Theology on the Web.org.uk
Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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

Buy me a coffee https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

PATREON https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb

PayPal https://paypal.me/robbradshaw

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

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

THE
CHURCHMAN

July, 1913.

The Month.

The Present Season.

During the months of July and August there is a certain slackening of the tension of life on the part both of writers and of readers, accompanied by the desire to obtain some measure of rest and of recreation. In the sphere of parochial life both clergy and lay-workers have completed for the time being the varied tasks of the winter campaign; Confirmation classes have ceased, and many forms of parish activity are suspended for the summer months. In academic circles the differing periods of preparatory work have culminated, both for teachers and taught, in the final climax of examinations—a season of stress and strain for all concerned—and the period of reaction and of relaxation has now set in. At such a time material for detailed comment in the way of contemporary events is naturally reduced to a minimum. It may therefore not be inappropriate to take stock of the general situation, so far as it concerns the Church both at home and abroad, with more particular reference to the clearly manifest tendencies towards fuller co-operation and the urgency of the call to more extended missionary activity.

Swanwick.

Swanwick ought to mean much in the history of the C.M.S. By that we do not merely mean an increase of pecuniary resources; it will mean that, because that always follows when all else is well. But the things for which Swanwick ought to stand are much greater than mere matters of

finance. It ought to mean greater consecration and sacrifice all the way through C.M.S. circles; it ought to mean a better understanding between headquarters and the country; it ought to mean a fuller sense of our dependence upon God. We have used the word "ought" not because we are faithless, but because we want our readers as well as ourselves to realize that the ultimate success of Swanwick depends upon the rank and file in the country. Obligation must be translated into actuality, duty must become practice. The spirit of Swanwick must permeate the country, and we have faith enough to believe that it will. In that hope we can face the future. But we must face it also with a firm determination that we, each one of us, will do our duty with prayerfulness, with self-sacrifice, with determination, and with devotion.

Church Problems.

Our own Church of England is faced by certain grave problems. With regard to the clergy, there is the twofold difficulty of the supply of ordination candidates and of their proper training. There seems to be no doubt that at present the supply is diminishing. The *Westminster Gazette* has recently made an interesting statistical survey of the Church of England, based on figures taken from the *Official Year-Book of the Church of England.* We there find that in 1910-11, 711 deacons were ordained, and that in 1911-12 the number had fallen to 686. And this decrease in the ministerial supply has to be set over against an increase of 3½ millions in the population during the last ten years. There is not only a shortage of men, but of money. Voluntary offerings have decreased to the extent of £402,561 in the past year as compared with the previous, and with the exception of 1906-07, have not been so low for ten years. This is not due to lack of available money, because the country has recently been passing through a period of abundant prosperity. Is the shortage both of men and of money due to similar or identical causes? Does it arise in both cases from greater preoccupation with the world and its affairs, with a corresponding slackness of religious

interest? Or does it arise from defective management and organization within the Church?

The "Constructive Quarterly."

Our Church has its problems, not only of internal condition, but of external relationship with other religious bodies. There is no doubt that the loss resulting to Christianity from "our unhappy divisions" is being more clearly realized than ever, and that the movement towards closer fellowship and fuller co-operation is growing in strength. A permanent organ for the expression of it exists in the new periodical, the *Constructive Quarterly*, which has now reached its second issue. A paper in which Roman and Protestant, Eastern and Western, write in amicable co-operation, without surrender of principle but with fullest courtesy and consideration, is a striking sign of the times. There are revealed, of course, differing ideals. Many will feel—and the feeling will not be confined to Roman and to High Anglican thinkers—that the ultimate goal of our aspiration should be not only one Spirit but one Body; that we can finally be satisfied with nothing less than a world-wide communion, sharing in fellowship the same Sacraments, governed and organized on lines that meet with the loyal acceptance and submission of all its members—with allowance for wide variety corresponding to race, locality, and temperament—yet one in form as well as in its inner life.

The Ideal of Federation.

This is not an ideal that appeals to all. For some, at any rate, the more attractive ideal is that of federation. Dr. Selbie, the Principal of Mansfield College, writing in the present number of the *Constructive Quarterly* from the side of English Free Churches, says:

"They are anxious to remove causes of friction and to prepare the way for that better understanding and closer co-operation which they believe now to be within reach. But they are under no illusions in this matter. They do not look forward to any corporate reunion with the Anglican Church. It is unity rather than union that is their ideal, and they believe a true unity to be quite compatible with large diversities of method and administration."

