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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

May, 1913.

The Month.

Church Finance.

THERE are two topics before us at the present time, of pressing and vital interest, to which Evangelical Churchmen will do well to give careful attention. One is Church Finance, and the other is Education. The real point of importance in the proposals of the Archbishop's Finance Committee was indicated in Bishop Ingham's letter to the *Record* of April 4, and was emphasized at length by the Dean of Canterbury in his special article contributed to the *Record* of April 11. It is, in brief, that the great voluntary Missionary Societies of the Church of England should cease to exist, and that their work should be done by the Church as a whole acting through the Central Board of Missions. We believe Bishop Ingham is right in his contention that under any such arrangement enthusiasm will be cooled and support diminished, so that good work now being done in many parts of the world will be increasingly paralyzed. To bring about such a possibility, just at the time when doors are opening to missionary enterprise in the East and in Africa to a far greater extent than ever before, and the need for support at the home base is being so urgently demonstrated, is the very last scheme in which any whole-hearted supporter of Missions can willingly acquiesce.

Voluntary Societies.

The Dean of Canterbury rightly contends that the whole area of Church History, both Medieval and Reformed, shows how high has been the value and how effective the work of great voluntary organizations.

And it is in England, of all places in the world, where the voluntary principle has been most vital—witness the present horror of the very word "conscription." An Englishman will do much if he is asked for his help. He will do nothing if he is told that he must. There may be a great lack of logic in all this, but logic is not supposed to be the strong point in our national composition. It is from this point of view that the "*general obligation* to contribute a voluntary Church due of not less than one halfpenny per week" would probably prove a very poor substitute for the money now contributed to the various great voluntary societies of the Church. Representative Churchmen have already expressed strong hostility to this. There is no getting away from the fact that the Church of England as a National Church embraces various schools of thought, expressive in each case of principles for the maintenance of which their respective upholders will spend both work and money. Any arrangement which deliberately ignores this state of things is bound in the long-run to be heavily penalized. We must see to it that our great Evangelical Societies do not pass out of existence.

National Education.

Of the manifold aspects of the educational problem two in particular are coming into increasing prominence. One is that of national, the other is that of clerical education. With regard to the former, the recent speeches of Mr. Pease and Lord Haldane have disclosed no details of the Government's plans; they have been rather announcements of a general and preparatory kind, designed to produce a sympathetic attitude on the part of the general public. On one point Lord Haldane is emphatic. The various elements in our national education—primary, secondary, and University—are crippled and enfeebled through lack of co-ordination. With regard to the religious question, he frankly declares that education must come first if a national system is to be built up. Mr. Pease declares that the denominational difficulty appears to him insoluble, but he is quite clear that the proposals of the

Government will involve increased expenditure. This is the bed-rock fact to which we come down. Our national system of education needs to be improved, and the improvement will mean heavy outlay. Are we so thoroughly convinced of the need for reform that we are ready to pay the necessary cost?

The Training of the Clergy.

The factors in the problem of the supply and training of clergy are of a somewhat similar kind. There is need for other methods, and the other methods will cost much money. In a recent "Open Letter" to the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Headlam has emphasized the fact that the supply of men for Orders comes now from many other sources than the older Universities. This is a fact that needs no demonstration, and we are not concerned here to discuss the particular type of education that Dr. Headlam would advocate for these ordinands. But what we do say most emphatically is that training and discipline they *must* have, whether it be by academic graduation or by alternative methods. In many cases they are too poor to pay for a three or four years' course of training. They are conscious of the vocation, and they are willing to work hard, but they lack the necessary means. For the Church as well as for the nation, education means expenditure. That school of thought will, in future days, be most influential in the Church of England which is willing now to contribute most generously to the education of the future clergy.

Divinity Degrees at Oxford.

The question of the Divinity Degrees at Oxford will be settled, for the time being at any rate, in a few days from now. We venture to prophesy that the proposed new Statutes will be rejected. The opposition has been excellently organized, and there is a powerful force of opinion behind it. It seems to us that a great mistake has been made on the part of the advocates of reform, in the absolute and wholesale throwing open of the Degrees to which they are committed. If a serious attempt had been made to frame a

Statute which should open the Degrees to professed Christian students other than those of the Anglican priesthood, they would have secured the votes of many members of Convocation who, as it is, will journey to Oxford to oppose them. The position that, if Nonconformists are to be eligible at all, it must only be in company with men of any or no faith, is utterly indefensible, and so far as it has influenced the framing of the present Statutes, it is to be strenuously resisted. A letter to the *Times* of April 11 by the Vicar of Leeds so exactly expresses our own attitude that we venture to reproduce it here. It is from the same standpoint as that of the Headmaster of Shrewsbury, which we printed last month, and we believe it is representative of a widely spread body of opinion.

The Letter of the Vicar of Leeds.

"I have been daily hoping that the eight signatories to the Oxford circular would have sent some reply to the Dean of Canterbury's main point that the Oxford D.D. need not be, and ought not to be, robbed of its Christian significance. To me there seems a contradiction between the statement of their circular, defining the proposed Statutes, which claims that 'there are safeguards secured in that each candidate must have shown his acquaintance with Christian theology,' and their querulous complaint that 'the method of throwing the Degrees open only to the professing Christian would have confronted the University with the difficult problem of defining a Christian.' If the problem of definition is given up as incapable of solution, how can the thing not defined remain in any shape as a safeguard?

"It is this negative result of the proposed change which I know to be distressing to many thoughtful men outside Oxford, both laymen as well as clergy, almost all of whom would wish to see the Degree open to all students who profess and call themselves Christians. During the past twelve months Dr. George Adam Smith, of Aberdeen, and Dr. A. S. Peake, of Manchester, have been my guests when lecturing in Leeds to the clergy and ministers of all denominations, and it is im-

possible not to regret that the Oxford Degree of Divinity should not gain added lustre by being conferred on such distinguished Christian teachers.

"In effect, however, the proposed Statutes, as interpreted by the Oxford Professors' circular, undoubtedly lay an axe at the root of the very tree under the stately branches of which we had desired to see Churchmen and Nonconformists alike sitting, and they will leave it a mere stump, capable of affording shelter neither to Churchmen nor to Nonconformists.

"At all events those who, like myself, feel bound to journey to Oxford to oppose the new Statutes, although supported by the names of scholars and personal friends for whom we have a profound regard, must not be understood as in any way opposed to the widening, while we object to the weakening, of the Christian significance of the Oxford D.D. Degree."

The Church of the Future.

The principal article in the *Christian Commonwealth* for April 2 was written by the Rev. J. M. Thompson, and its title is "The National Church of the Future." Mr. Thompson is the writer of the much-canvassed book on "Miracles," and the *Christian Commonwealth* is, we presume rightly, to be regarded as the organ of the Rev. J. R. Campbell's so-called New Theology. The article, therefore, for two reasons attracts our attention. There is much that is wise and something that is not. It recognizes the difficulty of a really National Church amidst the war of sects. The Church of the future will be no one of the Churches of the present; it will be a federation of them, and it will take account of the masses that stand outside the Churches. Mr. Thompson then goes on to describe its characteristics. Concerning most of them we shall not seriously quarrel with him: it is to be a real society, not a vague ideal; it is to be definitely religious; it is to be national; and, above all, it is to be democratic. So far so good, but this is not all. Another characteristic is added, and lest we cause misunderstanding, we quote it in full:

"Thirdly, the National Church will be Christian. ***But its basis will not be dogmatic.*** The Church of the future cannot require subscription to any creed.

It will be an association of all who share the experience of the Divine value of the life and teaching of Christ, and who wish to express it in a life of love and service towards their fellow-men. It will not question the right to membership on the part of any 'who profess and call themselves Christians.' The separate denominations may still set up what tests they wish; but a man may belong to the Church if he will without belonging to any of the Churches."

It is the sentence which we have thrown into italics that we cannot accept. It is conceivably true that it is possible for "a man to belong to the Church if he will without belonging to any of the Churches," but we regard it as impossible for an organized society—and the Church of the future, in that it is to be national, must be an organized and visible society—to exist without a dogmatic basis. Undenominationalism tends to eliminate the dogmatic, and sometimes our sense of charity and of fellowship has tempted us to jeopardize some of the cardinal doctrines of the Faith. There is no need to multiply essentials, no need to convert our prejudices into principles, or our opinions into convictions, but we must not attempt to purchase unity at the cost of fact. Christianity is a revealed religion, and upon the basis of that revelation it must stand. There is room for give and take in the interpretation of that revelation, but we must no more dispense with it than add to it. For us the basis of the National Church is and must be dogmatic. It is as well that the fact should be stated, lest the readers of the *Christian Commonwealth* imagine that Mr. Thompson is speaking for the Church of England. We dare venture to believe that in this matter at least we have the general assent not only of the Church of England, but of the large majority of Christians outside it with us.

The Theology of the Plain Man.

That the religion of Christ must have a dogmatic basis was most helpfully urged by the Bishop of Wakefield in the Spital Sermon the other day. According to the *Times'* report, which we venture to quote, the Bishop insisted that at the very centre of Christianity, viewed both religiously and theologically, there

stands the Cross of Christ. His words are wise for all times, and, in the light of Mr. Thompson's article, particularly apt at this time:

"Many of us had relatives and friends who were caught in one or other of the cross-currents of belief that were about, and, he believed, never before was the appeal of Christ so urgent to His humblest followers to search and see what truths we really had, and bring them out in actual life to help our fellow-men. He wished to speak of the theology, not so much of the head, but of the heart and life. It was a common mistake to confuse theology with religion. The highest forms of theology stood behind religion, as scientific formulas stood behind the working of the machine, or the laws of music behind the symphony, or the canons of art behind the painting. All true theology was the result of experience, as well as revelation. The Christian society had never faltered in the central message of the Cross. They could argue as they would about the difficulties of theology, but the fact remained that the doctrine of the Cross was the hope of all mankind."

Yes, the Church of the future will have a dogmatic basis, or it will not be a Church, and it will have no future.

Vestments.

The open letter of the Bishop of Manchester has drawn a reply from the Primate, to whom it was addressed. The Bishop makes two new points of the gravest importance: he shows that the rubric is in the nature of a proviso, and therefore is intended to ordain nothing beyond the enactments and requirements of the Prayer-Book itself; he points out that the rubric applies to the ornaments, both of the Church and of the minister. That the revisions of the Prayer-Book have ruled out certain ornaments of the Church we all agree; the Bishop contends that they have ruled out the vestments. The Archbishop recognizes the importance of his open letter, and, in the main, suspends judgment. He does, however, suggest that the question of the Ornaments Rubric is one rather of archæological than of practical importance. In itself this is true. The historical and practically important fact is that for three hundred years, and for good reasons, the Church of England absolutely declined the wearing of vestments. The real reason why was that they represented and symbolized Roman doctrine; the legal reason may be found in the injunc-

tions or the advertisements, or in the rubric itself—that is a matter for the archæologists. The question to-day is, Do we want to go back to ornaments which both at the time of the English Reformation and now, both by those who use them and those who do not, are recognized as symbolical of doctrine which the Church of England rejects? Our answer to that question is an emphatic no! Archæology may tell us that originally the vestments meant nothing; it may squabble as to the meaning of the rubric. Three hundred years of intentional and significant disuse represent a practical and indisputable act, and provides an argument which has never been rebutted. The Bishop of Manchester has given us a new explanation of the origin of the fact, and it may be that it is the right one.

Lord Wolseley's Opinion.

To those who are engaged in a particular controversy, and who, while fighting with courage and conviction, are apt to be troubled by misgivings as to the ultimate issue of the fray, it is occasionally helpful and refreshing to hear the opinion of some external observer who surveys the whole area from a wider and more general point of view. In a recent letter to the *Times* Sir Arthur Conan Doyle gives some personal recollections of the late Lord Wolseley. The following is one of them: "The conversation having turned to the religious future of Great Britain, he said, 'That question was definitely and finally settled three hundred years ago. There is no example in history of a nation going back on a decision of that sort.'" Lord Wolseley was not speaking as a theologian or an antiquary, but as a trained man of affairs. And we believe his opinion will prove to be true. Whatever may be the issue of the particular controversy on vestments in the Anglican Church, we do not believe that the nation as a whole (for here we have to reckon with the great non-Episcopalian bodies) will ever go back on the decision it made three hundred years ago.

Sir Edward Clarke on Dr. Legg.

We called attention last month to Dr. Wickham Legg's article on Vestments in the March number of the *Nineteenth Century*. Those who read it should continue their studies by reading the replies given in the April number by Sir Edward Clarke and Mr. Alison Phillips, the writer of the article on Vestments in the "Encyclopædia Britannica." Sir Edward Clarke, after noting the vituperative and "tempestuous" character of Dr. Legg's article, which was in effect not only an attack on the Ridsdale Judgment, but a personal assault on Sir Edward himself, sets out afresh to show that the judgment was perfectly sound in the particular point criticized by Dr. Legg. We have no space to summarize or discuss his article, which should be read as a whole, but we note that in certain important points of historical detail he agrees with the contentions of the Bishop of Manchester's letter to the Primate, and we further note his words in commenting on the total disuse of chasubles from the death of Mary onward: "If contemporary interpretation is of any value as evidence, the fact that Bishops, priests, and people immediately and universally accepted this as the meaning of the memorandum, and acted upon it for three hundred years, appears to me to be conclusive." This argument is an impregnable position which no assault can touch.

The Ascension.

By the Rev. W. D. ALLEN, M.A.,
Formerly Fellow and Tutor of Magdalen College, Oxford.

IN Matthew there is no notice of the Ascension. Matthew has for its basis the Palestinian Christian Catechisms. (1) James, the brother of the Lord, was not a witness of the Ascension. The witnesses were "the Apostles whom the Lord chose"—*i.e.*, the eleven. (2) The main interest of the Gospel is the Galilean ministry. The mount by the Sea of Galilee is the scene of the opening and the close of that ministry.

Mark xvi. 20 is ascribed to Aristion, a disciple of the Lord, coupled by Papias with St. John as a living authority in the Church at the time that Papias was writing (A.D. 90-100). It is a short summary; it records, with insistence upon their priority, the appearances to Mary Magdalene and to the two travellers. After these comes an appearance to the eleven. Words spoken by our Lord, probably upon various occasions, are given in concise substance. "After He had spoken to them" (no date or place is mentioned), "He was received up into heaven, and sat down on the right hand of God." The Ascension, *i.e.*, is *an event in time*, which occurred after Resurrection appearances of the Lord. As to its manner, it is conceived as the taking up of Elijah (2 Kings ii.); and as to its result, it corresponds to the sure mercies of David (Ps. cx.).

St. Peter (1 Ep. iii. 22), writing of the Ascension, uses the word "*journeyed*" (*cf.* Acts i. 10, 11): "gazing into heaven as He *journeyed*," "ye saw Him *journeying* unto heaven." St. John uses the same word: "I *go* to prepare a place for you" (John xiv. 2, 3), "I *go* to My Father" (John xiv. 12), etc. "I *ascend*" is the common Johannine term. St. Peter also has (Acts ii. 33) "*exalted*"; *cf.* St. Paul, Phil. ii. 9. In St. Paul, too, we find both "*received up*" (1 Tim. iii. 16), "was received up in glory," and "*ascended*" (Eph. iv. 9): "He that descended

is He also that ascended" high above all the heavens. Heb. iv. 14 speaks of the Lord as "having *gone through* the heavens."

St. John, like St. Paul, contrasts the "descending" with the "ascending." The Lord (John vi.) is "the Bread of Heaven that cometh down from heaven," and in John iii. 13, "No one hath ascended into heaven, except He who out of heaven came down." The Incarnation, *i.e.*, is a coming down. In John vi. 62 the Ascension is a *visible event.* "If, then, ye behold the Son of Man ascending where He was at the first?" and in John xx. 17, "Go, tell My brethren that I ascend," is evidently a message concerning *an event* presently to take place.

It is to be remembered that the Ascension is, as in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the exaltation of One made like unto ourselves, who carrieth with Him through the heavens, into the Holy of Holies, His human nature—spirit, soul and body: "This same Jesus" (Acts i. 11). Our own life in heaven in the age to come is like the life of Jesus—life in a body. The natural body may be transformed into a spiritual body, from glory to glory, but through the transformations its identity remains.

If we come to narratives, the only narratives properly so called of the Ascension are by the same writer, in Luke xxiv. and Acts i. They are both concise summaries supplementing one another. That in Luke is most compressed, but it records *the place:* "He led them out as far as towards Bethany." He led them out, *i.e.*, from the place where they had been "gathered together"—probably the "upper room." Luke speaks of the eleven, and others with them, but from Acts i. 2 it is clear that the eleven only, "the Apostles whom the Lord chose" were the witnesses. "Towards Bethany" may mean as far as the borders of the village—*i.e.*, the foot of the descent of the Mount of Olives. Acts i. 12 gives the exact distance from Jerusalem. Luke has no note of *time;* Acts i. 3 specifies the *forty days*, but incidentally. Luke alone records that the last act of the Lord was to "bless them," "lifting up His hands." Acts omits to note it. Luke says, "was parted

from them." This should be compared, not with the "was received up" of Acts i. 2, but with the "was lifted away" of Acts i. 9. "Was received up" is the technical creed form for the Ascension into heaven; "was parted from them" and "was lifted away" are the first steps of the Ascension, and are visible (contrast Luke xxiv. 31: "became invisible away from them"); the "and was being carried up into heaven," inserted in the second edition of Luke, corresponds to the "journeying into heaven" of Acts i. 10, and is necessary to complete the sense for those who have not already knowledge.

For the "adoration" of Luke, which is also of his second edition, we have in Acts only "a steady gazing into heaven"; and Luke also, in harmony with this adoration, marks the joy that filled the eyewitnesses. On their return, in Luke xxiv. 53, they are occupied with praising God in the Temple; in Acts i. 13, with earnest prayer for the Holy Spirit in the "upper room."

There is to be noticed still, in Acts i. 9, that a cloud received Him away from their eyes after He was lifted away. There was such a cloud at the Transfiguration, and it was luminous, comparable to the Shechinah, an emanation of His glory. Beholding this cloud, in Acts i. 9, they behold "Him" as He journeyed into heaven, till the vision of angels takes its place. The luminous cloud is one with Him.

