rev. A. Edersheim.

calary month was added to the old year, making a thirteenth, and the new year was not commenced until *another* new moon had appeared, twenty-nine or thirty days later.

This plan is in full accord with the command given to the Israelites when they were in Egypt (Exod. xii. 2, 18), that the first month of the year was to be the one towards the middle of which the barley was in the ear and the wheat not grown (Exod. ix. 31, 32) in that country.

As the climate of parts of the deep depression of the Jordan Valley approximates to that of Egypt, the specimens of the early crops were doubtless, in subsequent years, sent from the almost subtropical neighbourhood of the Palestinian river to the colder uplands of Jerusalem. This circumstance explains the very early season at which the Passover was sometimes held in Bible times. The ears of corn need not have been quite ripe, because the barley-fields of Egypt had not been reaped when all the crops were destroyed by hail and locusts only a few days before the first Passover (Exod. ix. 31 to x. 15).

After a careful consideration, therefore, of astronomical and calendar considerations connected with the subject, we must come to the conclusion that we cannot adduce any valid objections to the date March 18, A.D. 29, for the Crucifixion. On the other hand, when we reflect that this date is contained within the narrow limits possible from astronomical and calendar considerations, and that the weight of historical testimony very strongly supports it, we are bound to accept it as the year of the Crucifixion, because the evidences in its favour are very much greater than those for any other year.

G. MACKINLAY, *Lieut.-Colonel.*

"SOME THOUGHTS ON THE CHURCH OF INDIA."

(*The "Churchman," October,* 1912, *p.* 792.)

"AN Englishman in India" has every right to call to order an Englishman in England, if it is true that he makes trouble and "light-heartedly" leaves it to be faced by others, as your correspondent suggests; so perhaps an assurance to begin with, that the writer of the article in question would dearly love to have still the privilege of being an Englishman in India, may not be out of place. His sole purpose and desire is to try and serve that land where he would gladly have spent his life.

But apart from the expressions which your correspondent feels it necessary to use—and "who can refute a sneer?"—I am concerned with the two points which underlie his letter. First, he seems to deny the possibility of that event occurring to which he makes reference; and secondly, he disputes the wisdom of recognizing and stating the fact that, to some minds, the possibility appears even in the light of a probability in the remote future. As to the first point, no doubt much

might be said either way, but it is at least arguable that the divisions and mutual hatreds of early England, under heathen conditions, were as racially fundamental and as openly avowed as those which now afflict non-Christian India. And yet England began to become united and strong when once the native kings became in name, and in fact, Christian. I cannot help thinking that were we agreed on the depth and reality of the word "Christian," our differences of opinion would be somewhat composed. I "day-dream," if thus it may be called, of the time when the Face and Figure of our Lord Jesus Christ shall have won India's heart, when India shall be truly Christian, not at all of a time when the "grim," and rather unworthy, "story" of the "virgin" and the "rupee" can be quoted in serious argument. It *may* be that India's choice will for all time fall on England's king, but it may also be held, I trust without reproach, that India's millions may one day prefer a prince of their own blood.

But it is probably on the other point that the gravamen of the protest lies. It is stamped as "the folly of the unwise," "an airy castle of political and ecclesiastical fancies built in the study of an English vicarage," etc., to give any utterance to the possibility of such an event. I would call the attention of your correspondent to the following words of the Edinburgh Conference, which has had the very best opportunities of gauging the opinions of Indian missionaries. They summarize their investigations thus: "Whilst differences may exist among missionaries as to the proper *rate* of change, they are, on the whole, agreed that *a transfer of power to the natives of India* should proceed, *pari passu*, with their advance in enlightenment and moral stability" ("Missions and Governments," vol. vii. p. 34). I might urge, reasonably enough, that this plain and unquestioned statement as to the opinions of those well qualified to judge, is only pushed to its logical conclusion in matters political and ecclesiastical, in the passage criticized by your correspondent.

His illustration of the "growing lad" at first sight seems apt and impressive, but I really fail to discover any attempt in my article to impress upon that lad "the grand times he will have when he is freed from parental control," nor can I think that your readers will find me guilty of "sowing seeds of discontent and rebellion." I find a curiously exact statement of what I ought to do in the next sentence: "He is the true friend who encourages the lad to fit himself to enter into his parents' noblest aims." And I would continue the illustration by adding that sometimes our wisdom is not to withhold from the lad altogether the fact that one day he will have to act for himself. To make him believe that he will be in leading strings all his life tends to paralyze the faculties of mind and soul. To train to independence is the main purpose of a wise father in his dealings with his son, and he is seldom ashamed to own up to it.

But I can only add my earnest hope that the article may be at once

robbed of whatever interest attaches to these "gorgeous visions" (contained, by the way, in twelve lines), as your correspondent is good enough to suggest, if only some attention may be given to whatever of truth there may be in the remaining pages.