In the same issue Professor Moulton, speaking of the place of Methodism in Catholic Unity, says:

"Men who used to dream of union among the Churches, and mean by it the absorption of others within their own community, are now beginning to see that such union will not come to pass. And, without perhaps consciously framing the phrase, they are coming towards a working policy which some of us think to be far better. The omens point unmistakably towards Federation among the Churches, the accomplishment of which may well bring union in its train some day—to a certain extent."

Better Omens.

Later in the same article Professor Moulton says:

"My own dream would be that of a great Federation like that of the Free Church Council, but including all forms of British Christianity, meeting together to see how far we can co-operate, and to narrow down to definite and well-understood issues the subjects on which *we must disagree.*"

We have italicized the last words. Do they not introduce a note of needless pessimism into the outlook? It is, at any rate, to be noted that two great instances are visible in the ranks of Nonconformity of a desire for more than federation, but for corporate union. Three of the smaller Methodist bodies have now combined to form the United Methodist Church, and in Scotland we have the interesting and inspiring spectacle of the gradual coming together of the United Free Church and the Church of Scotland. These have hitherto been separated neither in ritual nor in theology, but on the question of the relation of the Church to the State. We trust that real union will be successfully accomplished, and that these happenings in the Church life outside the Anglican Communion may be of good omen, for the hope that one day these may come not "to a certain extent," but wholly; not only a federation, but a union of all who love and worship Christ.

The Church in U.S.A.

The Church newspapers of the States have been much concerned during the last few months with proposals to change the title of the Protestant Episcopal Church. An effort was made years ago, and it failed. Its object was to get rid of the title "Protestant," and the

grounds given are generally and roughly these: either the Church is not Protestant, or the word is misunderstood, or it has changed its meaning. It is easy to misrepresent a controversy, the details of which we only know from Church newspapers; but on the whole the first of the above-given reasons seems to be most in the mind of those who desire change, though the other reasons are sometimes most on their tongues. The opposition to the change is as keen and forceful as the championship of it. The line of the opposition may be gathered generally from the following paragraphs culled from a letter giving a series of reasons by Rev. R. W. Hogue:

> "We stand with the Church and against this effort to change the name—
>
> "*Because* the misconceptions of the 'uninformed' furnish no more fit or honourable excuse for rejection of the word 'Protestant' than for the rejection of the word 'Catholic.'
>
> "*Because*, as we are charged to see to it that the word 'Catholic' is properly understood, so we are also charged by established history and honourable heritage to see to it that the word 'Protestant' is properly understood.
>
> "*Because* the deliberate setting aside of our Protestant title would inevitably imply the deliberate cancelling of our Protestant principles, despite the adoption of any well-meant Round Table resolutions of compromise.
>
> "*Because* an overwhelming majority of our Church membership have expressed themselves as opposed to any change in the title on the only occasion offered to the Church to vote as a whole.
>
> "*Because*, despite petition after petition during the last thirty-six years, the General Convention has decided against any change.
>
> "*Because*, during the period of these decisions and under the title held by the Church, the forces of Protestant Christianity have been drawn closer to our side; and pride, prejudice, and ignorance are being overcome by understanding, fellowship, and love.
>
> "*Because* the day of Christian reunion is about to dawn, and the Church that delays or darkens its approach will have much to answer for."

The controversy is being carried on, as we should expect in America, with a plainness of speech to which our more delicate ears are unaccustomed. Some of that plain speech is very refreshing and suggestive. There has been a tendency in England to let the word "Protestant" go by default, a tendency to be ashamed of it. It is time that it was reinstated in its full content. Both "Catholic" and "Protestant" have been

debased as terms, and both must be redeemed. American Churchmen are being compelled to face the issue in their long-continued controversy. It were well for us to face it too. We are Catholics, we are Protestants; we will continue to be both. But we must define our terms, just now especially the latter one. We must not allow ourselves to be laughed out of a name which means so much. If we would realize, or help others to realize, how much, we cannot do better than turn to the very valuable book which the Dean of Canterbury wrote some year or two ago, "Principles of the Reformation, Practical and Historical." We commend it to our American friends.

Protestant and Catholic.

We venture to make a lengthy quotation from an article by the Bishop of West Virginia contained in the issue of May 13 of the *Southern Churchman*. Its interest is sufficient apology, and no comment is needed. The Bishop writes:

"It would seem almost impossible to present the much discussed question upon change of name in any new light, and yet there is one aspect of it that I do not think has been sufficiently emphasized, and I desire to say a word about it to-day.