The gist of the angelic message is that the Lord would come again—"this same Jesus"—"in like manner" as they saw Him go. The Second Coming, Parousia, Epiphany of the Son of Man, would be, *i.e.*, with clouds—"descending in the air." It is plain, then, that those who believed in a Parousia of such a kind would believe without difficulty, and naturally, in an ascension of the same kind, and *vice versa*. St. Matthew and St. James, *e.g.*, believed in such a Parousia at the last day. He to whom the kingdom is given is "One like unto a Son of Man."

We have seen that the creed term, "was received or taken up," recalls Elijah, who in 2 Kings ii. "was taken up" and "went up." So that this narrative has both the New Testament expressions. Elisha saw Elijah as he went, and because he saw him

received a double portion of his spirit. The "was taken up" of the creed form in Mark xvi., Acts i., 1 Tim. iii. 16, presupposes, *i.e.*, a reference to the ascension of Elijah. An ascension like that of Elijah, and coupled with an outpouring of the Spirit, is the foundation of the creed form. *The narrative of the event*, i.e., *is earlier than the earliest creed form. Possibly*, the idea of such an ascension *may* have been begotten in the minds of the eleven by words or prophecies of the Lord, and in their exalted, ecstatic state they *may* have been deceived. The luminous cloud ascending and the angelic vision *may have been* illusions. Such a theory presupposes, however, not only such an expectation or idea in the witnesses, but some occurrence that gave rise to the illusion then and there. It presupposes, *i.e.*, the "parted from them," "lifted away from them," and even some kind of cloud receiving the Lord.

The illusion, then, is reduced to a narrow compass. "*Going into heaven*" is imagination, set up by the predictive word of the Lord; but *the parting from them, the lifting up away from them, and the cloud receiving Him*, are facts reported. For the rest they relied on the word of the Lord. He was ascending to His Father and their Father, His God and their God, as He predicted that He would. They had no contrary prejudices. Heaven for them was above. Through heaven after heaven, several or seven, the way lay upward to the Holy of Holies. The journey to heaven for them was as certainly upward through space as the ascent to the Hill of the Lord, or Mount Sion. We who have the contrary prejudices stumble at the fact. We ought, then, surely to stumble at the resurrection of the body, at the thought of a human life in the body in the heavenly places. The Ascension filled the minds of the beholders with joy, because it guaranteed that impossible hope, and the Ascension beheld was the foundation, too, of the confident expectation of spiritual strength from above.

We are invited to believe in the spiritual truths symbolized by the creed forms and the mythic narrative, but to reject the husks of literalism. We may ask at least for definition of these

spiritual truths. What are they? The invitation is intelligible if we would sweep away as mythic the supernatural *en bloc.* The ascent into heaven of Jesus expresses, then, the confident certainty of the disciples that the teaching, principles, and methods, of Jesus are "set down at the right hand of God"—*i.e.*, are the teachings, principles, and methods, that are certain to dominate the human race. Mankind will recognize in Him the Saviour, Example, Pattern, and Sovereign, of their race. The foundations are firmly laid, and He sits expecting till His enemies be made His footstool. The moment that we begin to speak of an immortality or a life of the world to come in any other sense than that of a new and better earthly life—in that moment we are involved in endless confusions, if we attempt to separate the fact visible from the truth conveyed. Christianity, *e.g.*, teaches resurrection of the body; the body may be transformed from glory to glory, but it preserves its identity. Human nature, however angelic it may become, preserves its identity. Human relationships continue. Human relationships in human conceptions are relationships of beings in space. The life of the world to come cannot be divested of the notions of life in a better Galilee, a new Jerusalem, a heavenly city, country, or Paradise.

Even the notions of rest in love imply some externalities in form; "in the bosom" of Abraham or of God, "with Christ," "in Jesus," "with the saints," are terms that express spiritual links of spirit to spirit. But unable as we may be to define the clothing, the spirit will be, not unclothed, but clothed upon. Not even God is unclothed. He, too, has a form corresponding to His nature, and a glory visible.

The Ascension visible is the very ground of our assurance of this spiritual faith; whatever difficulties beset the one beset the other. We are afraid of anthropomorphisms. The most subtle of all anthropomorphisms is the anthropomorphism of the Transcendentalist. The process of arriving at Pure Being by abstracting the particulars has for its end Pure Nothing. The characteristic dogma of Christianity is that "all things" do not

come out of "Pure Nothing" but "out from the Father." "True Being" is manifest in sensible forms; by senses it perceives and is perceived. There may be—there doubtless are—other senses than ours; the same True Being may be manifest, perceive, and be perceived, in as many divers ways as there are divers "mansions" for it. There may be transitions from mansion to mansion, but True Being is never naked or homeless, and is always itself. God Himself perceives; God is not He who is eyeless, but He who sees through *all eyes* at will. He beholds the visible beauty of His universe, with its colours, even the bow in the cloud. He who beholds the visible beauty is not philosophically absolute. Eternal life is not a life that belongs to no age; it is a life that endures through "all the ages," and in every age has its own expression—the form, *i.e.*, that is proper to it; it is impatient of each age in its turn as imperfect, and is itself already suited for a better. There is nothing in human philosophy that forbids belief in the Ascension as a fact. There are philosophies that are inconsistent with it. But what have we to do with Platonisms, or Neo-Platonisms, or pure Transcendentalisms?

The scientific objections to the Ascension are some of them such as lie against all miracle—some of them special; special is, *e.g.*, the stumbling-block of "up and down"; "up" and "down" have lost their meaning; "the antipodes have been discovered"; "solar systems, and terrestrial or celestial revolutions round axes or suns," have become the commonplaces of our children's schools. The narrative of the Ascension implies therefore, it is said, a conception of the universe that is now known to be false. "In the old times some things were above and some things below; now all things are upside down and topsy-turvy."

When we know the shape of the universe, whether "all things" are in the form of a revolving ball, or outside or inside a ball, or are perhaps a solid cube with substantial foundations, or are set in a plane surface with "nothing" above or below them, it will be time seriously to consider these naïvetés.

Another kind of objection is that, in passing through the heavens, atmospheres would cease, voids would be met with, and human life or any life would be impossible without constant transformations *en route*. If fools might be answered according to their folly, we might answer that the cloud perchance carried with it the preserving conditions of life, or that even the Lord had life in Himself.

The Ascension is without doubt the crowning miracle of the Gospel. It is the last and greatest stumbling-block. It is also the last and final witness (for those that have followed the Lord) of the sovereignty and power of Him in whom they have trusted. They that were chosen to see the Ascension had passed through a long probation, from stumbling-block to stumbling-block. Miracles had been a stumbling-block, and the lack of miracles a stumbling-block. They had been children of the "all things," and asked of the Lord how these things could be. They had been children of rash belief, and asked for miracles at every turn. The Cross had scattered them, and the Resurrection had gathered them. In one great crisis nothing held them to the Lord but their assurance that He alone had the words of living truth. In the last great crisis even that assurance failed them. Truth itself in Him lay dead, was buried in His sepulchre. Truth itself was false, and the lie that stalked the earth was true. The Ascension was the crowning witness to them that the Truth itself was true and alive for evermore. They worshipped, they rejoiced, they praised God and waited for the promise of that Spirit who is the Lord and Giver of Life. Can this Man give us His flesh to eat, His blood to drink, make us partakers of the life for evermore? Does this offend you? If, then, ye behold the Son of Man ascending where He was before?

The Ascension is a fact in a sequence, an event in a life; it is, again, a fact in a sequence and a turning-point in lives; it is, again, a fact in a sequence and a turning-point in history. The study of it begins with the study of a Person; the first attraction of this Person is that He alone has the words of eternal life;

the final knowledge of Him is that He has in Himself life and the power of life. Power over "all things," over "Nature" and "natural laws," is an essential element in the power of eternal life. If we are the children or servants of "all things," we are fast bound by heredity and environment. They that put "all things" in the place of God rivet the chains of Nature on their inner moral or spiritual life. The Person who ascends up into heaven has power to quicken the souls and bodies of men. The disciples' experience of Jesus is not that He has words of truth only, or in Himself holiness; it is the experience, also, of one who manifests His glory in mastery over "all things." The Ascension is the last in a series of such manifestations of power. Even before the Resurrection there were cognate energies. The storm was quelled; He came to men walking on the sea. It is not scientific, then, to approach the Ascension as though it were the ascension of *quivis homo*, or to dismiss the Ascension as incredible because it overrides "laws of Nature"; to override "laws of Nature" is the very purpose and profession of the Ascension, and He that ascended into heaven is not *quivis homo*, but He who came down from heaven.

Science, indeed, has the business of exploring things possible for *quivis homo*, for "the man in the street"; Christ also died, rose again, and ascended into heaven, for *quivis homo*. Science and the religion of Christ come so into contact; but they come into contact just at this one point: "Is the power of a new life, breaking the bands of sin and nature, given to them who 'see the Lord ascending'?" The answer is written in the history of the Christian Church and in the experience continually renewed from age to age of all who are blessed in believing.

Science, if it deal with the Ascension, must consider, first, not whether *quivis homo*, "the man in the street," can ascend into heaven just as he is, but whether *quivis homo*, believing with all his heart in the Ascension of this same Jesus, is not therein and thereby blessed within himself with the power of a new life.

The Church and the Poor.

A SERIES OF HISTORICAL SKETCHES.

By W. EDWARD CHADWICK, D.D., B.Sc.

V.

The Middle Ages.

1. *Institutional Relief: The Hospitals and Monasteries.*

THE greatest of all influences upon Christian doctrine throughout the Middle Ages was undoubtedly that of St. Augustine. His teaching had also an immense effect upon the ideas of charity. Harnack shows quite clearly that it was as a "reformer of piety" that Augustine's really greatest work was done.[1] To understand the influence of Augustine upon the medieval theory of charity it is necessary to notice the following sequence of ideas[2]: Augustine starts from the thesis that love or desire (*amor* or *cupido*) is the strongest of all powers which man can use in his efforts to assert or express himself—an effort which is implied in the very consciousness of life or possession of vital energy. Next Augustine taught that the highest and sweetest enjoyment (the object of love) was to be found in the sense of the love of God (the Well of Life and the Fountain of all Good), and therefore from the certainty of "grace." Now, love, like faith, springs from God, for both are the means whereby we enter into communion with God, and are enabled to appropriate Him. Man's redemption through Christ Jesus "takes place through grace and love, and in turn through faith and love." In this process the part or action of love is *humbly* to renounce all that is its own, and to long for God and His law.

[1] "Augustine is in the first place to be estimated . . . as a reformer of Christian piety" (Harnack, "Hist. of Dogma," Eng. trans., vol. v., p. 67).

[2] For a brief summary of Augustine's line of thought, see Loch, "Charity and Social Life," p. 252 *et seq.* See also Harnack, "Das Mönchthum, seine Ideale und seine Geschichte," p. 36 *et seq.*

Moreover, the peace of God is shed upon the soul which has the living God for its Friend. That which mars this Divine peace is sin. And the misery of sin overcome by faith, humility, and love, is Christian piety. In this temper the Christian must live.[1]

It will at once be seen that this doctrine was capable of wide application. The direction of thought was introspective, and turned the mind "towards hope, asceticism, and the contemplation of God in worship."[2] Thus, by Augustine's doctrine a high value was given to a life in which these three elements were paramount. The first—hope—could not be connected with any one form or expression of Christianity more than another; but for asceticism and the contemplation of God in worship it was felt that the monastic life offered the fullest opportunity.[3]

Hence in the early Middle Ages we witness an immense growth in monasticism, and an attempt, generally successful, to teach that the religious life and the monastic life were identical, so much so that those living the monastic life were ultimately regarded as "the religious"—that is, those who attempted and achieved a higher and more perfect form of Christianity than those living in "the world."[4] Gradually all that was connected with Christianity became more or less connected with monasticism, and, among other Christian works or duties, that of charity or the relief of the poor. Western monasticism did not in any way owe its origin to Augustine, but undoubtedly in its rapid growth it received an immense impetus from his teaching, and especially from his conception of Christian piety.

I now propose to give a brief account of the work done by

[1] See Harnack, *ibid.*, vol. v., p. 71. [2] Loch, *ibid.*, p. 253.

[3] Upon the influence of Augustine upon Bernard, whom he terms *Augustinus redivivus*, see Harnack, vol. vi., p. 10. How Bernard, and after him Francis of Assisi, revived belief in the historical Christ must not be forgotten.

[4] On monasticism as a return to the aristocratic tendencies of the old world, see Uhlhorn, "Charity in the Ancient Church," p. 340 *et seq.*; also Harnack, "Das Mönchthum," p. 49: "Das abendländische Mönchthum war bis zum Schlusse des zwölften Jahrhunderts auch noch ganz wesentlich eine aristokeratische Institution gewesen."

the Church for the poor through *institutions* (whether monastic or otherwise) during the early Middle Ages. The subject is an immense one, and all I can hope to do is to indicate the points of chief importance. I may at once state that, certainly from the fourth century, we see the system which to-day is termed "institutional relief" carried on side by side with that which is now known as "home aliment," and, at any rate so far as the Church was concerned, gradually superseding it.

The earliest institutions for the relief of the poor were the xenodochia—literally, houses for strangers, but in which there were frequently lodged all who needed an asylum: viz., travellers, sick, widows, orphans; indeed, practically all who suffered from poverty or inability to maintain themselves. I cannot here deal with the subject of pre-Christian hospices—such, for instance, as those connected with temples of Æsculapius,[1] or Jewish inns at which no money was taken.[2] I must confine myself strictly to Christian institutions.

Some have considered that the xenodochia, or hospitals (in the true, but not present, sense of the word), mark a downward step in Christian charity. Much more probably they were an attempt to cope with altered conditions and with new needs. When Christians were few, so would be the number of these requiring shelter and care. It would then be possible to provide for such persons in the houses of bishops or private members of the Church.[3] But when, after the conversion of the Empire, the number of Christians enormously increased, it became necessary to establish special institutions for them. Originally, as I have already implied, the xenodochion sheltered people needing help from various causes; but later we find a variety of institutions each devoted to a special class of sufferers.[4]

It is impossible to say when the first xenodochia were founded. There seems to be no trustworthy evidence of their

[1] Uhlhorn, p. 323. [2] Loch, p. 196. [3] 1 Tim. iii. 2.

[4] In the Cod. Just., lib. i., tit. ii., l., 22, we have, *e.g.*, ptochotrophia, orphanotrophia, gerontocomia, noscomia, brephotrophia, etc. Institutions for the blind, the dumb, and for lunatics, also existed (Ratzinger, pp. 143, 144).

existence during the reign of Constantine. The first indubitable proof that they did exist comes from the letter of Julian to Arascius, in which Julian orders that a xenodochion shall be established in every city, and for which he makes legal provision.[1] From the letter it appears to be clear that Julian was led to do this by the examples of Christian xenodochia and ptochotrophia, which then evidently existed widely. About A.D. 370 Basil founded his famous hospital at Cæsarea in Cappadocia, though before that ptochotrophia existed there. Epiphanius tells of them in Pontus, and when Chrysostom preached in Antioch there was one there; he himself founded two in Constantinople.[2]

From the East the xenodochion passed over into the West, and at first, even in Italy, the hospital was known by this name rather than by the Latin terms *hospitale* or *hospitium*. The first hospitals in the West are supposed to have been the house for the sick founded by Fabiola in Rome, and the house for strangers established by Pammachius at Portus (Oporto). But they did not multiply in the West as they did in the East. There were no xenodochia in Milan during the bishopric of Ambrose, and Augustine mentions them as a novelty; Pope Symmachus founded three, and Belisarius founded and endowed one in Rome. In Gaul they existed by the middle of the sixth century, and a little later "a home for strangers and the poor was reckoned among necessary ecclesiastical arrangements."[3] It is interesting to notice that according to the plan of Basil the xenodochion was not to be merely a refuge for the wayfarer and the sick; it was also to be an asylum for the workless. It was actually to combine the idea of the hospital and the workhouse in the fullest sense of the latter word.[4]

At first, whether founded by the bishop himself or by laypeople, the xenodochion was strictly under the personal control of the bishop of the diocese.[5] He chose the superintendent,

[1] Uhlhorn, p. 326. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 327. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 329.

[4] Ratzinger, "Armenpflege," p. 142: "Er wollte . . . die Idee eines Hospitals mit der eines Arbeitshauses combiniren."

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 145, who quotes Häfer: "Auch in diesem Zeitraume gab es unter den Presbytern viele tüchtige Aerzte."

who was a priest, and laid down stringent rules with regard to both the receipts and the expenditure. Upon the bishop also lay the responsibility of protecting the property of the institution. The care of the sick was entrusted to deaconesses and widows, who were maintained by the Church. There were also frequently lay-brothers who gave assistance, and physicians were not wanting.[1] In the East one class of helpers in connection with the xenodochia were the *Parabolani*, whose duty was to seek out the sick and suffering and to bring them in; then there were the *Copiates*, who buried the dead.[2] There were also some who sought to atone for former sins by gratuitously serving in these hospitals.

Before proceeding to consider the monastery, as the other great institution for the relief of the poor, I may notice that between the xenodochion, or hospital, and the monastery there were many connections and similarities; indeed, the two institutions were frequently found in combination. Each revealed features of the other.[3] Those who ministered in the xenodochia generally lived a monastic life, and Gregory the Great goes so far as to require that only the *religiosi* (*i.e.*, monks) should be chosen as presidents of the hospitals.[4] Another point of connection lies here: both classes of institutions gradually escaped from episcopal control. They became more and more independent, and only subject to the Pope or the King or to the heads and members of their Order. Further, both hospitals and monasteries began to place themselves under some common rule and to become members of some common Order. From these various reasons they were able to become more independent channels of relief, and frequently the means at their command for dispensing this were far greater than either those of the bishop or of the parochial clergy.[5]

I have no intention of dealing with the subject of monasticism generally[6]; I am only concerned with it as an instrument

[1] Ratzinger, p. 145. [2] Uhlhorn, p. 335.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 336. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 337. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 338.
[6] One of the ablest and most judicious examinations of the whole subject will be found in Professor Harnack's lecture, "Das Mönchthum, seine Ideale und seine Geschichte."

for the relief of the poor. Two points I have already made clear: First, that the changes in doctrine due to Augustine and others ministered to its growth, because they put a high value on those virtues which were specially the product of the monastic life, or could be best cultivated by that life; secondly, because, in the rough times which followed the break-up of the old Empire, undoubtedly the monasteries did a work which no other institution, so far as we can see, could have done; they met an urgent need.