I heartily agree with "An Englishman in India" that "many a long year" will pass, probably more easily reckoned by generations, before England's work in India will be complete. And if that be so, perhaps it may be deemed premature to think or speak of it now. Certainly if the thought raises such indignation in the mind of *one* Englishman in India, and adds in the slightest measure to his difficulties already overwhelming, it had far best be left unspoken. But the meanwhile presents so many problems of practical and pressing interest, that I believe your readers would have welcomed more gratefully from your correspondent some further criticism of the remaining nine-tenths of the article, which doubtless he is fully qualified to give.

STUART H. CLARK.

Notices of Books.

THE REASON OF LIFE. By W. P. Du Bose, M.A., S.T.D. *Longmans.* Price 5s. net.

Dr. Du Bose has given us some hard reading, and the plain man is sometimes constrained to rub his eyes and wonder where he is. We found the four or five chapters which follow the introductory one packed with difficult thoughts and needing the closest application on the reader's part. In the next half-dozen chapters we met with much more that appealed, and it seems to be here that the main theme of the book is worked out and "the reason of life" discovered. Christianity is seen to be a life, a life of Christ, a life like Christ's, a life of Christ in us. There is no "other life" save as a sequel to this, and our desire should be, not to go to Heaven, but rather to bring Heaven to us. Love is the fulfilling of all law, and is the "seminal principle" of life. By bringing Christianity into the common life we make Heaven out of earth, and in this happy service every individual member of the Church should be engaged, co-operating with God. A quotation from p. 118 is a fair summary of much of this central portion of the book: "The truth we are trying to carry along with us is, that life or salvation is not away from the natural to the spiritual, but through and by the natural into the spiritual. We are not to love God instead of our neighbour, or heaven instead of earth, but to love God in our neighbour, and make heaven out of earth. If we have not loved the visible, how shall we love the invisible?"

There are further seven chapters which again need careful following. We have such familiar doctrines as those of Imputed Holiness and Justification by Faith "properly and scientifically" demonstrated. The rival claims of the teachers of Divine Immanence and Divine Transcendence are tested and harmonized. God is both, just as Christ was seen to be both "Encosmic and Incarnate" in the early part of the book. Should we speak

of Christ's Deity or of His Divinity? Is He man reaching Godward, or God reaching manward? "My answer is that he is both" (p. 254). "The conclusion of the matter is, that if Jesus Christ is not God to me, there is no God for me at all; God outside of Him is an inference." A supplementary chapter deals with the modern attempt to distinguish St. Paul's theology and Christ's ethics. It is shown that no real difference exists. "The chief seeming differences between Jesus and St. Paul are not differences at all, but only harmonies too deep for shallow experiences."

The book all through, is stiff reading; it is, in turn, startling, instructing, dazzling, confusing, comforting, stimulating. The result of a fearless investigation, in the course of which most of the fundamental positions of the Christian Faith are brought under review, is that the orthodox position is maintained and confirmed. Old-fashioned evangelical truths find themselves scientifically and philosophically stated, and, somewhat to their surprise after such unusual handling, endorsed. But the main message of the book is that "we are here, not to conform or correspond with the world as it is, but to be perpetually reforming and making a new world out of it."

W. Heaton Renshaw.

Christian Epigraphy. By Canon Orazio Marucchi. *Cambridge University Press.* Price 7s. 6d.

This dumpy little volume puts into short compass a mass of information on this subject, which has been, up to the present, practically inaccessible to English readers, and will prove serviceable to the student of Christian origins. The inscriptions are carefully classified, and, so far, are easy of reference; and the material provided for the discussion of doctrinal development and of the organization of the Church is of great interest. At the same time, it must be said that the book is deficient in several directions. In the first place (and this the author himself notes in the preface) the bulk of the material is drawn from the Roman cemeteries; a hasty examination has revealed about half-a-dozen inscriptions from Africa, two from Asia Minor and one or two from Gaul. Apart from the *stele* of Abercius, Professor Sir W. Ramsay's discoveries in Phrygia—amongst which are some late second-century inscriptions of singular interest—are completely ignored as are the researches of Père Delattre at Carthage. Further, it would have added considerably to the value of the book if a chapter had been inserted dealing with inscriptions throwing light on the New Testament. For instance, there seems to be no reference either to the Amplatius inscription of the cemetery of Domitilla, or to the Tryphæna and Tryphosa marble of that of Priscilla; and sundry inscriptions, like the 'lapis Tiburtinus' (which exists in the Lateran Museum), the συναγωγὴ Ἑβραίων from Corinth, the Sergius Paulus inscription from Karavastasi (*Soli*), in Cyprus, and others, which are not easily accessible, might well have been included. Still more serious is the absence of an index, which will add considerably to the labour involved in using the volume. But most serious of all the deficiencies of the book is the absence, in the vast majority of cases, of any indication of the approximate date of the inscriptions cited. Cavaliere Marucchi expresses a hope that this volume will be of value in the illustration of lectures; but the lecturer on the doctrine or organization of the Church will find it hard to