"In this comprehensive Church of ours there are practically two religions, and that fact is at the bottom of all our trouble. The difficulty of further defining arises from the very different use of the same words, so that you cannot tell positively what one means by 'Protestant' or by 'Catholic.' To urge that we must abandon the term 'Protestant' because the word has changed its significance is altogether inconclusive, because 'we have as much right and reason to assume an ideal and expurgated sense of the term "Protestant" as others have to assume such a sense for the word "Catholic."'

"That there are practically two religions at this time in our Church is not too strong an assertion. The one champions Sacramental Confession—that is, the Sacrament of Penance; the Objective Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Elements on the Altar; the Sacrifice of the Mass; Eucharistic Adoration; Reservation, and Seven Sacraments. All these things are openly professed and practised in the one religion. While the other is distinct from it in this—not to define more closely—that it strongly holds that all these things, without exception, were cast out of the English Liturgy and omitted from the English standards of doctrine at the Reformation.

"It is not claimed that all who favour dropping the word 'Protestant'

from our title hold the views described above, but the most active and influential among them do hold them.

* * * * * *

"We are insistent as we are in regard to this matter because we cannot but regard the movement to drop the word 'Protestant,' if not on the part of the great mass of those favouring, yet on the part of the most active and influential leaders, as evidence of their affiliation and practical sympathy with the views of Lord Halifax; and these leaders are apt to determine policies rather than the great mass, and they have shown their purpose in striking at what Protestants consider one of the bulwarks of their position, and so disturbing the balance, on the preservation of which depends the continued working together of the two religions in our Church. This is the gist of the whole controversy. We can work along as we have been doing, however illogical it may appear to be; but let the balance between the two religions be disturbed by addition to or subtraction from our present standards, and no one can tell whereunto the difference will grow. We therefore deprecate further agitation of the question. If the party of change can stay with us—well, they know where we stand. If they must go, we bid them God-speed. As for ourselves, here we are in the Protestant Episcopal Church, the Church of our fathers. We have no idea of going out or being cast out. Here we stand—can do nothing else. God help us!"

Crockford. Once again, and for the forty-fifth time, Crockford's "Clerical Directory" has been issued from the press. It comes as complete as ever, but with new features which make it even more useful than ever. It is simply a list of names and places, with certain details about them. But it is a sign and symbol of the services that the Church renders in every corner of our land and beyond it. It is the suggestion of a tremendous force. It is the inventory of a wonderful piece of machinery. The clergy of the Church of England have an incalculable opportunity. When we pick up this great volume and turn over its pages, it requires little of imagination and little of prayerfulness to drive us to our knees to pray that the names contained in this book may not only be contained in the Lamb's Book of Life, but may be beacons pointing others to the kingdom of God the whole country through. We are grateful for Crockford and the lessons that it teaches.

The New Evangelicalism.

BY THE REV. A. R. WHATELY, D.D.

THE preaching of the Gospel has lost much of its old force, because it has been felt necessary to qualify its traditional form. Some of this qualification has been sound, some unsound. Much of what is called the Gospel to-day is in essence little more than a haloed morality. The emphasis is shifted from specific fact to general truth, and when this is done, the case of redemptional religion is virtually surrendered. But we here assume a general agreement between the writer and the readers of this article upon such vital questions. What is more necessary to note is this: that not only unsound, but sound, qualifications of our old preaching have blunted the edge of its message. What, then, are we to do? We cannot fall back upon crude and harsh teachings, no more true to Scripture than to modern thought and feeling. For, even if we believed them true, they are becoming less and less effectual. And yet, on the other hand, we find it hard, under modern conditions, to preserve that clear-cut issue, that clash of two eternities, that sense of the transcendent reality of sin, that gave to the old preaching its spell.

The barbarian chief, in the early days, who, when told in answer to his inquiry that his heathen tribesmen were condemned to an inevitable hell, stood back from the baptismal water and said, "I will go to my own people," exemplified the recoil of the nobler, not the baser, side of human nature from what was preached as the Gospel. It is easy for us to-day to repudiate this alleged presupposition of the message of salvation; but we must follow up this presupposition as far as it will lead us. We must do so, not only to remove the reproach, but to adjust our view of sin and salvation upon a firm basis. For it is clear that the problem—if we call it such—of the unevangelized heathen extends itself in principle to all who have not had a really fair chance to appreciate the Gospel—all who have never really been brought face to face with the issue.