One most valuable service which the monasteries rendered should never be forgotten. They emphasized the obligation of work.[1] In this they were entirely true to the teaching of the New Testament.[2] The old world, with its aristocratic tendencies, had despised manual labour of almost every kind. It regarded it as a painful necessity, which whenever possible should be delegated to others who could support themselves in no other way. To work was the avocation of the slave, not of the free man—indeed, not of anyone who could in any way escape doing it.

The monasteries were the birthplaces of free labour.[3] In them was first asserted that the practice of work was an evidence of Christian life. In Holy Scripture, as is well known, work and benevolence are connected; the one found the means for the other.[4] So it was in the monasteries. We must not imagine that their endowments, furnished by others, were the sole source of the wealth of the monasteries. These certainly were often great; but where, as in the monasteries, we find diligent work combined with considerable skill, there wealth generally increases. Then, in the monasteries there was work in combination; we may say that they were the earliest co-operative associations. Basil in his rules for monks clearly states that it

[1] Ratzinger, p. 146 *et seq.* [2] 1 Thess. iv. 11; 2 Thess. iii. 8, 11.

[3] "Entstanden in der absterbenden rörmischen Welt die Klostergemeinden, n welchen die beiden grossen Principien der freien Arbeit und der Verwerthung des Besitzes im Dienste Aller ihre Verwirklichung fanden" (Ratzinger, *ibid.*).

[4] Eph. iv. 28.

is among the duties of a monk to work[1]; he further states that the chief object of his work must be to support the needy.[2] His directions as to the kind of work to be chosen are eminently practical. The monks must think what kind of raw material can be most easily procured in the neighbourhood, and they must try to make what will command a ready sale.[3] Augustine wrote a book on "The Work of Monks." According to the Rule of St. Benedict, the day began with four hours of work; after dinner there was a time of rest, then work until supper, and after supper more work. The diet of the monks was to be regulated according to the amount of hard work to be done. The monks, of course, were great cultivators; they were excellent agriculturists, and in those days, besides there being immense tracts of land which needed to be brought into cultivation, there was also, especially in France, much land which during troublous times had become almost a desert and required to be recultivated.[4] From the monks the new nations learnt both agriculture and handicraft. Lastly, according to the Rule of St. Benedict, among other works to which a monk was particularly to devote himself was that of philanthropy[5]; having provided the means for this, he must expend those means upon it. Work in the monasteries was also sometimes regarded as a moral restorative, as not merely a sign of penitence, but as a means of expiation and forgiveness.[6] It was even regarded as more important than fasting. If fasting hindered work, then fasting must give way.[7] We must also remember that the monastery was the home of "common possession."[8] Thus, at least ideally, the monastic life was a safeguard against covetousness. A well-regulated monastery was

[1] "In der Regel des hl. Basilius bildet die Arbeit den Angelpunkt des ganzen Mönchlebens" (Ratzinger, p. 148).
[2] Uhlhorn, "Christian Charity in the Ancient Church," p. 353.
[3] *Ibid.*
[4] "Sie roden Wälder aus, sie schaffen Wüsteneien zu Ackerland" (Harnack, "Das Mönchthum," p. 41).
[5] Uhlhorn, p. 359.
[6] "Als sittlicher Beruf und als Mittel der Busse, Sühne, und Erlösung" (Ratzinger, p. 147).
[7] Basil, Regul. 38.
[8] Ratzinger, p. 148.

an enormous boon to the district surrounding it—sometimes, indeed, to those living far away, for cases are on record where not only money, but even supplies of such necessaries as corn, were sent long distances to those in need.[1] One of the most effectual ways of helping the poor is by providing education for their children. The monasteries did a great work in this way.[2] Connected with, or rather as part of, them there was generally a school in which many a poor boy obtained the learning which afterwards enabled him to live a life of usefulness, and not infrequently to rise to a position of eminence. In the nunneries girls were also taught much that was useful to them in later years.[3] Then, there can be no doubt that the best monks and the best-organized monasteries (as communities) exercised an immense influence through the examples of "spiritual heroism" which they exhibited, and the power of a community which has risen to this level is always greater than the power exercised by even a number of independent individuals.[4]

One cause of the enlarged power of the monasteries to help the poor must not be forgotten. During the rough ages of feudalism undoubtedly much robbery of the funds of parish churches took place.[5] Feudal barons, and even feudal bishops, were guilty of this crime. When strong ecclesiastical rulers arose, they compelled these to disgorge at least a portion of their ill-gotten gains. But very frequently what they gave up was bestowed upon the monasteries rather than upon the parishes.[6] For this course the following reason was given: By "the poor"—for whose support, according to the ancient custom of the Church, a portion of the Church's wealth should be devoted—was meant, not the poor people in the parishes, but the monks and nuns, who for the Gospel's sake had renounced all, and had "for Christ's sake become poor." They are the true *pauperes Christi*.[7] This was the theory maintained in the

[1] Uhlhorn, p. 359.
[2] Both Basil and Chrysostom lay stress on this.
[3] Ratzinger, p. 150 (who quotes Augustine for this).
[4] Ratzinger, p. 151. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 282. [6] *Ibid.*
[7] *Ibid.* (Ratzinger gives the authorities for this).

False Decretals, which, in spite of their origin, exercised an immense influence over the customs of the Church.[1] Peter the Venerable, Abbot of Clugny, appealed to the practical advantages of the change: "Who is best entitled to the gifts of the faithful, the monks who constantly pray to God on behalf of sinners, or the worldly clergy, who, as one sees, expend all their energies on the increase of their possessions and entirely neglect the care of souls?"[2] It must not be inferred that the poor always ultimately suffered. It was not that the final disposition or object of the Church's wealth was altogether changed; what was altered was the channel through which it was dispensed. For a considerable period (except perhaps in England)[3] relief of the poor through the parochial clergy practically ceased; it became the work of the monasteries. Ratzinger states that in the Decretal of Gratian, "which from the middle of the twelfth century was regarded as a standard handbook in the Church," there is no mention of any recognized system of relief (other than monastic).[4] One result of this neglect was an enormous increase of mendicancy, to check which many attempts were made, but without much result.[5] This is an instance of an experience of which the history of poor relief furnishes only too many examples—namely, that every change of system falls heavily for a time upon some particular class. Undoubtedly, the dissolution of the monasteries at the time of the Reformation increased, at least temporarily, the amount of extreme poverty. This was again the case, at least for a few years, after the enactment of the "New" Poor Law in 1834.

[1] Upon "The False Decretals," see Milman, "Latin Christianity," vol. iii., p. 190 *et seq.*

[2] Ratzinger, p. 282.

[3] Upon this Ratzinger is very positive: "In England erhielt sich das ganze Mittelalter hindurch die kirchliche Gemeinde-Armenpflege, wie sie im karolingische Zeitalter geordnet worden war" (p. 421; see also authorities quoted).

[4] "In dem *Decretum Gratiani* . . . findet sich keine Spur mehr von einer geordneten kirchlichen Armenpflege" (Ratzinger, p. 305 *et seq.*).

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 307.

2. *St. Francis of Assisi: The Mendicants.*

There was one movement in the later Middle Ages which had far-reaching consequences, and to which more than a passing reference must be made, though actually this movement had, on the whole, far less direct connection with our present subject than is generally supposed.[1] I refer to the work of the mendicant Orders, and especially to that of St. Francis of Assisi. In his work some of the most dominating ideas of the Middle Ages, both theological and social, find their clearest expression. Francis, like Augustine, was a "reformer of piety." It is his conception of the Christian life, founded upon certain doctrines—in which the true and the false were strangely blended—that is the key to his work and that of his followers.[2] Actually to understand this conception, we ought to go behind Francis to St. Bernard and his teaching of "humility before God and love to the sorely suffering Redeemer." But it was in Francis, as it has been well said, that "the chord—humility, love, and obedience—was struck with the greatest purity, while the tone which he lent to it was the most melting." We have already seen the high estimate attached (at least in theory) to poverty throughout the Middle Ages. In fact, there is almost an assumption that poverty and righteousness are necessarily allied. A natural consequence of this was the extreme sanctity attributed to voluntary poverty. But the doctrine had another and very evil issue. As poverty was a state to be admired, it was not a condition to be abolished. Endless efforts were made to relieve it, to mitigate its sufferings, but none to remove its causes. It is upon the philanthropy of St. Francis that stress is usually laid; but it is to his theology that we should

[1] The Friars were primarily preachers; they produced the great thinkers and theologians of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries; they gave a new impetus to science and art, also to politics. In this connection, Dr. Workman points out that "In the coming of the friars, to a lesser extent also in the earlier monastic movement, we note the most successful effort ever made towards constructive socialism" ("Christ and Civilization," p. 296).

[2] Harnack, "History of Dogma," vol. vi., p. 85 *et seq.* (Harnack points out how Sabatier's charming "Life of St. Francis" needs to be read with discriminating criticism.)

rather pay attention, for this is the true key to his conduct. The central ideal of St. Francis was "imitation of the poor life of Jesus," but poverty meant more than this; it meant imitation of the apostolic life, "the life of the pilgrim preacher." It meant the life of service, issuing in warm compassion and in self-abasement, expressed in preaching repentance, but also in deeds of mercy of very various kinds.[1]

Both to the student of history and to the student of social science, the life and method of St. Francis are full of interest. From him we learn both what to cultivate and of what to beware. His teaching is full of paradoxes, which are ever the danger of extremists. While he revived the truth of the value of the individual, he (as Bishop Westcott points out) destroyed individuality.[2] He ignored the truth which every scientifically-minded philanthropist realizes, that it is not in the destruction of individuality, but in its purification and transformation, in awakening it to a nobler energy and a keener sense of responsibility, that hope lies. The imperfect, or perhaps rather disproportionate, creed of St. Francis had one fatal result: "The tender devotion of Francis to the Lord's manhood became the occasion of grievous error. Everything that is compassionate in the character of the Lord was separated from His sovereign righteousness."[3] If in our dealings with the poor we forget that these two cannot be separated, our work is doomed to failure. I have seen case after case ruined because together with sympathy for suffering and help in distress there did not go a demand for the fulfilment of the law of righteousness. In spite of his wonderful powers of humility, sympathy, self-sacrifice, and faith, the work of Francis, if measured by the test of permanently benefiting the condition of the poor, cannot be pronounced a success.

[1] Harnack, vol. vi., p. 85.

[2] "Social Aspects of Christianity," p. 109 *et seq.* Bishop Westcott also points out how Francis "disregarded also the Divine office of nations for the race. He strove . . . to seize the conception of humanity without recognizing the form of life through which God is pleased to reveal to us the rich fulness of the whole" (p. 110).

[3] Westcott, *ibid.*, p. 111.

If Francis of Assisi represents the highest point reached in the Middle Ages in charity on its active and practical, we might also add on its emotional, side, it is Thomas Aquinas, the great Dominican, who has bequeathed to us the completest exposition of the theory of medieval charity.[1] To him alms are the instrument of pity, and their effects are tested by the recipient being moved to pray for the benefactor. The gift should simply meet the actual necessities of the recipient. He seems to hold it is better to give a little to many rather than much to one. Thomas (though an Aristotelian) does not press the importance of purpose in the giver, and he forgets "that gifts without purpose and reciprocity foster the dependence they are designed to meet."[2] To Thomas there are seven spiritual acts—to counsel, sustain, teach, console, save, pardon, and pray; there are also seven corporal acts—to clothe, to give drink to, to feed, to free from prison, to shelter, to assist in sickness, and to bury. These of course became "good works"; they availed, as boons after this life, and later became connected with indulgences.[3] With him, as with other medieval teachers, the benefit of almsgiving is primarily to the donor; the deed itself, and not its usefulness or results, is the first consideration. "An extreme inducement is placed on giving . . . but none on the personal or social utility of the gift." In all this we can see that the social aims and social purposes of charity were ignored, and thus its power for good was neutralized.

Before closing this article I will attempt to gather up the lessons to be learnt from a study of the spirit and methods of charity during the Middle Ages. First, the Church's methods were governed by the theology then dominant—in other words, by the religious views then current. Here, as always, doctrine is the motive power of conduct. Throughout we find the con-

[1] On the doctrinal position of Thomas, see Harnack, "History of Dogma," vol. vi., p. 149 *et seq.* Many quotations from Thomas upon Charity will be found in Ratzinger's footnotes, p. 381 *et seq.* Also see Loch, "Charity and Social Life," p. 257 *et seq.*

[2] Loch, p. 261.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 262.

viction that poverty in itself is a state to be honoured[1]; it is not a condition to be abolished, but to be relieved. There is never any effort to remove its causes. If pauperism means dependence, there is no organized attack upon pauperism. Then, we have the gradual transference of poor relief from the parochial clergy to the monastic institutions. From the tenth century onwards—except in England and in the case of the poor on the great estates, for whom the owners of these were responsible—the relief of distress was almost entirely the work of the monasteries and the hospitals. It has been charged against the Church that she did little to abolish slavery and serfdom. But we must remember the conditions of the age, and that so long as serfdom existed there was secured to the serf at least the means of subsistence. The Church, with her immense estates, was probably the largest serf-holder, and there is evidence to show that her serfs were generally far better treated than those of lay proprietors.[2] Great as some of the evils connected with the system undoubtedly were, we may question whether in its practical working medieval serfdom was quite so evil as it seems to us to-day. "We may well doubt whether the landless peasantry of modern England, though nominally free, is in reality much better off than the medieval villain whose land was secured to him by custom."[3]

The doctrine of almsgiving in the Middle Ages was weakest from its strongly self-regarding aspect. But we must remember that this evil is far from having wholly passed away. To-day there

[1] "The Middle Ages—unlike the twentieth century—was not afraid of poverty; poverty was not the one evil of life which more than any other must be shunned. So far from looking upon poverty as a crime or stigma, the medieval Church erred rather in the opposite direction in elevating poverty, provided it was voluntary, into the mark of saintliness. . . . The Church of the Middle Ages was at least true to its Founder in refusing to recognize the ideal of life in the successful millionaire" (Dr. Workman in "Christ and Civilization," p. 301).

[2] "The abolition of serfdom was hindered by the great number of serfs attached to the estates of the Church. Many of these were originally free peasants who had bartered their liberty for the greater security and protection which the spiritual overlord could give them" (Dr. Workman in "Christ and Civilization," p. 298).

[3] *Ibid.*

are thousands of people who give rather to salve their own consciences than because (after having taken all possible trouble to find out the real needs of those who ask assistance, and how best to supply this) they are anxious to give the best help they can.

Undoubtedly, medieval philanthropy came to its fairest flower in the work of St. Francis of Assisi, and I may be charged with having done far less than justice to the work which he and his followers accomplished. But we must remember that the movement very rapidly changed its character. At first, both in spirit and method, it was intensely democratic. It took religion and charity outside the monastery into the common life of the people. The needs of the people were studied and supplied where they existed, especially in the poorer quarters of the towns. This was well. But, on the other hand, the glorification of dependence preached by Francis and his followers produced a rich crop of permanent evil. It made begging more than ever a profession, and one to which there should be no shame attached. Archbishop Trench, in his "Lectures upon Medieval Church History," goes so far as to assert that the want of self-respect still evinced in this matter in certain parts of Europe is an inheritance from the followers of St. Francis, and that, "little as he foresaw or intended this, he did much to bequeath to those lands the eating sore of an almost universal mendicancy."[1] Thus, the purest intentions coupled with enthusiasm will not avail to promote the welfare of the people where we find either ignorance or neglect of those laws upon obedience to which social welfare permanently depends.

[1] P. 246 *et seq.*

Evangelicals and the Problem of Ritualism.

By the Rev. B. HERKLOTS, M.A.,
Vicar of St. Thomas's, Kendal.

THE articles which have appeared on this subject, written by the Dean of St. Aidan's College, Birkenhead, and the Vice-Principal of Ridley Hall, Cambridge, and published in the Churchman for January and March of this year, have given the Evangelical party the lead for which many of its members have for some time been looking in vain. How much has been actually lost to the party by its negative attitude to the problem of Ritualism it would not be easy to estimate. It is disastrous to a party, whether the party be a political or an ecclesiastical one, if, in reference to a great and growing national movement, it has no constructive policy. The best method of defence is generally that of attack. Perhaps the main reason for the political débâcle of 1906 was that the Conservative party had exhausted its ideas, and had no practical policy worth speaking of to put before the country. The exigencies of the times were demanding a positive and constructive attitude to many problems of social reform. The Conservatives went under because they had no policy.

Now, the ecclesiastical position of to-day is analogous to the political position of yesterday. The progress of thought and feeling in the country with regard to the externals of religious worship have produced a somewhat similar state of affairs. The exigencies of the times have been demanding with more and more insistence a positive and constructive attitude to the problems which attach to the externals of the worship of Almighty God in the twentieth century. The Evangelical party has lost ground because it has had no constructive policy with reference to the growing development of the æsthetic sense throughout the nation.

Some might indeed urge that its losses, through the failure to develop a constructive policy towards the question of beauty, dignity, and ceremonial, in Divine worship, have been more

than made up for by the gains which have accrued to it from its emphasis upon the spiritual elements in worship, in contrast to those which are external, ritual, and spectacular. It has stood out conspicuously for that attitude to the externals of worship which was emphatically adopted by the Divine Head of the Church. "God is Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth." And it is just because it has insistently done so that the Evangelical party, though comparatively small in numbers, is becoming increasingly respected in the Church of England. For though as a party the Evangelicals may be small, as a school of thought they are far from small, and are exercising an increasing influence upon other sections of the Church. "When in doubt," Bishop Montgomery is reputed to have said to a gathering of clergy, "play C.M.S.!" But when the question is asked whether the party as such has kept in touch with the growing advance in the artistic perceptions of the nation which the last few years have witnessed, it would not be easy to give a satisfactory answer. We have been going on quietly much as before, with slight improvements here and there in our churches and services, for the most part, as Mr. Dewick and Mr. Derbyshire have reminded us, in the wake of the Ritualists, adopting here and there improvements and usages which they inaugurated, but have since discarded, but totally innocent of, and apparently indifferent to, any formulated policy.

Meanwhile two things have been happening in England. The first is that there has been all through the nation a most remarkable increase in the standard of comfort, due to the possession of increased wealth, which has resulted in a conspicuous improvement in the popular taste. In matters of dress, not only the feminine, but also the masculine portion of the community has made a remarkable advance in the direction of refinement. In matters of house decoration and furnishing, the houses of the poor no less than those of the rich give evidence to an immense development of artistic ideas. We may deplore, and rightly so, the luxury of the age, and the craze for wealth, and all the pleasures, comforts, and embellishments which the posses-

sion of money makes possible. But when we recollect that this increased standard of comfort and beauty is not only to be found in the mansions of the wealthy, but also in varying degrees in the cottages of the working classes, in the homes of the artisans, and in the day schools, where congregate the poorest children from our most squalid slums, we shall see how impossible a thing it is to put back the clock which registers the march of human progress, and to imagine that the ritual of the Evangelicals of the seventies and the eighties is in keeping with the environment of the twentieth century.