illustrate his points, when he is unable to say whether the inscription which he adduces, say, in support of the practice of the Invocation of Saints, is of the second or the seventh century! That the vast majority of these inscriptions cannot be *accurately* dated goes without saying, but in most cases either the type of lettering or the particular provenance of an inscription gives some clue to the expert as to the period from which it comes, and of this no hint is given. It is much to be hoped that a second edition will soon be issued in which the learned author, who could, better than any man living, make good the last defect, will give this most necessary additional information.

M. LINTON SMITH.

BIBLE STUDIES IN OUTLINE. By G. A. Gollock. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 1s. net; cloth, 1s. 6d. net.

STUDIES IN THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN. By Annie H. Small. *Student Christian Movement.* Price, cloth, 2s. 6d. net; paper, 1s. 6d. net.

Two ladies write studies on the Fourth Gospel. Both volumes are excellent, but there is a difference. Miss Gollock provides the reader with much more material, and makes him do the work for himself; Miss Small does it for him. In Miss Gollock's case both she and the reader have to study; in Miss Small's, she has studied, and the reader enjoys. We are very thankful for both books, and are certainly not going to indulge in comparisons. For study circles and individual Bible students—*i.e.*, for all real Christians—the two books come as a real help. We simply make a suggestion: For the circle or for the individual who is working through Miss Gollock's book it would be a real help if the work were done with Miss Small's book ready at hand. All good wishes for a prosperous and useful career to both books, each excellent alone, but better together.

Received: AN APOSTLE OF THE NORTH: MEMOIRS OF BISHOP W. C. BOMPAS. By H. A. Cody. Price 5s. net. A fascinating story of a man who for more than thirty years was a Missionary Bishop in North-West Canada. HEROES OF SCIENCE. By Charles R. Gibson, F.R.S.E. Price 5s. net. AMONG CONGO CANNIBALS. By John H. Weeks. Price 16s. net. ADVENTURES IN SOUTHERN SEAS. By Richard Stead, B.A., F.R.Hist.S. Price 5s. THINGS SEEN IN PALESTINE. By A. Goodrich-Freer, F.R.S.G.S. Price 2s. net. THE ROMANCE OF SUBMARINE ENGINEERING. By T. W. Corbin. Price 5s. PHOTOGRAPHY OF TO-DAY. By H. Chapman Jones. Price 5s. net. THINGS SEEN IN RUSSIA. By W. Barnes Steveni. Price 2s. net. AMONG INDIAN RAJAHS AND RYOTS. By Sir Andrew Fraser, K.C.S.I. London: *Seeley, Service and Co.* Price 5s. net. The first instalment of the autumn publications for which this firm is famous, and all of them excellent for their purpose. GREAT TRUTHS SIMPLY EXPLAINED. By the Rev. W. St. Clair Tisdall, D.D. Price 3d. Dr. Tisdall deals wisely and well with some of the foundation truths of the faith. An excellent manual for simple folk. THE TRUTH OF THE BIBLE. By the Rev. Trevor Fielder, M.A. London: *Chas. J. Thynne.* Price 1s. net. Mr. Fielder writes from the point of view of verbal inspiration. PRAYERS ANCIENT AND MODERN. By William Angus Knight. London: *J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd.* Price 2s. 6d. net. An interesting collection of prayers from many sources. THE OUTCASTS' HOPE. By Godfrey E. Phillips. Price 1s. net. THE RENAISSANCE IN INDIA. By C. F. Andrews, M.A. London: *C.M.S.* Price 1s. 6d. Two excellent missionary manuals, reliable and readable. NEW SONGS OF GRACE. By R. F. Beveridge and D. M. Thomson. Price 1s. THE SOUL-WINNING CHURCH. By the Rev. Len. G. Broughton, D.D. Price 1s. 6d. net. A new book by Mr. Meyer's successor at Westminster. EXPLORING IN NEW TESTAMENT FIELDS. By Ada R. Habershon. Price 1s. 6d. net. THE OPEN-AIR PREACHER'S COUNSELLOR. By Frank Cockrem. London: *Morgan and Scott, Ltd.* FIFTY DOCTORS AGAINST ALCOHOL. London: *The Brotherhood Publishing House.* FORCES THAT HELP. By Florence Northcroft. Price 1s. 6d. net. VOICE OF THE PRAYER-BOOK. By Lilian Carter. London: *H. R. Allenson, Ltd.* Price 6d. net. MASTERMAN READY. By Captain Marryat. Price 6d. net. PRESTER JOHN. By John Buchan. London: *T. Nelson and Sons.* Price 7d. net.