And this will include a vast number who have received orthodox instruction in the Faith. And it will raise the further question: Who really has rejected Christ, with a proper realization of of what that rejection implies? Are there not degrees of guilt even in the crucifying of the Son of God? And yet, on the other hand, has not Christ died to save us from sin, and does not that presuppose a lost condition antecedent to the hearing of the call? When, therefore, we exempt the heathen, and some others, from the *massa perditionis*, are we not watering down—however necessarily—the stern truth to which the Gospel itself owes its light and power? Have we not made an inroad upon a principle which, as a whole, we dare not disturb? Dare not, because if we affirm baldly that Christ died only for the sin of rejecting Him, we reduce the whole Gospel to incoherence. And yet we seem compelled to make concessions which would lead logically to this conclusion.

But even if we could escape the dilemma by what I may call a fair and reasonable special pleading—by considerations drawn from outside the immediate terms of the problem—should we thus have gained all that we want? A Gospel that has to be qualified loses by the very fact. Its freedom, simplicity, and grip are weakened, and at the same time it is not able to set at rest entirely the misgivings of all who demand of their religion that it shall not only tolerate, but embrace, all that is true, lovely, and of good report. We must not soothe with apologies or console with uncovenanted mercies the human soul that responds to our Gospel: "I will go to my own people."

We are now in sight of the real solution—a solution which lingers, I think, half-expressed in the background of such modern teaching as is sensitive both to the spirit of the Gospel and to the spirit of the age. It is not the object of this article to bring to bear any mere theory, not already present as a half-formed intuition, working towards conscious expression, in the best evangelical preaching of to-day. But to bring it into full daylight, and to formulate it sharply for self and for others, means, for many of us, a somewhat formidable breach with old

habits of thought. And yet, so far from tending towards a dead rationalizing level, it helps us far towards just that focussing and unification of Christian truth which is its best preservative against hostile or virtual attack. As little as possible will be said about its doctrinal context, in which alone we can do full justice to its significance. This, of course, is inevitable in a short article.

What we need, surely, is not to qualify this feature of absoluteness in the Gospel—its incisive contrasts, its balance of finalities, its language of eternity. If we dislike to talk bluntly of perdition, we cannot preach a *moderate perdition*. The antithesis must *somewhere* be absolute ; *somewhere* a deadlock in life and thought must be discovered which only the Gospel can solve.

The old theology taught that eternal damnation rested upon sin, simply as it is. Beneath all blurred distinctions, we were told to assume, not merely two fundamental tendencies, but two complete states, at least wherever the Gospel was known; and conversion was the passing from the one to the other. Writing as to Evangelicals, I need not pause to defend the vital element of truth in this view, as against a mass of would-be liberal theology. For us the definiteness of the historical redemption has its consequence and reflection in the definiteness of the offer and the claim with which the Redeemer meets the individual soul. We believe in conversion. But we do need, I think, to readjust our conception of the state of ordinary unconverted soul, not definitely rebellious, and of the exact sense in which Christ died to save us from sin.

There is one great feature of certain pronouncements in the New Testament which are specially appealed to against all "moral," or rationalizing, theories of the Atonement: with all their substitutionary import, they set forth personal renewal and holiness as, no less than forgiveness, the *direct* object of Christ's atoning death. He "bare our sins . . . that we, being dead unto sin, should live unto righteousness." Deliverance from the power of sin is not a secondary, but a primary, object of His

death. Of course, the victory over sin in our hearts is progressive, and thus subsequent to acceptance with God; but, even so, sin is in principle overcome, as well as pardoned, as soon as it is renounced.

Christ came to save us from sin, whether regarded as guilt or as a power. Now, the ultimate issue of sin is the conscious rejection of the Saviour. This is so, because Christ reveals in Himself the ideal goodness, and to reject Him is in principle to reject goodness as such. All sin, therefore, in so far as it is conscious, deliberate, and cherished, tends towards this consummation. It comes short of this consummation only because it is not fully known for what it is. If we realized it fully in one solitary case, the temptation in that case would be the very crisis of life, the choice between Christ and apostasy. All actual sins, in persons not reprobate, are *partly* due to impulse or to deception. The more it tends to deliberateness, the more is it a movement of the whole man against God. Therefore, whoever breaks one commandment is in principle guilty of all. There is a solidarity in sins as in virtues; and the former find their goal in apostasy, as the latter in the new man created as such in Christ Jesus.