The second notable thing is this, that while one party in the Church has pandered in every possible way to the popular demand for the beautiful, the æsthetic, and the spectacular in public worship, and has thereby gained a considerable following in the nation, in spite of the fact that its medieval and sacerdotal pretensions are absolutely and fundamentally opposed to the deep-seated convictions of Englishmen, the other party, which stands for a doctrinal position, which is far more Anglican, and an attitude to the laity which is far more British, has at best made but slow progress because of its negative attitude as a party towards much that is good and pure and beautiful in the spirit of the age.

The Evangelical party has maintained its position even if it has not greatly improved it, because of its spiritual basis, or, in other words, because of its depth. It might, as a party, have made a most notable advance, if it had been characterized by breadth as well as depth, if a broad, far-seeing outlook had been associated with its deep evangelistic and missionary zeal, and its splendid insistence upon the fundamental pre-eminence of the spiritual in contrast to the external in religion.

Now, is it not possible for it to become broad as well as deep? Is there any reason why a deep spirituality should be necessarily associated with a narrow outlook? Cannot we frankly face these developments in the æsthetic sentiments of the nation, and as a party adopt a positive attitude instead of a negative attitude to the national desire for greater beauty and dignity in the externals of religious worship? Cannot we bring the greater refinement of the

nation and its larger access to, and appreciation of, the things that are artistic and beautiful, into closer touch with those great spiritual and Evangelical truths and principles in life and worship which our party stands out conspicuously to represent, both in the Church of England and towards the nation at large? In short, cannot we develop an Evangelical Ritual?

It will be obvious at the outset that such a task would not be "a work of one day or two." The change of front in a party such as ours from that of timid and fearful, if not of open distrust and suspicion, of what is called ritual in any shape or form, to that of frank appreciation of its use, and open adoption of it as a helpful and important accessory to spiritual worship, could only be effected as a result of a gradual and general understanding of, and sympathy with, the changed circumstances of the day. That such a change, were it to come about, would not be without its grave difficulties and dangers is evident. To develop the æsthetic in Divine worship, and yet to lay a great and ever greater emphasis, not on the æsthetic, but on the moral and spiritual elements, would necessitate wise and devout leadership in our party, and equally wise and devout leadership in our individual parishes. It would need more than this. It would need, as Mr. Dewick has well pointed out, the labours of "a rising school of church architects and artists who are at heart Evangelicals, and keen to express Evangelical ideas through their art." But though the task would be a difficult one, surely the conception of its ultimate goal should form a strong incentive towards its pursuit. For it is possible to conjure a vision of the Evangelical Church of the future, with a stately architecture and ceremonial, all expressive of Evangelical truth, where simplicity and spirituality in worship were closely wedded to dignity and beauty, where the eye as well as the ear were receiving impressions of the truth of Christ's Gospel, and where a powerful witness was constantly being afforded to the fact that there is no need to journey Romewards for a ritual expressive of the Anglican Faith, and that there is no artistic gift with which God has blessed us which may not be used to contribute to a worship of God Almighty as a Spirit, in spirit and in truth.

Meanwhile the matter is one for individual thought and study, and for general conference at the smaller or larger gatherings of the clan. It will be well for those who see visions to unfold them, for those who dream dreams to interpret them, for those who have ideas to state them. The process has already begun. Mr. Dewick has boldly advocated the adoption of the Westward position at the Holy Communion, with all the necessary rearrangement of the chancel which the Westward position would entail. Mr. Derbyshire has followed with a proposal consequent on Mr. Dewick's idea, for an abandonment of the tight-fitting frontal (which better befits an altar than a table) and its substitution by a "large cloth or 'carpet' of some rich material hanging freely down on all sides," and further, the vesting of the Holy Table at the time of the administration of the Holy Communion with "a large and visible white cloth."

Now let us see whether we can get any further. What about the East end itself? Instead of a symbolic cross or crucifix, and non-symbolic but artistic vases of fresh flowers, why not substitute in sculpture, carving, or mural painting, a representation of the Living Christ. The cross is, without doubt, a precious symbol of our Faith, and one to be retained in our scheme of Evangelical symbolism, but the cross on the re-table behind the "altar" has become an integral part of the High Church scheme. It has been adopted by large numbers of men of Evangelical views, but it has been none the less either consciously or unconsciously copied from the Ritualists. The cross as a symbol has become so multiplied and hackneyed that it has lost much of its original significance. The crucifix concentrates attention upon the dying Christ to the practical exclusion of the truth that He is not dead, but alive and glorious. As Evangelicals we want a symbolism that will give every possible emphasis to the conception of the Living Christ in contrast to the medieval emphasis upon the dead Christ. We want an artistic treatment of our East walls which shall, if possible, present, whether by stained glass, or statuary, or wood carving, or mural decorations, or all four elements combined, a

representation at once dignified, reserved, and reverent, and yet striking and impressive of the Living Christ. At the Holy Table we "show forth His death till He come." It is as the living, glorious, triumphant Coming One that we want to represent Him. We look back to the cross, but we look forward to the crown! We worship Him not as dead, but as One who was dead, but is now alive! The artistic presentation of the Living Christ must be the outstanding and dominant feature of the new Evangelical symbolism, in contrast to that of the dead Christ which has dominated the medieval symbolism.

Many of the readers of the CHURCHMAN will doubtless have seen the statue of Christ on the Meggenhorn, the jutting crag of rock which marks the entrance of the north-western arm of the Lake of Lucerne, and close to which thousands of tourists pass by every day in the steamers which ply on those romantic waters. The statue, which is one of considerable size, is that of the living Christ standing erect with outstretched arms, and gracious mien, and a winning smile upon His face. It is the very antithesis of the crucifix, and affords a refreshing and moving sight after the eye has become wearied and the mind depressed with the countless representations of the Saviour in the helpless attitude of death. Christ is alive! Let our Churches say so in their symbolism, as well as our clergy in their sermons.

In harmony with this I should further suggest the substitution of the Comfortable Words in the place of the Ten Commandments, so dear to the heart of the old-fashioned Protestant. What is there in the Ten Commandments that is so specifically Evangelical? Is it not rather the case that the Ten Commandments are connected by association with the old-time penitential discipline of the Church, which they have superseded? Are not the Comfortable Words far more expressive of Evangelical truth than the Ten Commandments? What is there outside long party usage that so weds the Protestant to the Ten Commandments? The Gospel is better than the law; and while we stand for the law, we stand much more emphatically for the Gospel!

I pass by the question of how to secure the treatment, at the same time artistic, and also characteristically Evangelical, of the lectern and the pulpit. Let me take up another matter which the High Church party has developed to its no small advantage—I refer to the Choral Communion.

Now to many an Evangelical the Choral Communion of his High Church brother is a strange blend of the attractive and the repellant. If any part of the liturgy should be hallowed, softened, and beautified by the tender, restful melody of music, and the quiet singing of words which give point and emphasis to the sacred theme on which the soul is meditating, it is the office for the Holy Communion. Singing is nowhere more appropriate than connected with the administration of the Holy Communion. But, as a matter of fact, what is the Choral Communion even in a church that is very far from being advanced? It is, as a rule, and it is, in the main, a performance by a non-communicant choir! It is a singing of the most sacred words at the most sacred time, not by the communicant congregation, but by a professional body of singers, men and boys, who may or may not be communicants, and whose demeanour may or may not be a reverent and devotional one. Moreover, it involves as a rule a distracting and disturbing interruption by the singing of a hymn at the moment when the clergy are uttering the words of administration; or the communicants, having received the sacred memorials, are desiring quiet for silent prayer. It is as disturbing to the clergy as it is to the communicants, and suggestive more of a professional performance than of a congregational communion feast.

I should like to advance the suggestion whether it would not be possible to introduce the helpful element of singing into the administration of the Holy Communion in a manner which would be in emphatic accord with Evangelical sentiments and habits of devotion? If a hymn could be sung immediately after the consecration by the congregation as a whole, led by a small choir of adult communicants who took pains to prepare for and perform this office as an act of worship and a labour of love, a

very different effect might be produced. If, when it was thought desirable, this could be coupled with the singing, again by the congregation, of the *Ter Sanctus* and the *Gloria in Excelsis*, to simple and yet beautiful melodies, would not a warmth and a colour be added to our rendering of this service which it often lacks, and would not a large number of people be impressed with the beauty and devotion that it was possible to associate with a characteristically Evangelical administration of the service of Holy Communion?

There are three other suggestions which I might briefly submit towards the evolution of an Evangelical Ritual: 1. It would be a commendable feature in the worship of our churches if, on the entry of the choir and clergy, the congregation unitedly joined with them kneeling in silent prayer. The service would tend to become more truly devotional in character if it were prefaced by a united act of prayer to God for grace to render to Him, each in his several ways, that heart-felt worship which is His due and in which alone He delights.

2. The Evangelical party has stood out conspicuously in the Church as the great advocate of Foreign Missions. It has continually taught the importance of prayer for Missions, but has not practised its teaching by introducing it into its public worship. I should suggest that the Collect for Foreign Missions, authorized for use by the Upper House of Convocation for Canterbury, be, after the receipt of the permission of the Diocesan, adopted for regular use in church morning and evening after the Collect for the day.

3. As a party we want dignity as well as simplicity in the dress of the officiating clergy. We also want distinctiveness, for we are proud and not ashamed of our heritage. The coloured stole with its tassels, its embroideries, and its varied hues, is both effeminate in appearance and associated in its origin with the sacerdotal vestments. I suggest that Evangelical clergy adopt in place of the stole, coloured or otherwise, the broad scarf or tippet of rich black silk, which would be at the same time legal, simple, dignified, and distinctive.

The Coming Kingdom.

By the Rev. ROBERT KEABLE, B.A.,
Zanzibar.

THAT first impressions have a value all their own is a commonplace of travel, the danger being a tendency to forget that the new-comer must be content with *impressions.* It has, indeed, become a classical warning that whereas intuitive judgments are frequently right, the reasons by which we try to support them are usually wrong, and that hence suggestions for reforms based upon our early judgments ought to be reserved until some few years have passed over us. But the first impression, as an impression, is always valuable, and perhaps the more so if it be a kind of secondary "first impression." A visitor whose stay in a mission is limited to a few weeks often forms an entirely erroneous conception of the work that is being done unless he is in a position to acquire more authoritative information than is possible for most men; while most new-comers at the end of a few months would give anything but a rosy account of Missionary activity. And this is natural. The chance visitor is impressed by the mere sight of black men in church, and native Ministers in the sanctuary. The new-comer, on the contrary, has to pass through a stage of helplessness, while he, whose service was active at home, must stand by and do nothing but learn a wearisome language, and contrast foreign and home methods. He has to learn, too, that Missionaries are no better than other people, and that, on the whole, miracles are not more common abroad than they are at home. Somehow this awakening to reality, foolish as it is not to be prepared for it, is a bitter time to the young Missionary. We ought, surely, to prepare him more carefully for it.

But this is not the real "first impression." This is merely the experience which belongs to the adaptation of a man's personality to his new environment. It is the finding of the new shoes, which pinch because of the very things which made them so beautiful when first they were put on! The real "first impres-

sion," which this article is an attempt to express, is perhaps only found when, a little more attune to his surroundings, while as yet not so far removed from the old as to forget the contrast, the newcomer is able to weigh, as they cannot, the solidity of the past and the hope of the future. Men who have been many years in the field bend a little beneath the care of the Churches, and see the stars less readily. It must be so. They told themselves ten years ago that it was natural for these converts to fail, considering that they have inherited the burden of heathen centuries, and have been dragged to civilization in slave-chains; but ten years seems long except to Him who sitteth above the water-floods, and older Missionaries may be forgiven if they lapse sometimes into the ways of arm-chair critics. Even they forget sometimes that the Church is very nearly two thousand years old; that it took three centuries to conquer even on the shores of the Mediterranean, and that the Canons of the English Church, many years after Augustine, revealed amazing blemishes. And it is just because the other side sometimes needs emphasizing that these words are written; because, to the writer, one kindling, glowing fact seems more true than ever it did in England; because that "the Lord God omnipotent reigneth" is here not only a dim hope grasped by faith, but a word of conquest blazoned in the heavens.

This is a Mohammedan city, and as you walk through its streets you cannot fail to realize it. There are mosques at every turn, and small green tickets, recently affixed by the Government to all mosque property, remind you that religion is richly endowed. Then, again, the very Government is outwardly Mohammedan, and such is the elasticity of the British political conscience that it can on Sunday, as Christian, declare its faith in the Life and Passion of our Lord, and on Monday, as Mohammedan, set up schools with a curriculum which embraces the teaching of the Koran, whose plain words give the Apostles' Creed the lie. But despite all this and very much more, despite all that we are told (and all that is *true*) about forward movements in Islam, nothing is more absolutely sure than the break-up of Mohammedanism as

a religion. It is already in its death throes. It has entered on a conflict not only with organized Christianity, but with that civilization which has been born of Christianity, and which is proving its origin in the face of the critics by doing the works of Christianity at every turn. Of the issue of that conflict there is no doubt. Like every other conflict it will have unexpected developments, and like every other conflict, there will be loss and blood and tears; but already the Crescent wavers before the Cross. Some who see the wavering do not see the Cross; but we see, and it is just this victory of faithful seeing which has ever overcome the world.

Let us look at it. It is Ramadhan here, in a Mohammedan city, and however poor a Moslem's faith may be, if he is a Moslem at all, he keeps Ramadhan. No wonder, then, that the old religious leaders of the town are troubled when one high *Mohammedan* authority declares that only 4 per cent. of the city has kept the Fast this year, and the highest authority of them all sets the figure at 2 per cent.! It is the young men who will not keep it. If one stands on the bridge that leads from the city to the country, one can see each morning young Arabs by the hundred going out into the woods for the day to escape observation. They will come back in time to join in the ceremonies of the evening ritual, because as yet they are not prepared to break so entirely with the past; but the spirit of Islam is no longer in them. And why? The answer is absolutely simple. It is just that the fever of the West is in their veins, and that they know its doom is on the old order of things.

Very many are, of course, intoxicated with the liberty and licence of the West. Others are well aware that learning and progress is of the West, and, in reality, of the West alone. Others still are feeling that truth is of the West, and in their heart of hearts they know that the crudities of popular Mohammedanism, as well as the manifest absurdities of the official faith, cannot be held by instructed men.[1] It is the coming of learning that has done it.

[1] Since writing the above, a young modern Arab, of his own initiative, used almost precisely these words to me.—R. K.

The young Arab of to-day not only knows the English tongue, but also reads English papers, and thinks in English terms. One such, during a recent lecture, showed entire familiarity with the decisions of the Thompson-Bannister case, and inquired of the precise obligation to Protestantism, as opposed to Catholicity, which King George inherits by reason of the Act of Settlement! And to such men, that Mohammed split the moon, and underwent an angelical surgical operation for the removal of original sin, is precisely the rubbish that it is to us. The only trouble is that so many Moslems, here at least, know so little about their own faith; but even that they are learning from Western sources. And they will learn. The son of a prominent Arab has recently returned from an education on Western lines in Beyrout; he declines to attend his father's mosque. An old relation of high rank, fearful at this, vows that his grandchildren shall not learn English nor English ways—but how will he stop them? It is all very well to speak of Eastern culture and science, but practically it is as nothing against the learning of the West. The West has power, and practical things, and money. Rightly or wrongly it is El Dorado to the young Eastern, and you cannot keep him from those riches. Personally, I believe that he is right. Argue as you will, the East has stored its treasures these many centuries, and they are of ancient things. It is the West that has been alive. The West has parcelled the world and divided its riches, and the East will only win them back with Western tools. Japan, China, and, in a great measure, India, know it well, for the former have proved it true, and the dead hand of Mohammed cannot any longer hold back the Moslem world.

The great unappreciated factor in the awakening of the East is the effect of the dominance of Western influence here in the heart of the East itself. This city, for example, is itself, to the young Arab, largely European to-day. His learning takes him into Government service, into commercial undertakings, or into the courts; and in these days he must earn his living or starve, and in these ways he must do it. But what then? At the head of every department stands the European, with

Western standards and methods. To get on he must know English. English judges are supreme in the courts, and already we see the beginnings of the modification of Moslem law. The Moslem marriage laws, for example, have religious sanction, are unalterably fixed by the lusts of a prophet 1,300 years dead, and regard women solely as the slaves of men's lust! How can an English judge, however much he may regard himself as fettered by his technical position as a member of a Mohammedan administration, serve laws such as these? He cannot, and he does not. He modifies them, and his modifications are an object-lesson to the young officials. With opening eyes they see still more. They see what is the relationship of the decent Englishman to his wife. They watch the Western manners at some Agency function. They attend Western plays performed by amateurs among the European colony. Their rich men buy motor-cars, drink wines, and copy our manners. The Sultan motors abroad among his subjects with his one wife and their little son as an English gentleman might do. The telephone, a typewriter, and pictures are in his study, and he is no feckless youth, but a middle-aged man, Westernized so far (for it comes to this) that he is wise enough to retain his rich and courtly Arab dress. The crowds in the palace square have the daily telegrams read out to them. The storming of Tripoli, the resignation of the Turkish Cabinet, or the doings at Delhi, leave them breathless with astonishment. The picture-shops, with gaudy cartoons of the war, are thronged every day. If Constantinople falls, or if Turkey becomes a Republic, our world will rock yet more ; none can say how much. And meanwhile our young men petition for compulsory education, read the *Weekly Times*, form themselves into clubs, and keep Ramadhan in the depths of the woods!