Now we are brought a step farther towards our conclusion. If we so regard sin, then we must certainly reject two opposite views of the position of the ordinary sinner. He is certainly not in a definitive condition of damnation, because his sin has not reached maturity. On the other hand, his position as a sinner is that of potential ruin. His lower nature, as in the saint also, rests under condemnation; though how far he has identified his conscious selfhood with it, or how far he has assented to the condemnation of it, is a matter between himself and God. The definite conversion to Christ differs greatly in different people, not only in other ways, but especially according to the condition of the will before Christ is inwardly apprehended. In some it is mainly an enlightenment, in others essentially a repentance. On the other hand, we repudiate the reduction of the idea of salvation to that of moral renewal,

which it undoubtedly contains. Such definitions are not only less than Christian, but less than religious.

No, we must diverge from the old soteriology and from rationalism alike. We must maintain that Christ saves the sinner from sin—*real* sin, with all its potentiality of eternal death, with all its need of real pardon—yet not, as it were, from *ideal* sin—sin to which the sinner has not yet attained, and which is but a false interpretation of his actual state.

At this point we come in sight of the meaning of conversion. We will not discuss the eschatological questions which of course arise. For they are secondary, however closely related, to the results that emerge from the analysis of primary realities of religious experience. If Christ is preached to men as their own renewed conscience, which in Him has gathered up its scattered and broken threads, emerged from the confusion and the mists, confronted the soul with a definite call to surrender and a definite promise of acceptance—then to reject Him is a self-damnation. For the rejection of One who unites in His own person all the scope and all the imperative of the moral law leaves no ground for any of those hopes that depend upon moral and spiritual issues. A man may neglect a half-appreciated offer of salvation in the hope that God will have mercy in the end. But in so far as he knows what he is doing (and it is the business of the evangelist to show him), he knows that in so doing he is renouncing and killing his own moral selfhood; he is cutting away the very grounds of hope. He cannot thus reject the grace of God *in toto* and as such, and yet keep a reserve of it for future need.

All this may be got over by plausible theories; but these theories must be judged not merely as abstract theology, but by the living and concrete logic of experience. Here we have that great truth of the consummation of religious issues in Christ, so subtly expounded in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the most directly relevant, perhaps, to the modern situation of all the New Testament books. And it rests upon the laws of man's nature, no less than on the dispensations of God. To "crucify the Son of God afresh," in its full meaning, would be to crucify

hope and belief within the man. The Christ who has gathered in the harvest of the ages, and the harvest of the individual's own past, leaves a desert behind Him for all who turn back. Therefore, to "neglect so great salvation" is self-condemnation, just in so far as the salvation neglected has been apprehended as the historical and logical consummation of God's mercy. Now, the idea of conversion, when broadened and deepened to its full dimensions, simply embraces the whole claim and resources of God and the whole personality of man into a point of luminous and awful finality. How the doctrine of Baptism does not modify this, but clinches and completes it, we cannot now pause to consider; nor, on the other hand, need we now vindicate the main principle of conversion, except as it is vindicated on the lines of our present argument. It is assumed that conversion, as a spiritual reality, is involved in the logic of any Christian faith that is not either legalistic or nebulous. My present attempt is simply this: to get behind the antithesis between the Greek and the Western theology; to see in Christ the Logos and the Redeemer at once—each because He is also the other.

The revised Evangelicalism, then, will offer a definitive salvation which presupposes a relative spiritual death, but not necessarily a "lost condition" actually reached. Christ, as in the New Testament teaching, will be the test, and human sin will define and reveal itself face to face with Him. We need not, then, be in a hurry to fix what we believe as to the Second Death, though there are teachings, on opposite sides, which we need not hesitate to disbelieve. For in the soul itself there is a sense of diremption, a shadow of perdition, moral, spiritual, and metaphysical, when it rises to a consciousness of its own unfathomable depth, but not yet of the life in God.

This new revivalism will thus speak from the broad platform of human experience, and yet from that platform proclaim, in the clearest and most unqualified language, the Divine supremacy and presence of the Son of man. It will speak very quietly and soberly, but the awe and thrill of the older message will attend its utterance. And the phantoms of unreality and mis-

giving, which seem present more and more to chill the preaching of the Gospel, will disappear; for the whole field of heart and conscience will be taken into possession, and the light will flood the dark corners in which they now stand.