It is when one turns to the Christian Church, even here, that the amazing reverse of the picture appears. The element which suggests itself is *stability*, and it is suggested in such an amazing number of ways. Look at the language. It is the Mission that has considered it scientifically, and prepared the grammars and "readers," so that now in this Swahili-speaking

country, the best Swahili is the Swahili of the Prayer-Book and the Bible. There is only one marriage-law, plain and rigid, in the country, and that is the Christian. There are only two imposing religious buildings, and they are the Christian Cathedrals. There is only one effort being made to train religious teachers along lines fearlessly open to modern knowledge, and that is the Christian. There is only one literature flooding even Hindi clubs, and that is the English and Christian—for even where it is not orthodoxly Christian, it is Christian in moral and ethical tone. The Christian Church itself, too, is like a rock amid these floods. Day by day the Church's Liturgy is said in Christian sanctuaries as if Mohammed had never been born. It is said by an instructed native Ministry, which one feels instinctively has come to stay. And even more manifestations of Christ's religion, so impotent and foolish to the world, so revolutionary and dynamic to the historian, and so sublime and real to the Christian, are here at work. Near this big city, in a Christian village, at this very hour, a little band of women are pledged to a life of prayer. They are no longer "of England," for their gaze, for living and for dying, is towards Africa. They are "of the Sacred Passion," linked to that incredible foolishness of Calvary which has turned the world upside down. And these will do it; it is the lesson of history, of philosophy, of faith. What has Mohammed to set against that bewildering piety of surrender, that transcendental obstinacy of faith?

Or, again, the Apostolate is here. If I were an agnostic I should fear Bishops! In England it is sometimes our custom to make light of them, but after all is said and done, did ever army achieve conquests like those of the threefold Ministry of the Catholic Church? To the Catholic mind, the Bishop is the centre of obedience and unity; linked about him go all those forces which the alchemy of Christianity has wrested somehow from the world; and this apart from his claim to be, in the Ignatian phrase, "as Jesus Christ." It is surely a remarkable thing that the Episcopate has clung to lands with a pertinacity indifferent to reformations, reactions, or suppressions. And here it is in East Africa. Behind it is the driving force of a

priesthood which has no need to be ashamed. It was planned for conquest.

It may be urged against all this that Christianity is itself divided; and that even here, among some few score white rulers professing the Christian name, you have enemies and divisions. Nor may it be denied. As we count up the white congregation, Sunday by Sunday, we sometimes fear. We are not less than in other places; indeed, we show an excellent average, but what of this? Is not historic Christianity in a bad way everywhere?

Sir H. Johnson has pointed out recently in *The East and the West* that it is good for the clergy to see service abroad, as it enlarges their outlook. It seems to me that he is entirely right. For it is here, on the fringe of things, that the amazing weakness of the opposition to orthodox Christianity seems so plain. One has only got to read the books which influence anti-Christian thought among average Englishmen to see it. One such passed into my hands the other day, which only showed with unmistakable clearness that its author was opposing a Christianity that was a chimera of his own imagination, and basing his opposition upon incredible ignorance.[1] He can actually write that Hinduism, Judaism, Mahommedanism, and Buddhism have been "untouched" by Christ as they have been "untouched" by one another! Christ has made no more impression on China than Buddha on Europe! In a word, the world's religions are alike, stagnant and passing. And this with India's Christianity advancing for the last thirty years at such a speed that the Empire will be Christian in 160 years; with Catholic Christianity alone strong enough to produce in China an army of native clergy big enough to outnumber either the C.M.S. or the S.P.G. clergy throughout the world[2]; and with Japan recognizing Christianity as one of the religions of the Empire. The very fact that men who dissent from orthodox Christianity *think* their case supported by such works as these assures our victory. Men are mostly non-religious to-day, for

[1] "The Hearts of Men," by H. Fielding.
[2] "Annual Review of the Foreign Missions of the Church," 1911, p. 44.

exactly the reason St. John alleged centuries ago—they love the world. They are dazzled by its wonder, its freedom, and its ever-increasing pleasures in this age. They give up the faith because of its restraints, and then they bolster up their disobedience by incredible ignorance. Hardly a man who declines to believe the Catholic Faith could tell you what that Catholic Faith is which he declines to believe. Those of us who listen to his talk in the smoking-rooms of ocean-going liners, or in the lounges of clubs, gather that the chief articles of Catholic Faith are that God made the world in 144 literal hours, that Eve was deceived by a creeping serpent, that Baalam's ass talked, that Jonah was swallowed by a whale, that the greater part of the world is going to hell, and that heaven is a place of white robes and harps. That is, at least, the religion at which they jeer, and whose it is, I don't know. Of the Communion of Saints, the forgiveness of sins, and the life everlasting, there is no talk. They are simply ignorant of orthodoxy.

Over against these trivialities and nightmares stands the Apostles' Creed. Where all our quondam friends disagree and propose weird faiths, the Catholic religion remains a reasonable whole. In any hundred men picked at random—the hundred men that congregate in these outposts of the world—no one ever has a complete religious philosophy making any attempt to agree with logical science or history to offer except the Catholic. There may be a thousand philosophies in the study, but there is only one among the negations in the street. "In dealing with religion," says Harnack, "is it not after all with the Christian religion alone that we have to do? Other religions no longer stir the depths of our hearts." And if we want a further proof it lies in this, that there is no other philosophy of God that has Missions to the heathen save the Christian. That faith alone seeks to save.

I began by saying that this was but an impression, and I wish to leave it at that. Perhaps I have been over-daring to speak of such things as I have; certainly I have neither authority nor wit to say much more. But there surges through me,

as I walk down our Eastern streets that have not yet quite lost their novelty, an assurance that I never thought to have before. We seem to be living here in a chaotic confusion of religions, policies, and societies. No man knows what to-morrow will bring — religiously, politically, or socially — among all these crowds in our streets. There is a fever abroad, and a fear. But it seems to me that, among all the mists and quicksands, there is a Rock, higher than I, which is as steadfast as ever, as unique as ever, and as pronounced as ever. There are a thousand elements of unrest abroad, there is only one of rest; there are a thousand elements of change, there is only one of stability. I look on the Moslem Faith growing vaguely fearful, and I would cry with Alfred in Mr. G. K. Chesterton's ballad:

> "That though all lances split on you,
> All swords be heaved in vain,
> We have more lust again to lose
> Than you to win again!"

I look on these wavering Christians, and I am more sure than ever that there is only one source to which any soul in this city will turn when it comes to need God. And, above all, I look on this kaleidoscopic world, and I am utterly convinced that of all kingdoms there is but one that has no end.

All this is, of course, beyond argument, and I feel content that it should be so. So is the First Epistle of St. John. So was the confidence of Alban and George, the wanton dying of the child martyrs, the ecstasy of Julian and Theresa, and the extravagance of Francis and Ignatius. It is this faith which bears us, and teaches us at last to rest from our petty efforts to support it. And it is this faith which lights a vision of which there is only one thing to say:

> "Mine eyes have seen—only God I glorify!
> Mine eyes have seen—Trust me! I would not lie.
> Nay, trust me not, my tidings prove and try!
> An you would see, come the same way as I—
> Way of the white fields where the sheaves we tie—
> Come!"

A Coptic Lectionary.

By the Rev. A. SMYTHE PALMER, D.D.

A VOLUME of more than ordinary interest has lately been published by the authorities of the British Museum,[1] and has hardly received the attention which it deserves at the hands of Biblical students. It is a Coptic version of three books of Scripture, which has been edited by Dr. Budge, from a papyrus codex discovered and brought from Egypt only last year. This codex is believed to have been written not later than the middle of the fourth century, and the version itself was probably made a century earlier, in which case it is the oldest known copy of any translation of the Bible, and the oldest Coptic MS. in existence. This interesting relic of the Early Church, as might be expected, is much worn and worm-eaten, and at an early date was retouched in parts where it had become illegible. It seems to have been written for his own use by a private individual, who for some reason selected three out of the sixty-six books of which the Bible consists, and had them bound together for convenience under one cover. The Church to which he belonged was one of the earliest founded. Some devout Jews from Egypt were amongst St. Peter's converts on the day of Pentecost, and these, on their return to their own land, would become the nucleus of a native Church. Apollos was sojourning there about the year 70, and St. Mark preached the Gospel there before that date. The owner of this volume was a member of that ancient Church. Now the three books of the Bible, which on some account he especially valued and combined into a little lectionary for his own edification, were these—Deuteronomy, Jonah, and the Acts of the Apostles. Dr. Budge calls it an "extraordinary selection," and cannot suggest any probable reason for its being made. That there was *some* reason governing his choice, and that it was not an arbitrary collocation, or made at haphazard, we may be perfectly certain. Can we, then,

[1] "Coptic Biblical Texts," edited by Dr. E. A. W. Budge.

discover any principle which governed this curious selection and combination of two books from the Old Testament with one from the New? Have they anything in common? Is there any bond of connection, more than the material thread which binds them together, which caused them to be thus brought into conjunction? No doubt there is some such if we can discover it.

The point of connection, I would suggest, may be found in the subject-matter of the triad. The books are distinctively the three most Catholic or Universalistic books in the Bible. They have this in common, that they alike contemplate the universality of God's Church, as intended for all mankind, and as free to the Gentile as to the Jew. This early Christian, whoever he was, was a man of broad and catholic sympathies, who dwelt with peculiar satisfaction on those portions of the sacred records which spoke of the common salvation, and taught that the great All-Father will have all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of His truth. If we glance at these books of his choice we see that this was their characteristic teaching.

1. Deuteronomy is a book of large-hearted sympathy far in advance of the Mosaic teaching. It is animated by the broad humanitarian spirit of the prophets. It extends many of the rights and privileges, which were once held to belong exclusively to the Jews, to the stranger and the foreigner who came within their borders. Many of the charities and amenities of social and religious life are now thrown freely open to the Gentile without any distinction of race or creed (xxiv. 19-22); and the precept is laid down, "Because Jehovah loveth the stranger," Israel, after His example, should love him also (x. 18, 19). The laws of a ritual and ceremonial character which have to do with physical defilements and cleansings, so conspicuous in the Levitical ordinances, are here significantly absent. Even the initial rite of circumcision is only insisted upon in a spiritual sense. The religion it inculcates is a religion of the heart, and the service which Jehovah requires is a life of active love, because He is Himself the God of love (x. 12). Anticipating

our word "humanity," the law of loving-kindness and tenderness is to embrace all mankind, not only the "neighbour," but the stranger, the bondman, the captive, even the dumb beast and the bird, because it is the outcome of love and gratitude to the one dear God "who made and loveth all," the Father whose loving-kindness is over all His works. Men are made to know that the service which He values consists not so much in outward conformity to cult and ordinances, as in the inward devotion of the heart, which is an oracle always at hand and always a true guide. "The word is very nigh unto thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart that thou mayest do it" (xxx. 11). It is in the highest degree significant that St. Paul, when he wished to draw a sharp contrast between the righteousness of the law and the righteousness of faith, singles out this verse in Deuteronomy as the typical expression of evangelic truth over against the legal requirements of the Levitical code (Lev. xviii. 5; Rom. x. 5, 6). In the words of St. Jerome, Deuteronomy is "a prefiguring of the Evangelical law" of the New Testament; it brings us to the very threshold of the Gospel. "It is the most spiritual book of the Old Testament," says Bishop Hicks, "and nearest to the teaching of the New; and this is why our Lord loved the book and used it so wonderfully."

While Israel, under this higher teaching as to its relation to its fellow-men, carried on something like a home-mission by gradually absorbing into itself many who had no right by birth and inheritance to be considered Jews, it did not feel called upon to spread its faith among the outside nations of heathendom. And yet an ideal, though latent, belief in the duty of Foreign Missions seems to have been implied in the great promise that in the seed of Abraham all the nations of the earth should be blessed. The obligation of this duty is the essential truth which the second book in this vade-mecum was written to unfold.

2. The Book of Jonah demonstrates how completely Israel had failed to realize its vocation to be the priestly nation of the world. As its typical representative, Jonah is shown as resist-

ing to the uttermost the Divine command to preach repentance to the Assyrian capital. Slowly, reluctantly, and by painful experience, he is compelled to learn that the heathen also are God's children and capable of salvation, for He willeth not the death of any sinner.

> "For the love of God is broader
> Than the measure of man's mind;
> And the heart of the Eternal
> Is most wonderfully kind."

The whole of this beautiful prophetic tale inculcates a spirit of universal benevolence and unlimited humanity. The confession wrung from the unwilling lips of the prophet, when his narrow and exclusive particularism which would confine God's mercy to Israel is confronted, well expresses the inspiring idea of the book: "Thou, Lord, art a merciful and gracious God, slow to anger, and of great kindness, and repentest Thee of the [threatened] evil." Beyond all other Books of the Old Testament it is the evangelic pronouncement of the universality of the Divine Love.

3. Side by side with these Old Testament writings this good Coptic Christian sets the Acts of the Apostles, evidently regarded as their complement and fulfilment. And with good reason. For there we see fulfilled what was foreshadowed in the earlier books. It is the historic record of the spreading of the Gospel and planting of the Church Catholic in lands outside the Jewish territory. Israel is at last carrying out its world-wide mission "unto the uttermost parts of the earth." From Jerusalem round about unto Illyricum is fully preached the Gospel of Christ. The proclamation is made that "God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth Him is accepted with Him," and that "to the Gentiles also God hath granted repentance unto life."

Beginning with the Pentecostal effusion of the Spirit upon all flesh, on "men from every nation under heaven," the book ends by leaving its chief missionary in the capital of the Roman empire preaching the Kingdom of God "without hindrance,"

with which suggestive word it breaks off. As to its correlation with the previous book, it is interesting to find Baumgarten drawing a parallel and a contrast between the Old Testament missionary and the New; between Jonah, the unwilling herald sent with a message of mercy to Niniveh, the capital of heathenism, and Paul voyaging to Rome, the centre of the empire, and bearing the Gospel in which he gloried; just as, quite similarly, Hommel traces a correspondence between Jonah preaching Jah intelligibly to the Ninevites, as worshippers of Ya, their chief deity, and Paul finding a common ground for his missionary address in the "Unknown God" of the Athenians.[1]

The man who brought three such books as these together, to form a compendium for his own private reading, was evidently one of a broad and catholic spirit, who delighted in the universality of Redemption, and loved to dwell upon those Scriptures which proclaimed the all-embracing love of the One Father and the world-wide freeness of His salvation. The writings which most explicitly set forth those great truths appealed to him with a special force; and these he selected as for him the most significant books in the Bible.

[1] Hommel, *Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, p. 145; Hilprecht, *Explorations in Bible Lands*, p. 745.

Transmission of Orders in the Reformed Presbyterian Church.

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

THERE are no doubt many, in the Churches both of England and Scotland, who regard the idea of a ministerial succession from the age of the Apostles as a baseless figment, but these may well be reminded that Episcopacy and Presbyterianism are equally based on that theory, which is, indeed, the very *raison d'être* of their respective systems, and one on which they are obliged to fall back if they would justify either their existence as distinct ecclesiastical organizations or their implied protest against sectarianism. There are others who, although they attach no particular *doctrinal* significance to an Apostolical Succession, are nevertheless prepared to admit it as a fact; and there seems no reason to doubt that the claim to a regular succession of ministry transmitted by the imposition of hands which the Church has so constantly made is, in reality, a valid one; for, even if the difficulty of tracing it through each and all of its steps be admitted, there is still, in the unvarying practice of centuries, sufficient evidence to establish it as, at least, a moral certainty. The rite of the laying-on of hands, practised in every age, conveys the idea of continuity, and of the general intention on the part of those Churches which have, since the Reformation, retained it there can be no reasonable doubt. Therefore, once it is granted that the orders of ministry were validly handed on by the bishops of the Church Catholic from the time when it became customary for the *episcopos* to be the sole minister of the rite of ordination, there need be—can be—little difficulty in admitting that the Scottish Church was actually in possession of a duly ordained ministry when it was determined that the Presbyteral form of government should, after the lapse of many centuries, be revived. Nor is the question of the right to confer orders the insurmountable difficulty which it is fre-

quently made to appear, for we are obliged to confess that it is at least an open question whether the power of orders is rightly limited to the Episcopate, and whether the ordination of presbyters by presbyters may not be canonically as valid as the consecration of bishops by bishops.

An impartial consideration of the manner in which many important questions have been dealt with in the past seems to bring into view a feature of their controversial treatment which stands out from the surface with undue prominence—namely, the apparently overmastering desire to justify preconceived opinions, whether expressed in ecclesiastical formularies or in the tenets of "schools," and this, often enough, lest failure to do so might be taken as indicative of a weakening in regard to long and fondly cherished convictions. But to "reverently use and esteem" a system of Church government on account of its inherent merits and advantages is one thing, while to insist on it as an indispensable "note" of Catholicity is quite another; and it is hardly too much to say that those who regard Episcopacy as of *exclusively* divine institution convey the impression that, in their reading of Church History, they have begun, not at the first century, but at the second, without pausing to consider whether the condition of things then observable in Church life is an exact reproduction of what is seen in the New Testament, or is the result of growth and development. To this unfortunate tendency is due, in great measure, the common error of regarding Scottish Presbyterianism very much as one of the many forms of "dissent," and of overlooking the fact that, based as it is on ancient and traditional principles, it has as little in common as the Church of England herself with the medley of independent and heterogeneous sects which neither claim continuity from Apostolic sources nor even regard it as in any way essential, appearing to hold that the institution of orders of ministry or the provision of defined channels of grace did not come within the scope of our Lord's purpose, but are due rather to the growth of hierarchical pretensions.

It will naturally be objected that the "First Book of Discipline,"

published in 1560, in the first heat of revolt against what was regarded as a wholly corrupt ecclesiastical system, speaks of the imposition of hands as unnecessary,[1] and repudiates the "former clergy" as "usurped ministers," declaring "the new preachers to be the only persons that have the power to administer the Holy Sacraments"; but if violent and revolutionary language on the part of some of the extreme section of the Scottish Reformers is to be taken as proof of a deliberate intention to make a wholesale break with the traditions of the past, the argument may be applied with equal force to the Reformation in England.[2] "We err egregiously," says Dr. Norman Macleod,

[1] "It is true, of course," writes Professor James Cooper, of Glasgow, "that the writers of the 'First Book of Discipline' (ascribed generally to John Knox, but by others to Alexander Gordon, Bishop of Galloway) judged the laying-on of hands unnecessary; but it must be remembered (1) that even they—though doubting about this as 'one of the ceremonies of ordination,' a doubt which Cranmer at one time shared—never doubted that ordination was necessary; (2) that the 'First Book of Discipline' was never law either in Church or State; (3) that there is no evidence that the recommendation to omit the laying-on of hands was generally acted upon; (4) that there is the unexceptionable evidence of Erskine of Dun—a reformer less noisy but hardly less influential than Knox himself—that the laying-on of hands was an Apostolical rite observed in the Church of Scotland; (5) that in 1566 it was formally accepted by our Church in the Helvetic Confession; Andrew Melville and our earlier Puritans laid great stress upon it and insisted on it in the 'Second Book of Discipline'; and Bishop Patrick Forbes, replying in 1614 to the Roman Catholic impugners of Scottish ordinations in the period from 1560 to 1610, said they were impudent to deny that our ministers had a valid 'ordinarie calling.'" (See a letter on "The Present Position of Presbyterianism in Scotland" in the *Church Times* of July 28, 1911.)

[2] *E.g.*, Cranmer, referring to the Roman clergy, says: "The very Antichrists (the subtlest enemies that Christ hath) by their fine inventions and crafty scholastic divinity deluded many simple souls and brought them to horrible idolatry," etc. "It is a wonderful thing to see what shifts and cautels the popish antichrists devise to colour and cloke their wicked errors." ("A Defense of the True and Catholic Doctrine concerning the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ," Parker Society's edition, pp. 228, 229, 348 *et seq.*) Again, in "The Resolutions of several Bishops and Divines, of some Questions concerning the Sacraments," Cranmer expresses opinions which are not one whit less revolutionary than those attributed to Knox, *e.g.*: "The ministers of God's word under his Majesty be the Bishops, Parsons, Vicars, and other such priests as be appointed by His Highness to that ministration. . . . In the admission of these officers be divers comely ceremonies and solemnities used, which be not of necessity, but only for a good order and seemly fashion; for if such offices and ministrations were committed without such solemnity, they were nevertheless truly committed. And there is no more promise of God that grace is given in the committing of the ecclesiastical office, than it is in the committing of the civil office." "The Bishops

"if we suppose that what the Reformers of the sixteenth century designed was to set up a 'new Church' having no root in the historical past."[1] As it was, however, the Council refused to ratify the Book, and within a few years the setting up of the bastard Episcopacy known as the "Tulchan" convinced the Reformers of the need of a "decent and comely order," so that, under the genius of Andrew Melville,[2] the true father of Presbyterianism, the "Second Book of Discipline" ordered the rite of the imposition of hands, and, in terms clear and unmistakable, declared the "Power of the Keys" to be the direct commission from Christ Himself to "them unto whom the spiritual government of the Church by lawful calling is committed," which is held by them as "successors of the Apostles."

A *tu quoque* may not be the most logical line of argument, but it may nevertheless be effective, and the fact that the Church of England, by the consecrations of 1610, recognized that no breach in the Scottish succession had actually taken place, reminds those English Churchmen who would unchurch the Kirk of Scotland that it is on grounds precisely similar that they themselves are unchurched by Rome. Whatever hypothesis we may be inclined to accept, thought out in the light of history, it is undeniable that the possibilities of weakness in the chain of succession are numberless, and it has even been contended that

---

and Priests were at one time, and were no two things, but both one Office in the beginnings of Christ's Religion." "A Bishop may make a Priest by the Scripture, and so may Princes and Governors also, and that by the authority of God committed unto them, and the People also by their election." "In the New Testament he that is appointed to be a Bishop, or a Priest, needeth no Consecration by the Scripture, for election, or appointing thereto is sufficient." (Answers to Questions 9-12, Stillingfleet's MS. See Bishop Burnet's "History of the Reformation," Collection of Records.)

[1] Guild text-book on "Church, Ministry, and Sacraments," p. 18.

[2] It is a mistake to suppose that Knox was a violent opponent of episcopacy; he even recommended it in a modified form. And it must not be forgotten that after he had obtained his release from the French galleys, where he had been a prisoner in irons for nineteen months on account of his supposed complicity in the murder of Cardinal Beaton, he exercised for a time the functions of his ministry as chaplain to Edward VI., and had a hand in the revision of the Prayer Book of 1549. Offered high preferment in the Church of England, he enumerated his reasons for declining it, but amongst them there is no hint of objection to the episcopal form of Church government.

but for the laying-on of the hands of "the Presbytery," which takes place even in episcopal ordinations, the due succession of orders could not have been maintained; and further, that—because, according to the old saying, "the whole world is Presbyterian on a consecration day"—it would be more accurate to compare the ministerial succession to the meshes of a net rather than to links in a chain of which, if one is lost, all is lost.[1] Be this as it may, had the preservation of continuity depended solely on an episcopate vested in, and exercised by, but a few, the case against Presbyterians had been stronger; as it was, however, where the "chain" of Episcopacy might, under the peculiar circumstances, have failed, the "net" of the Presbyterial Order, spread over the whole face of Scotland, was able, in spite of the possibility of a few broken meshes, to enclose and retain the draught. Slavery to hypothesis is apt to bring endless difficulties in its train, and it is possible to prove too much.[2] "The very fact," says Principal Storey, "that no theory of Apostolic succession hampered the free action of the Reformers makes it all the more noticeable that that succession was not broken, and that now (though the passage was more rapid and stormy) as the Celtic Church had been amalgamated with the Romanist, so the Romanist was in part absorbed into, in part superseded by, the Reformed."[3]

[1] See an article in the *Nineteenth Century and After*, April, 1909, by the Rev. Archibald Fleming, D.D., of St. Columba's Scottish Church, London.

[2] One hesitates to adduce the testimony of so manifestly biassed a witness as Lord Macaulay, nevertheless the numerous objections which he urges are too serious to be ignored. See his essay on "Gladstone on Church and State."

[3] R. H. Storey, D.D., "The Continuity of the Church of Scotland,' quoted by Dr. McAdam Muir in his Guild text-book, p. 33.

"So."

I.

SMALL is the word, but charged with import great,
A pivot on which Heav'n's own windows swing,[1]
When God to trusting souls would blessing bring
In rich supply, above all estimate.
When Faith God's promise doth anticipate,
His "So" holds all the starry skies in store,[2]
And Ocean's sand, innumerous on the shore,[3]
As pledge to those who Love's profusion wait.
But still beyond compare this word we find,
Adapted to all needs, however deep;
Yet in His own all-wise, all-loving Mind
The *fulness* of its meaning He doth keep.
Here Faith finds rest—all care to God resigned—
"For so He giveth His belovèd sleep."[4]

II.

But man in use of "So" still needs a guide
To lead and stimulate the laggard soul,
Or with firm hand to hold within control
Impetuous ones filled with presumptuous pride.
And all, who will within God's will abide,
May every doubt and care upon Him roll,
Assured that He will lead them to Truth's goal,[5]
And for them all heart-questionings decide. . . .
We ask the LORD to grant us *so* to eat [6]
The flesh of His dear Son, and drink His blood,
That sin-stain'd bodies may His healing meet,
And souls be washed in the all-cleansing flood.
Swift guidance comes: Self-scrutiny you need,[7]
Then *thankful hearts by faith* shall on Him feed.[8]

A. J. SANTER.

[1] Mal. iii. 10.
[2] Gen. xv. 5.
[3] Heb. xi. 12.
[4] Ps. cxxvii. 2.
[5] St. John vii. 17.
[6] Prayer-Book.
[7] 1 Cor. xi. 28.
[8] Prayer-Book.

The Missionary World.

DURING the month of May all the British Missionary Societies speak for themselves, presenting at their annual meetings the account of their past year's work, which is transmitted far and wide through the religious press. If there is not an increased response from the Church as a whole, it will not be from lack of knowledge. The announced programme for some of these meetings shows more life and variety than in the past. The great need is for opened hearts and responsive wills among those who hear. It is still not impossible to treat the "May meetings" as a species of religious dissipation.

* * * * *

Special interest attaches to the C.M.S. meetings, at which Mr. Bardsley and Mr. Baylis are to speak. Many are looking with keen expectation to the details of their tour in the East. Indications from many quarters encourage the hope that, notwithstanding financial pressure, the old principles of the Society are working towards fuller fruitfulness, both at home and abroad. The Conference of C.M.S. Committees to be held at Swanwick from May 27 to 31 bids fair to mark a new departure in co-operation between central and local workers. For some time the local associations have been developing a strong corporate sense, and preparing themselves to enter more fully into the responsibilities of leadership. The discussions at the conference at Swanwick should strengthen the work of the Society everywhere, as men and women come into close fellowship with central policy, assume responsibility for its implications, and return to their local work as "partners in the concern."

* * * * *

The one-hundredth anniversary of the Wesleyan Missionary Society will be celebrated on May 5. Strenuous preparations have long been on foot, and it is earnestly to be hoped that they may result in deep enthusiasm, increased income, and consequent ability to maintain and expand the work in the great

mission-fields of the Wesleyan Church. All who love the cause of world evangelization will unite to wish our brethren Godspeed.

* * * * *

One is tempted to wish that the three large missionary quarterlies could arrange to distribute themselves, and not all appear in the same month. Mr. Silas McBee, in issuing his new *Constructive Quarterly* in March instead of in January or April, is evidently conscious of the strain upon a reader's time and energies. Yet there is no missionary reading which is more rewarding than these reviews, into which the best thought and experience of missionary experts is poured. *The East and the West* opens with a remarkable article by Mr. Campbell Moody, written with his usual fresh incisiveness, on "The Western Form of Christianity." It is worthy of careful thought. The paper following it, by Miss Ethel McNeile, of Agra, on "Theosophy and 'The Coming of Christ,'" is timely and illuminating. Professor Margoliouth contributes an article on some recent Moslem literature, including a scathing notice of Mr. Leeder's "Veiled Mysteries of Islam," a book which is also severely handled in the *Moslem World* by Dr. St. Clair Tisdall. Articles based on books have found favour with missionary editors this month. Dr. C. R. Watson has a paper on Pastor Simon's "Progress and Arrest of Islam in Sumatra," in the *Moslem World*, and the *C.M. Review* has no less than three such—one on the "Livre d'Or de la Mission du Lessouto," another on a group of Pauline books, and a third on a small but significant book published in India, which was reviewed by the same writer in the *Harvest Field* last September, recording the efforts — Christian and non-Christian — for the uplift of the depressed classes.

* * * * *

The periodical literature issued in the cause of Missions is more extensive and important than many are aware. Some of the Continental missionary magazines, especially the German ones, at least equal, if they do not excel, our best. Then there are the periodicals issued on the mission-field, mainly for

missionary readers. The three most influential are the *Harvest Field* (India), the *Chinese Recorder*, and the *Japan Evangelist*. Each of these is full of interesting matter, and contains the thought of the ablest missionaries on current problems in their work. They bring one so close to the heart of Missions that no keen student can afford to pass them by unread.

* * * * *

The *International Review of Missions* is certainly living up to its name. The contributors to the April number include an American negro (Dr. Booker Washington), an Indian (Principal Rudra, of St. Stephen's College, Delhi), a Japanese (Miss Ume Tsuda), two Germans (Professors Meinhof and Westermann), and three Americans (Professor D. B. Macdonald, Dr. Wanless, and Mr. S. Higginbottom). The summaries of "Noteworthy Articles from Recent Periodicals" are drawn from the *National Review*, the *Journal of Race Development*, the *Hibbert Journal*, the *Revue du Monde Musulman*, *Anthropos*, the *Constructive Quarterly*, and from German, Dutch, and Swedish papers. In the preparation of the International Bibliography the Editor utilizes the aid of correspondents in New York, Berlin, Paris, Leiden, Aarhus, and Calcutta. Surely this should help in the fulfilment of the desire, so strikingly expressed by Mr. Bryce in his Presidential Address to the International Congress of Historical Studies (*vide* the *Times*, April 4), for the increase of "a bond of sympathy between the nations, helping each people to feel and appreciate all that is best in the others, and seeking to point the way to peace and goodwill throughout the world."

* * * * *

Medical missions are still waiting for an adequate literature, as a publisher widely concerned in missionary books remarked the other day. Therefore we welcome the recent publication by the S.P.G. of a small book called "The Claim of Suffering," by Mrs. Paget, and the fact that several articles on the subject appear in the April magazines. In the *International Review of Missions* Dr. Wanless, of Miraj, writes on the "Place and Policy of Medical Missions in India"; in *The East and the West*

Dr. Aspland, of Peking, has an article on "China and Medical Missions"; and in *Mercy and Truth* Dr. Duncan Main, of Hangchow, reports the great conference of the China Medical Missionary Association held last January in Peking, at which over eighty missionary doctors were present. It is striking to read the address of President Yuan Shi-kai at the reception which he gave to the delegates. The most important topic dealt with in the conference was the training of Chinese as doctors. But for far-reaching influence the most valuable literature on the whole subject is found in the small pamphlet containing the conclusions arrived at by the body of missionaries who met in Dr. Mott's conferences in India. A summary of these is given in the "Findings" of the National Conference, Section VII., pp. 26-31.

* * * * *

It is no small achievement to have touched the heart of nations with a children's book. Mr. Basil Mathews, the Editor of the London Missionary Society, has done this with "Livingstone the Pathfinder." Wherever one goes people are reading it. Boys who once get enthralled by its pages never emerge until they have reached the end. The London County Council's Education Committee have placed the book on its Requisition List of Books for School Lending Libraries. It is being used as a textbook in Trinity College, Kandy, and read aloud in Chinese schools. A German translation has been issued by the enterprising publishing department of the Basle Missionary Society; and America, where already the English edition has had a great circulation, is claiming 500 copies for its German-speaking population. No household should be without a copy of this book. In its German form it will be welcomed in many schoolrooms.

* * * * *

Among other noteworthy articles in the April magazines we may mention "A Call from China" in the B.M.S. *Herald;* a striking financial statement covering ten years in *China's*

Millions; an account of a Transvaal Women's Prayer Union, which is full of interest, in the Wesleyan *Foreign Field;* the first part of a record of Bible translation in the "Isles that Wait," published in *The Bible in the World;* an interesting sketch of itinerating work in the Wynaad—"After Many Days"—in *India's Women;* and a thoughtful survey of the present "Critical Time in Jewish Missions" in the *Missionary Intelligencer* of the L.J.S. The *Missionary Review of the World* has a long article—to be continued—on "Mormonism To-day and its Remedy," a valuable study of "Religion and Religious Growth in the United States," and a discussion of "The Macedonia Problem and Missions." 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.*]

"EVANGELICALS AND THE PROBLEM OF RITUAL."

(*The "Churchman," March,* 1913, *p.* 178.)

Two articles bearing upon this question have appeared in the CHURCHMAN from the pens of the Rev. J. R. Darbyshire and the Rev. E. C. Dewick respectively. Two points, which we all agree to be of pressing importance, appear to be uppermost in their minds: (1) The more successful diffusion of Evangelical principles and "atmosphere" among the younger generation; (2) the preservation of the individuality of the Evangelical party as regards the externals of its worship. In other words, two possibilities are before us—failure to retain our younger people, and failure to preserve our individuality as against that of other parties in the Church. Such failures we are all determined must never be. How, then, can they be averted? Mr. Darbyshire and Mr. Dewick think the remedy to be the adoption of what is popularly known as "ritual," yet ritual with an Evangelical individuality of its own. They take it for granted that such a step is an immediate necessity, would be quite harmless both at present and in future, and is in no way contrary to the best traditions of Evan-

gelicalism. In expressing below a doubt as to whether this is so, the writer of the present article does this in, it is hoped, no carping and uncharitable spirit. He knows full well how easy it is to criticize the scheme of another, and how infinitely more complex is the task of the one who launches the proposals embodied therein. He would state his real appreciation of the cautious and thoughtful spirit in which the two former articles were written.

Mr. Darbyshire and Mr. Dewick have put forward a well-thought-out scheme which they believe contains a remedy for the present condition of the external aspect of Evangelical worship. But to the present writer it appears to be a palliative rather than a remedy. The disease needing to be healed is that of want of originality and attractiveness; it is deep-seated, and if it is to be remedied one must eradicate the root-cause. But the reformed ritual proposal, far from reaching successfully the root of the disease, seems to attack it at a point well on in its course. What is termed "Evangelicalism" is but the outward expression of personal beliefs and aspirations; surely, then, the grafting of a different ritual on to our public worship will not make us more original or more attractive Evangelicals!

As an instance of how we are losing younger men, Mr. Dewick cites a certain type of religious lad produced in our own day. He shows how such a lad continues for a while under Evangelical influence, and yet is ultimately lost to us, contending that the cause of such loss is the absence in our churches of an æsthetic ritual whereby he might be attracted. But is this so? Something more than lack of ritual is needed to account for that loss. Let us honestly face the real cause—lack of spiritual power and definiteness in the lives and ways of Evangelicals with whom the lad has been brought in contact, not lack of ceremonial in the services of the Church. The spiritual influence of his Evangelical friends has been too feeble, consequently the standard of their teaching has been too low to awaken and to satisfy his highest aspirations. And thus it is that what might be termed the lower cravings of his nature (amongst which must be placed a taste for the æsthetic or a longing for the outwardly beautiful), having been inadequately brought into contact with the Divine by means of the subjective influence of personal contact and example, cry out instinctively for a lower means of satisfaction—*i.e.*, the objective in religion, as realized in the outward symbols of worship. For this reason, then, a change in ourselves, and not a change in our ritual, appears to be the solution of the problems before us. And for another: Young lads of the type suggested by Mr. Dewick would, if feeling the need of ritual as an aid to worship, infinitely prefer to be surrounded by the associations of a ritual with a wealth of historical and romantic tradition behind it, such as that of the Roman Catholics or Tractarians; it is very improbable that they would be greatly attracted by any new-fangled devices which would approximate to those of the neo-Noncon-

formist type. If, as the writer believes, this is true, then the expedient of adopting a new ritual is not merely an unnecessary but a useless one.

The fact is, no special attention need be paid to ritual as a means of attraction. The whole question is one of personality. A retention on our part of that austerity and dignity rightly indicated by Mr. Darbyshire as characteristic of old-fashioned Evangelicals, together with the addition of rather more lovableness of spirit than they sometimes manifested, will attract our younger people without involving the question of any loss of distinctiveness. And it is a fact of great significance that the records of the history of religion in past ages with one voice bear witness to the principle that the highest type of spiritual life and activity is found hand in hand with the minimum of ritual in worship. Take, for example, the condition of things in the early Christian Church. Worship was then carried on in the bare surroundings of the Catacombs. Emblems of our Lord there were, but these found no place in that worship; yet never since those days has the Church been endued with such power as then. Or, to advance many centuries along the stream of time, recollect worship and work as they existed in the time of the early Evangelicals. If it be true that the eyes of the early Christians rested daily upon the outwardly beautiful and splendid in their ancient cities, the same may be said here. A little over a hundred years ago Evangelicalism numbered among its adherents many of the gently nurtured. But, accustomed as they were to that standard of refinement and of the delicate and artistic which had been reached in their day, they appear to have been content with, and even desirous of, worship in the barest of churches. Such worship, carried on under such external conditions, undoubtedly brought out the highest and noblest that was in them—for this reason, that those who ministered to them had realized in so wonderful a way, and had led their people so to realize, the beauty of holiness, that neither minister nor people, caught up in this attitude to meet the Lord, ever troubled themselves greatly as to the beauty or otherwise of the building in which they worshipped.

If it be urged that the above argument is weak owing to the advance in culture and refinement which has taken place since the periods mentioned, the writer would answer that ritual has no greater power of attraction now than it had then, other things being given. Personality, humanly speaking, is to-day just as it has ever been—the rousing and uplifting factor among men. People of all tastes, temperaments, and shades of opinion will rally round an eloquent preacher, undeterred by the external aspect of his church-worship. It was personality very fully indwelt by God's Holy Spirit which made Evangelicalism in the past a far greater power to change sinful hearts and to fill churches than it is at present. And nothing less than such personality will accomplish the same blessed work to-day. In fact, it is the recovery

of this which is essential to the continued existence of Evangelicalism as a spiritual force in the Church of England. In other words, we must go through a season of refreshing and revival from the Lord, and be filled with greater earnestness, fire, and fervour; we must once more be enrolled as prophets of the Lord, distinguished by the two marks of a prophet—(i.) certainty as to our message, (ii.) contact with the Giver of it.

NORMAN BAPTIE.

"THE DECIDING VOICE OF THE MONUMENTS."

(*The "Churchman," March*, 1913, *p.* 239.)

Will you allow me space for a brief consideration of a recent review of "The Deciding Voice of the Monuments in Biblical Criticism," a book of which I am the author? It will do much to avoid misunderstandings, which unfortunately already exist, to note at the outset that the book is a discussion of the thesis embodied in its title, "The Deciding Voice of the Monuments in Biblical Criticism." The discussion is divided into three parts. Part I. is to show that the monuments have by right the deciding voice wherever they have anything definite to say upon Biblical subjects. Part II. gives a comprehensive résumé of the deciding of critical questions by archæological evidence. Part III. touches the salient points of the outline of Biblical history as it at present appears in the light of archæological evidence. The large amount of archæological material in the book is distributed throughout as illustrative facts—evidence, indeed—to establish the thesis announced in the title. This evidence is brought to bear upon a large number of the problems of the Old Testament which are just now of paramount importance in the Biblical world: the geographical and topographical trustworthiness of Scripture; the relation between the mysterious Hyksos Kings and the Patriarchs; the semi-barbarous condition of Palestine in Patriarchal times, and the impossibility of high religious ideas among the Patriarchs; the evolution of Israel's religion from a Palestinian origin and environment; the gradual invasion of Palestine; the comparative unimportance of Moses as a law-giver; the naturalistic origin of Israel's religion from astral myths; and the late authorship of the Pentateuch, etc.

The reviewer does not agree with the conclusions of the book; I am at least sure of this, however wrong he thinks me to be in some other of my opinions. Now, I am not averse to criticism. I think I rather enjoy it. We learn far more from those who criticize us than from those who praise our work. Then I stand for the truth at all hazards. If it is not with me, I shall be glad to find who has it. I will express no opinion concerning the reviewer's work, but some brief consideration of the points which he mentions in criticism of my

book will enable the reader of the CHURCHMAN to decide for himself whether or not the reviewer's strictures affect the argument and conclusions of the book, even supposing that the exceptions are all well taken.

The general charges made by the reviewer are very clear and specific: inadequate equipment of the author, improper use of archæological materials, and weakness of logic—enough to make an end of any book, if sustained. The tone of the review is in the main exceedingly courteous, and the recognition of the sincerity of the author frank. The first two of the charges seem to be considered together, as follows:

1. He says that "at the outset the author complains that Biblical archæology has not had an adequate place assigned to it in recent Bible dictionaries, and, among other instances, he puts forward the 'Encyclopædia Biblica' as an offender." That would have been worthy of the sharpest criticism, if I had really said or implied that this great dictionary made little reference to archæological materials. The reviewer seems altogether to have missed the subject of the passage to which he refers. It is not "Biblical archæology," as he says, but "the function of archæology in criticism." On pp. 11, 12 I say: "Biblical archæologists generally, until the most recent, have not given this subject a place at all." Under this I cite, among many others, the "Encyclopædia Biblica," and note the fact that it is so far from discussing this subject that the very word "archæology" does not occur in the index. Sentences might be taken from the passage which, aside from the context, would give the sense presented by the reviewer, but this is not the sense of the passage.

2. The reviewer is disturbed because I rarely give "any hint of the fact that the methods of Biblical criticism are the ordinary methods of literary and historical criticism applied to the Bible, only *after* their value had been proved in other fields." In what "other fields" than the field of old literatures has the method of parcelling out a literature between different authors been applied? In what field of living literature has it ever been even tried where it would be possible immediately and finally to prove its value—or disprove it? I know that in one great modern University this method in the department of Biblical literature has been the butt of ridicule of the departments of living literatures.

3. The reviewer quotes from my book (p. 38): "Yet the spade of Petrie at Abydos, of Evans at Knossos, and of Schliemann at Troy has revealed the 'cloudland' as solid earth, and shown the ghostly heroes to have been substantial men of flesh and blood," and adds: "If by the last phrase he means 'historical characters,' two out of three of his examples are wrong. Flinders Petrie has demonstrated the historical character of Menes; but Dr. Evans, while revealing the

background of early Greek legend and demonstrating the historicity of its broad outline, has never ventured to suggest that the characters of that legend have been proved historical; and Schliemann's wild identifications of his discoveries with Homeric characters have never been taken seriously by responsible scholars." Well, if the "broad outline" of the legend of Knossos is historic, is it historic with characters other than "flesh and blood"? It has not been the custom to consider the doings of such ghostly folk as historic. Then I do not in my book endorse Schliemann's identification of particular Greek heroes, but only the fact that his discoveries had turned the story of Troy from legend to substantial history. Was a real city of houses and walls built and its history enacted by creatures of "cloudland," or by "substantial men of flesh and blood"?

My statement that "the Philistines are still to-day as great a mystery as were the Hittites a few years ago," which seems to amaze the reviewer so much, may well be left to the intelligent reader for consideration. Statements in Egyptian records, combined with those from Crete, have been thought by some to shed light upon the Philistines. Perhaps it is so. I am quite in accord with the reviewer in the hope that it may be so, but I am quite as much amazed at his confident assertion that it is so, as he is at the cautiousness of my statement quoted above. Moreover, if he proves to be right, I will be as glad as he, and the argument of my book will not be affected in the least. I will be glad to substitute his statement for my own. If my argument be disturbed by new truth, so much the worse for the argument.

4. Concerning the Hittite remains at Boghatz-Keui, I quite agree in the main with the reviewer in his statement. In fact, I could substitute his statement for my own in my book, without changing the argument or conclusion in the least. The only difference between us is in the statement of the facts. The great treasure of tablets found "in" Boghatz-Keui by Winckler were, as the reviewer insists, and as I intended to say, written in cuneiform script. My statement of what was brought to light "at" Boghatz-Keui was intended to cover a larger area than the village itself. In the exceeding brevity of the statement I do not seem to have made my meaning entirely clear. Whatever obscurity exists there I will endeavour to remove in the next edition.

5. The reviewer thinks I have placed the Hyksos in Egypt too early. The positiveness with which he claims "the entrance of these foreigners into Egypt after 1800 B.C." will astonish a good many. Even supposing that the dates derived from Cretan discoveries are absolutely correct, who can certify that the notice of the Hyksos so dated was really the first "entrance of these foreigners into Egypt"? I am quite willing to say that I am very cautious about determining facts so positively from ancient chronology in its present condition.

I have tried in my book to get the facts in proper order and synchronism, feeling confident that when this is done the chronology will be found to be correct—in short, to test ancient chronology by the order and synchronism of events, rather than the events by the uncertainties of chronology beyond the middle of the second millennium B.C.

Then it seems to me that there will be as many Assyriologists to dispute the reviewer's date for Hammurabi as there are Egyptologists to dispute my date for the Hyksos. Apparently he accepts, as I do, the new date for Hammurabi, which brings down the former "fixed" date for that King about three hundred years. Yet there are those who utterly repudiate that change, and still put Hammurabi 2100-2200 B.C.

The reviewer's criticisms of my discussion of the earliest Babylonian civilization is utterly unjust; but as what he says is almost entirely insinuation, it is very difficult to reply to it. I only ask the reader to consider what he says in conclusion: "Here is confirmation indeed! But he forgets to point out that Cush, if it means anything in the Old Testament, means Ethiopian; while archæology is equally clear that, if we know anything about Sumerian origins, that race was Mongolian in its affinities. The link needed by Dr. Kyle which would make the Ethiopians Mongolians has yet to be forged." And then read this, from p. 196 of my book, which is everything *I say on the subject:* "The first Babylonian civilization, according to the Bible, was Hamitic, by a son of Cush. According to archæological research it was Sumerian, or Accadian, but who the Sumerians or Accadians were archæology answers not, except that they *were not Semitic people.* They had not a Semitic language, and their faces are not at all those of Semites." I simply state the facts—and they are the facts—without comment. I do not hesitate to face the facts, whether they look like confirmation or like contradiction. I am a firm believer in the security of the truth.

I have now noticed every one of the strictures of the reviewer, and, with the single exception of some possible obscurity in my statement concerning the Hittites (I thank him for pointing it out), not one of them is founded upon undoubted fact where he speaks of matters of fact, or a correct representation of the book where he discusses it. Presumably he has chosen what he considered the worst errors, so that the others may be regarded as negligible. The reader of the review, who had not seen the book, might well be wondering if it consisted entirely of isolated, incidental references to archæological discoveries, so little does the reviewer touch upon the real purpose of the book or the problems with which it deals. There are great problems before the Biblical world to-day; there are different views concerning the correct solution of those problems. I have the utmost respect for the many honest scholars who reach very different conclusions from myself. Eventually we will all find the truth and move on to other problems;

but may I be allowed to express the opinion that we will not arrive at agreement concerning the truth by plucking the mote out of our brother's eye, but by a calm consideration of each other's arguments on the questions at issue?

Of the reviewer's charge against the logic of my argument I need say very little. If one's logic does not defend itself, it is incapable of defence, and especially if it cannot be defended by more logic of the same kind. I will only ask the readers of the CHURCHMAN to examine my argument and judge it for themselves; and at the same time I would remind the reviewer that he who challenges another man's logic does by that challenge put his own logic on trial, and that the multitude in the great amphitheatre of public opinion will decide the issue by thumbs up or thumbs down.

M. G. KYLE,
Kenia Theological Seminary.

THE TEACHING OF JESUS ON DIVORCE.

(*The "Churchman," April*, 1913, *p.* 280.)

In discussing, in the last two numbers of the CHURCHMAN, the problem of the discrepancy between the qualified prohibition of divorce by our Lord, as recorded in Matt. v. 32, xix. 9, and the absolute prohibition recorded in Mark x. 11, Luke xvi. 13, Canon Ford assumes (p. 259) that the death penalty for adultery was obsolete in His time. Was this, however, the case? The narrative in John viii. 1-11, which is generally considered authentic, certainly implies the contrary; and in the "Jewish Encyclopædia," vol. i., p. 217, it is stated that the death penalty was abolished among the Jews in the year 40, before the destruction of the Second Temple. But if this is so, it would have been as inept for our Lord to have mentioned in His teaching adultery as a ground of divorce as it would be among ourselves to lay down that marriage could be dissolved for murder. In either case the infliction of the legal punishment would sever the marriage bond without recourse to divorce. When, however, the death penalty was abolished, the writer of the First Gospel may not unnaturally have considered that he would more accurately represent our Lord's meaning if he expressed the exception which the state of the law implied when our Lord's words were actually uttered. If this is the correct solution of the problem, it supports Canon Ford's contention that the Church is not precluded by her Master's teaching from holding that marriage may be dissolved for adultery. In the exercise of her power of binding and loosing, she thinks fit to adopt that position. Whether, however, in the interests of morality, it is wise for either Church or State to accord unrestricted liberty of remarriage to an adulterous *divorcée*, and especially of remarriage with the partner of his or her sin, is an entirely

different question, upon which we may well come to an opposite conclusion from that at which Canon Ford has arrived (p. 260).

P. V. SMITH.

THE OPIUM QUESTION.

(The "Churchman," March, 1913, p. 167.)

There are some questions of supreme importance to humanity which for many years fail to gain the public ear, perhaps because of remoteness or unfamiliarity to the many. These questions are left to a small minority of the public who make a special study of them, and with difficulty, and in the face of much discouragement, strive to prevent such important matters from being entirely ignored.

A question of this kind, until a few years ago, was the opium question; now, however, it has come to the front, and, it may be added, it has come to stay. To-day there are few more living questions. Interest in the opium problem, however, has hitherto been mainly concentrated on China, but the International Conference on Opium at the Hague in 1911 has lifted the question to the rank of that international and world-wide importance to which it is entitled. This wider aspect is to be discussed on April 24 at a conference called by the Society for the Suppression of the Opium Trade, in Caxton Hall, Westminster, to which representation of a large number of Church and Nonconformist societies and philanthropic bodies are invited. In the meantime I would like to open a discussion on the more limited—*i.e.*, the Chinese—part of the question. Space will not allow me to deal adequately with the amazing development of the opium problem in China and its strange and disconcerting results to British policy, but I feel I may take for granted that readers of the CHURCHMAN are more or less familiar with the recent history of the subject. These developments should be closely followed by those who have the cause of Christianity in China at heart, and who are concerned for the honour of our country.

A good deal of attention has been paid to certain articles in the *Times*, to which reference was made in the CHURCHMAN last month, suggesting that China is less desirous of protecting her people from the ravages of opium than of getting the profits of the trade away from foreigners and into her own hands. Instances are given of poppy being planted in several districts again, the Government being unable or unwilling to put it down. No one denies that during the revolution many persons took advantage of the prevailing inevitable chaos to begin growing the poppy again; the high prices which opium was sold for constituted a temptation which it is not likely no one would give way to. But the thing that is wonderful is not that there was *some* return to opium growing, but that there was so little. Evidence has been pouring in upon us as to the strenuous efforts to suppress the growth

and consumption of opium, and the drastic legislation (whatever we may think of it from an ethical point of view) dealing with those who transgress certainly points to sincerity.

Perhaps the best answer to the one-sided statements of the Pekin correspondent (not Dr. Morrison's, whose knowledge and experience of China made his contributions to the *Times* so invaluable, but his successor's), may be found in the same paper in another column, when it was stated that two more Chinese provinces had just been added to the list of those which have shown to the satisfaction of British officials that they are clear of opium; while three more were awaiting inspection so that all might claim the privilege (?) of being allowed to exclude Indian opium.

To those who are constantly studying the subject nothing seems so clearly demonstrable as the sincere desire of the Chinese—their passionate desire—to be freed from the curse of opium, whether native or foreign. When the Chinese authorities—to the consternation of the opium merchants—seized seven chests of opium at Anking, the property of Chinese subjects, they did not store it up for future illicit use or sale, but publicly destroyed it. Surely this shows that whether or no they are breaking the spirit of the treaty by such actions, they are at all events sincere. No charge of discrimination in favour of native as against foreign opium has been maintained against the authorities.

Those who oppose the opium traffic deplore that a treaty should still exist which forces China to admit Indian opium even in reduced quantities. It is true that the trade will die out in five years' time; but the iniquity of such a treaty, acquiesced in gladly enough perhaps by China as the best terms she could get, stands out every year more glaringly as we watch the magnificent struggle of this pagan people to rid themselves and their nation of a vice, the destructiveness of which they know far better than any others.

No doubt the problem is a difficult one with which the British Government is faced. Is China to be kept to her bargain?—a bargain which the opium merchants relied upon when they bought up all the opium they could lay hands on in the hope of selling it again at fabulous prices to the opium victims. The Indian Government has profited by this so-called "windfall," and has devoted it to purposes of education—worthy enough, no doubt, like all the uses to which the opium revenue has been put during all these years in which China has been urged to allow the trade, but none the less "the price of blood."

The Government has to decide between the claims of India and of the opium merchants. It must also reckon with China—the new China—and last, but not least, with our own national honour. But difficulties of this kind are precisely such as statesmen are bound to face and solve. It is for the British public to give all the encouragement and stimulus they can to all efforts for a worthy solution, and,

above all, it is for those of us who believe in Christian ideals to demand that the problem shall be solved in a way that does not run counter to those ideals. China has had reason enough to think ill of Great Britain as a "Power"; but if there is one hopeful feature in all this sordid and sorry history it is surely that the best and most patriotic amongst the Chinese do recognize that, whatever reform has come about, and whatever sympathy shown to China—and there has been much, as we know—it has been inspired by our Christian ideals; and thus, as we hope, "the appeal of China to Christ" has not gone altogether unanswered.

A. CONSTANCE DAVIES,
Hon. Sec. Church Anti-Opium Committee.

Notices of Books.

THE MEANING OF CHRISTIANITY. By the Rev. F. A. M. Spencer, M.A. London: *T. Fisher Unwin.* Price 7s. 6d. net.

Mr. Spencer, like the authors of "Foundations" and others, believes in the necessity for restatement. He knows that criticism has dealt hardly with the Bible, and has shown that much of it is the product of beliefs and ways of thought current in a bygone age, but long since out of date. Therefore "we must not take the theology of the Bible without alteration as the foundation of our theology." Similarly, the dogmas and theology of the early centuries of Christianity represent the endeavour of early Christians to construct a theology by means of current thought, and these also need criticism and modification. With these premises probably every thoughtful man is to some extent in agreement, and he is therefore prepared to consider sympathetically any attempt to translate traditional beliefs into language which will make them more acceptable and intelligible to men of the present day. The danger of all restatement is that only such part of traditional belief will be restated as happens to fall in with dominant modes of thought at the moment. Hereby it often happens that the new expression is as much or far more open than the old to the charge of being a creature of its age. And, what is worse, the many-sided character of all truth about Divine things falls out of sight. Now, with however much sympathy we read Mr. Spencer's attempt to restate, we cannot feel that he has escaped these dangers; and with however great a consciousness of possible defects in the old, we still feel that "the old is better." Mr. Spencer expounds in lucid language his views on God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, sin, the Atonement, the doctrine of grace, the institutions of Christianity, the end of the world, the Resurrection, the Judgment, the Kingdom of God. It is impossible within the present limits to follow him in all these topics. The chapters on Christ and the Atonement may serve as illustrations of the rest, and Mr. Spencer shall speak for himself.

On p. 150 he says: "We found that the traditional conception of Christ was involved in certain difficulties arising from the progress of science.

Upon examination it appeared that these difficulties arose from a certain application of the notion of personality to the idea of Christ, and that this application had been made gradually during an age of inferior scientific knowledge to our own and with a less acute sense of personality. And we attempted, by readjusting the idea of personality to that of Christ, and in particular by substituting for personal unity spiritual unity, to preserve the religious values of Christianity while delivering it from its scientific entanglements. And in the course of this argument Jesus has for us, as it were, ceased to be a Being who has lived for ever with the Creator of the world and is equal to the Creator of the world, and has become one among the myriad souls dependent on God that pass through human existence; though, indeed, He was truly of the very essence of God, being spiritual, and the divinely appointed Leader to all others on this planet in becoming likewise spiritual and Divine." This theory is said to embrace both Athanasian and Unitarian doctrines. We question if Athanasius would have been satisfied with so meagre an interpretation of his ὁμοουσία; and still more whether St. Paul would have suffered this theory to be associated with his statement of Christ's pre-existence and kenosis in Phil. ii. by the suggestion (Mr. Spencer only puts it in the form of a question) that all souls exist before as well as after their human life.

The chapter on the Atonement begins with an attempt to interpret the experience upon which atonement doctrine is based, and Dr. Starbuck and Professor W. James are quoted to show that it is a surrender to the Divine will followed by a sense of peace with God. It is next argued that "atonement tends to conform to certain types in particular epochs." This is well known, but we were not so prepared for the elaborate distinction between the conversions of Luther and Paul, which is apparently meant to correspond with Starbuck's distinction between the "volitional type" and the "type by self-surrender." Finally, we come to the relations of Christ to the Atonement, and we are told "Christ effects the atonement through revealing the truth as to God and man—the sin of man, the mercy of God, the will of God, the higher life of man in union with God. For this revelation, appealing to intellect and will and emotion, produces that state of soul in which men are under the influence of the Holy Spirit." This is the "moral influence" theory again. We gladly admit the truth and beauty of this theory, and that it is an essential element in any complete statement of the Atonement. But we are still old-fashioned enough to believe that Paul was not merely a creature of his age when he talked of the wrath of God, of reconciliation, and of propitiation; that there is an essential element of truth underlying these terms; and that Dr. Forsyth and Dr. Denney are nearer the truth than Mr. Spencer.

It will be apparent that we differ widely from many of Mr. Spencer's conclusions. Nevertheless, what he has written is the result of his own thought; it will stimulate thought in others; and in the end the interests of truth as a whole will be served. C. H. K. BOUGHTON.

OUR LIFE HERE. By the Rev. Edward Hicks, D.D., D.C.L., Vicar of Fairfield. London: *Robert Scott*. Price 2s. net.

A companion volume to the author's helpful little work on "The Intermediate State; the Life Hereafter." Six out of the seven sermons present

the "life here" in a series of contrasts. The common experiences of suffering, sorrow, and temptation are shown to be balanced by the love, joy, and peace which are the fruit of the Spirit. The last sermon, preached after the *Titanic* disaster, and entitled "Reflections for To-day," is on the subject of endurance. There are sermons *and* sermons; happy are those who listen to such as these. The great perplexities of human life are manfully faced, the preacher is neither fanciful nor flippant, and the Redeeming Lord is "lifted up" so that all may see Him.

THE AUTHORITY OF RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE. By C. L. Slattery, D.D. *Longmans.* 1912. Price 6s. net.

The ruling idea which lies behind the book is that the scholar as such is not to be trusted with the solution of theological problems. He lacks "fresh air and reality." In all science theory must be tested by experiment—appeal must be made to the laboratory. Now, the laboratory of theology is the parish, and the only effective operator therein is the experienced pastor who has moved among men and understands them. Hence the scholar must not despise the pastor, but rather regard him as an indispensable colleague. The pastor will tell him what his theories are really worth, and will, moreover, render him the vital service of keeping him in touch with present religious experience.

This idea appeals to us as good, and deserves to receive much more attention than it has done in some quarters. Mr. Slattery proceeds to illustrate it by reference to the Bible, the Church, immortality, Jesus Christ, God. His book thus covers a wide range of subjects, and it is not always easy to discern the connection of his later chapters with his main theme. Nevertheless, on all the subjects he has found something helpful to say. Perhaps his most piquant remarks are on the pastor's view of Higher Criticism; for example, he makes much of Unitarian and other editions of Wesley's hymns as illustrating critical theories of "the later hand." In connection with the Church Mr. Slattery writes on the limits of the use of private confession, and quotes Mr. A. C. Benson's reminiscences of Bishop Wilkinson: "Though he carried in his heart the stained secrets of hundreds of lives, he never used his power for personal ends, nor tried to establish a personal dominance. He had no desire to seem to stand between the soul and God, or to retain a confidential hold over a single heart." If the book cannot be called a solid contribution to any branch of learning, it yet puts, in an interesting way, a pastor's thoughts on scholars, their merits and their failures. C. H. K. BOUGHTON.

LIGHT ON THE GOSPEL FROM AN ANCIENT POET. By Dr. E. A. Abbott. *Cambridge University Press.* Price 12s. 6d. net.

It was only in 1910 that Dr. Abbott published a massive book on "The Son of Man," forming Part VIII. of "Diatessarica." Now we have, as Part IX., a volume of 600 pages, marked by all the knowledge of detail for which he has accustomed us to look; and surely no one save so veteran and industrious a scholar could have described it as a by-study to a work on the Fourfold Gospel. The subject of the present book is the Odes of Solomon, of which the *editio princeps* by Dr. Rendal Harris appeared in 1909, a subse-

quent revision being published in 1911, and of which Professor Harnack has also issued a translation and commentary. Dr. Abbott's book differs considerably from that of Dr. Harris. Though nearly four times as large, it only gives us a commentary on twelve odes out of the forty-two—namely, on Nos. I. to XI. and XIII.—with a chapter on parts of Ode XXIII. A translation of the twelfth appears in an appendix. It differs considerably from Dr. Harris's, and we imagine also from that of Harnack, though we have not compared it with the latter. But the difference is intentional. Dr. Abbott professes to translate the Syriac quite literally, and to lay much stress upon giving each word its full value, believing that every small variation (as in the Fourth Gospel) is important and has its meaning. The commentary is most minute. Indeed, it is not commentary at all in the usual sense; it is rather a series of topical studies gathering round prominent words and ideas. In this way the book covers a good deal more ground than the twelve odes actually translated.

A good example of the commentary is that upon Ode XIII., which is: "Behold our mirror is the Lord: open ye the eyes and see them in Him: and learn of what kind your countenance is. And declare [a song of] glorifying to His Spirit: and wipe off the filth from your face, and love His holiness, and clothe yourselves therewith. And be ye without spot at all times before Him. Hallelujah" (§ 3,884, p. 401). We notice at once a similarity of thought to the passage of St. Paul about "beholding as in a mirror the glory of the Lord" and "the Spirit," and remember the parallel passage of St. James about "the law of liberty." "Now," says Dr. Abbott on p. xli, "our poet comes between these two, not as a later writer imitating either or attempting to harmonize both, but independently, supplying the missing link of Jewish thought which enables us to understand that the two apostles were describing the same thing in different aspects. The missing link is the thought of the bride adorned at her mirror, representing the redeemed soul or the New Jerusalem. . . . And the phrase that supplies the link is in the ode *without spot*—literally, *no spot*—and in Solomon's Song of Songs, 'Thou art fair, my love, there is *no spot* in thee.'" And then in § 3,884 the ode is shown to rest on the tradition in Exod. xxxviii. 8, that the laver in Moses' tabernacle was made of the mirrors of serving-women. Hence we get the connection of the Bride, the mirror of God in Christ, the transformation by beholding, and the cleansing of baptism. Dr. Abbott admits that his interpretation seems at first sight far-fetched, but the comment shows at least the minuteness and interest of his work.

On critical questions also he strikes out a line of his own. As a date he suggests provisionally the end of the first century, soon after Nerva's accession (pp. xxii and 463). As to the original language, he disagrees with Rendal Harris's view that the Syriac text is translated from Greek original, and is inclined rather to suggest a Hebrew original (p. xxiv). As to independence, he says the author "never quotes from any book of the New Testament, and never three or four words consecutively from any work of the Old Testament except the Song of Songs," though "he is continually reproducing, not indeed words, but pictures" (p. xxiv). As to continuity of thought, he denies the existence of the interpolations discovered by Harnack

and others, and holds that all the odes "taken together exhibit a mystical picture of God's design or plan of redemption for man. The first ode begins with the fruitful crown of truth, ordained from the beginning. Then, after many preparatory odes indicative of the need of a conflict for the Crown, the twenty-seventh ode introduces the Cross under the title of 'the upright tree' and in connection with the Lord's 'sign.' The last ode takes up again the tree, and describes, in effect, the triumph of the Cross, through which the Crown was to be attained" (p. 466). It will be now no surprise that the author is "a Jewish Christian writing in the first century, under the influence of Palestinian poetry, Alexandrian allegory, Egyptian mysticism, and—most powerful of all—the influence of the Spirit of Love and Sonship, freshly working in the Christian Church, at a time when Jesus was passionately felt to be the Son revealing the Father through such a love as the world had never yet known; but before the doctrine of the Father, the Son, and the Spirit had begun to be hardened by controversial iteration into a dogma accepted by the lips of almost all Christians, including many that did not feel the beauty and necessity of the doctrine in their hearts" (p. xxix).

The present reviewer is quite incapable of criticizing Dr. Abbott's conclusions, but he hopes that the extracts given will lead to a conviction of the wonder of the author's commentary and of the beauty of its subject, "The Odes of Solomon." C. H. K. BOUGHTON.

CHRISTIANITY AND OTHER FAITHS. By W. St. Clair Tisdall, D.D. *Robert Scott.* Price 5s. net.

Not long ago Dr. Tisdall gave us a very handy little volume on "Comparative Religion" in the Anglican Church Handbooks Series, and followed it up by a supplement called "The Mythic Christs and the True," published by the North London Christian Evidence League. His latest volume necessarily goes over a good deal of the ground which he had there covered, but it also contains a considerable quantity of new matter. Dr. Tisdall has here set himself to compare ethnic religions with Christianity so far as may be, point by point, and after some introductory chapters eleven such points are taken up. The method requires that the teaching of all the available religions upon each point be brought together in the same chapter. This makes the book somewhat difficult reading, and it would have been helpful if a close analysis had been supplied, and if here and there a little more attention had been paid to arrangement. This very difficulty will, however, secure from the serious student that close attention which Dr. Tisdall's argument deserves. His book is not one for a beginner. It presupposes at least a general acquaintance with the main tenets of the chief non-Christian religions. Such a preliminary knowledge will be a great help to the due appreciation of the points which are singled out for comparison. It is, perhaps, true to say that the author aims at showing two things. One is that some of the supposed parallels to Christian truth which are adduced are exaggerated, or are even non-existent except in their author's imagination. An instance of exaggeration is the Virgin birth, belief in which Dr. Tisdall denies anywhere outside Christianity, in spite of what Dr. Frazer and such popular writers as Mr. Vivian Philips have said to the contrary. And for the non-existent parallels, several writers are accused,

apparently, of deliberate manufacture of evidence. Dr. Tisdall's other object is the more familiar one of showing that all that is best in ethnic religions—the truth in them separated from its falsehood—is found in purer and fuller form in Christianity. Some of the facts tend to show incidentally that the farther we go back in some religions—*e.g.*, in China—the purer and loftier they become; and it is pointed out that a theory of the evolution of religion must be modified by a due attention to the undoubted facts of degeneration. Dr. Tisdall's book should be very useful to those who are interested in missionary problems and their discussion in study circles.

C. H. K. BOUGHTON.

HELLENISM AND CHRISTIANITY. By the Rev. G. Friedländer. *P. Vallentine and Sons (Successors).*

This is a very interesting attempt to utilize, from the Jewish standpoint, the results of the comparative study of religions in the explanation of Christian origins. The book is frankly controversial, and it is not likely that Christian readers will agree with its conclusions; but its tone is admirable, and the facts are for the most part fairly represented. The author minimizes the Jewish element in the New Testament, only allowing the influence of Hellenistic Judaism; and one of the most valuable parts of his book is that dealing with the relation of St. Paul with Philo, and Apocryphal writings of the Dispersion. Not unnaturally, he is less at home with Hellenism itself; we doubt if such a statement as that "the Greeks were undoubtedly the originators of this Divine King worship" (p. 30 of Alexander) can be maintained; and he fails to distinguish between god- and hero-worship. And he has been led away by the facile and inexact parallels drawn between Christianity (especially in the matter of Sacraments) and the mystery religions. The rigorous examination by Schweitzer in "Paul and his Interpreters," and by Dr. Kennedy in recent articles in the *Expositor*, of these alleged similarities has greatly reduced them; and the surviving likenesses are patient of another explanation than that of plagiarism by the Early Church. We do not think that the writer has allowed sufficient weight to the undoubted influence of the *Palestinian* surroundings of primitive Christianity, nor to the fact that the opposition of the Rabbis to hellenizing influence only crystallized after the fall of Jerusalem into a rigid exclusiveness. But the book contains a very valuable collection of material, which the instructed Christian may well interpret for himself.

M. LINTON SMITH.

REPTON SCHOOL SERMONS. By William Temple, M.A. London: *Macmillan.* Price 3s. 6d. net.

In this volume we have the sermons which the Headmaster of Repton preached to his boys during the first two years of his headmastership. They deal with big subjects, but they do so simply, clearly, and forcefully. Mr. Temple thinks of his school and of the Church as societies, and although his appeal again and again touches the individual, its main tenor is avowedly social. We quote a typical passage: "It is not possible for the isolated individual to be redeemed, not only because it is his duty to bring others with him to the feet of Christ, but because moral and spiritual growth are

always the work of social influences, and it is only as members of some body that we can secure it; and if we are to be moulded in the very likeness of Christ Himself, we must be members of a society whose vitalizing power is the Spirit of Christ—we must be members of the Body of Christ." We do not agree: the Church of Christ is a society of redeemed individuals. By coming to Christ we enter the Body, as the dying thief entered it, and, having entered, we bring others to Christ as he tried to bring his brother malefactor. Religion must be personal and individual before it is social. We miss, therefore, in Mr. Temple's sermons the preaching of conversion and of the Atonement; and, excellent and helpful though the sermons are, we cannot but deplore the absence of teaching which we regard as essential to the Gospel.

There are some flaws in the proof-reading. On p. 84 a sentence begins and does not end; on p. 243 there is an obvious misprint.

Received: THE ISLES THAT WAIT. By a Lady Member of the Melanesian Mission. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 1s. 6d. MORE GOLDEN THAN GOLD. London: *The Bible House.* IRELAND'S HOPE: A CALL TO SERVICE. London: *Student Christian Movement.* Price 1s. 6d. net. TWINKLE TWINKLE STORIES. By William Henry Harding. London: *Morgan and Scott.* Price 2s. 6d. net. SELECTION OF TEXTS FROM THE TAUCHNITZ EDITION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. Compiled and arranged by the Countess of Strafford. London: *Elliot Stock.* Price 3s. 6d. net. THE EDUCATION OF WOMEN IN THE EAST. London: *Student Christian Movement.* Price 2s. net. A BOOK OF DEVOTIONAL READINGS. By T. M. Connell. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 2s. 6d. net. THE GIFT AND THE LIFE. By Theodore Monod. Price 1s. net. FOUNDATION TRUTHS OF THE GOSPEL. London: *Morgan and Scott.* Price 1s. net. ECHOES OF THE ANGELUS. By W. Manning, M.A. London: *T. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd.* Price 1s. net. Excellent studies of the well-known picture. QUIET TALKS ABOUT OUR LORD'S RETURN. By S. D. Gordon. London: *Fleming H. Revell Company.* Price 2s. 6d. net. Another volume in this excellent devotional series. EXODUS XX. 18–XL. By the Rev. F. B. Meyer, B.A., D.D. London: *The Religious Tract Society.* Price 2s. Good, clear, and helpful. SYNTHETIC STUDIES IN SCRIPTURE. By W. Shaw Caldecott. London: *Robert Scott.* Price 2s. 6d. net. A really valuable aid to Bible study. A DEPUTATION HANDBOOK. By the Rev. F. D. Thompson, M.A. London: *Chas. J. Thynne.* Price 2s. net. VISIONS. By Bishop Montgomery. London: *S.P.G.* Price 1s. 6d. net. A second instalment of a much-valued book. THE MORTIMERS. By T. A. S. BATTY. London: *S.P.G.* Price 1s. 6d. net. THE SUPREME SERVICE: ADDRESSES TO MEN. By the Rev. F. R. Wilson. London: *Robert Scott.* Price 1s. 6d. net. THE DEAN'S HANDBOOK TO GLOUCESTER CATHEDRAL. By the Very Rev. H. D. M. Spence-Jones, M.A., D.D. London: *J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd.* Price 1s. 6d. net. An excellent account of this ancient cathedral. "THEOPPEUSTIA." By L. Gaussen, D.D. London: *Chas. J. Thynne.* Price 1s. 6d. net. A reprint of a well-known and very useful book. THE WELSH CHURCH BILL. By the Bishop of St. Asaph. London: *John Murray.* Price 6d. net. LONDON DIOCESE BOOK. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 1s. 6d. net. THE OFFICIAL YEAR-BOOK OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 3s. A mine of information about all that concerns the Church of England. THE TRUTH OF CHRISTIANITY. By Lieut.-Colonel W. H. Turton, D.S.O. London: *Wells Gardner, Darton and Co., Ltd.* Price 2s. 6d. net. A fine piece of apologetic in a new edition. RATIONALISM OR THE GOSPEL? By the Rev. H. E. Fox, M.A. London: *World's Evangelical Alliance.* Price 3d. net. CENTRAL CHURCHMANSHIP. By J. Denton Thompson, D.D. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 1s. net. We are most thankful to note a cheap edition of this invaluable book. THE GIFTS OF CIVILIZATION. By Dean Church. Price 6d. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE GOSPEL MIRACLES. By B. F. Westcott, D.D. London: *H. R. Allenson, Ltd.* Price 6d. Two reprints of books which must never be allowed to pass out of print.