The old doctrine of human corruption will be turned to the opposite account. It will no longer be used to disparage the good in the unconverted; but, on the contrary, the transcendent reality of human sinfulness will appear just precisely in this—that it can segregate even the Divine products of the Λόγος σπερματικός, and prevent the very virtues of the sinner from bearing him, by their own centripetal impulse, to the Christ who is their home. Thus, even as, in the historical climax of sin and grace, "Adam's sins have swept between the righteous Son and Father," so, in human life, sin comes in between the Divine and the Divine; breaks up the unity of the Logos, even in societies where Christ has been preached; sets up against the Gospel not merely rival pleasures and rival gains, but rival ideals; sets truth against truth and conscience against conscience.

We must claim all these things for Christ. We must hold Him up not simply as the exalted and Divine Jesus, but as the centre and fulness of all the scattered goodness around us in human life. And just for this reason intelligently to reject Him is to reject conscience and goodness even as such; and to accept Him is, even there and then, to enter upon a new relationship with the universe and with our own selves. It is just *because* He is the Logos that His claim is absolute and His salvation grounded in the very foundations of Being. And it is just for this reason that conversion, which answers to His own personal approach—which settles our relation to Him, and in Him to all that is right and good—is on His side the primary claim, and on ours the discovery of the Pearl of Great Price.

Such is the revelation, as I think, which is even now dawning upon the confusion of human life. Such is the Christ who can dissolve the mists of our perplexities by the sheer white light of His Presence, and answer with the one word of His Gospel the insistent and intersecting questionings of our age.

The Church and the Poor.

A SERIES OF HISTORICAL SKETCHES.

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

VII.

The Reformation—Luther and Calvin.

IN my last paper I pointed out that even before the Reformation there had arisen a growing secularization of the means taken for relieving the poor. First civic, and then national, authorities had already begun to assume a responsibility towards those in need, a responsibility which during earlier periods had been left entirely to the Church.[1] At this point, therefore, it will be necessary for me to remind my readers that I am not writing a history of Poor Relief, but of the means and methods which, from motives of religion, the Church as a whole, and individuals and societies within the Church, have employed to help the poor and to improve social conditions generally.

With the coming of the Reformation the term "the Church" must in these papers to some extent change its meaning. So far, at any rate since the days of Gregory the Great, it has meant the undivided Church of Western Christendom, of which the Pope was the recognized earthly head. From this point onwards it may mean either organized Western Christianity—*i.e.*, the sum total of the various parts or fragments into which the Catholic Church of the West broke up—or it may mean what we term the English Church. Under the first interpretation it would, of course, include the work of the great Continental reformers.

[1] Certainly since the Reformation the influence of the Church on the relief of the poor has been more indirect than it was previously; but if indirect, it has also been very real. Current conceptions of Christian duty have affected not only the clergy, but the laity—*e.g.*, statesmen who have framed the laws and Boards of Guardians who have administered them. The revival of interest in the doctrine of the Incarnation during recent years has had an immense influence upon the treatment of the poor.

Once again, let me insist that the period which we term the Reformation was marked not only by doctrinal and ecclesiastical, but also by immense social, changes. The two sets of changes proceeded side by side; they were not independent, yet we must be extremely cautious in speaking of any particular change in either category as being either the cause or effect of a change in the other.[1] What I would maintain is, that quite apart from a consideration of the doctrinal and ecclesiastical changes which took part, the immense alterations which occurred in social conditions during this period demand the most careful attention of those who are interested in the history of the welfare of the people, and who would learn valuable lessons from a study of that history.[2]

But especially during the second half of the fifteenth and the first half of the sixteenth century a rapid change was taking place in another, and an extremely important, sphere of activity —that of thought. This affected the conceptions both of religion and of everyday conduct; it affected the whole conception of life and duty. This change of thought was chiefly due to enlarged knowledge. It manifested itself in a growth of the critical spirit, also of the scientific spirit, and in a much more free exercise of the reason; it resulted in a harvest of individualistic tendencies and an ever-growing demand for liberty. We have no right to assume, as is frequently the case, that in these various movements the Reformers invariably stood on the one side, and those who failed to follow them on the other. Very frequently the actual conduct of the Reformers was in direct contradiction to the principles they professed; and even so far as freedom of thought is concerned, men like Erasmus and More were far in advance of men like Calvin and Knox.[3]

[1] Professor Pollard in "Cambridge Modern History," vol. ii., p. 175: "The assertion that there was no connection between the Reformation and the Peasants' Revolt is as far from the truth as the statement that the one produced the other."

[2] The "economic" changes which took place in Western Europe from the middle of the fifteenth to the middle of the sixteenth century can hardly be exaggerated. On the whole subject see chap. xv. of the "Cambridge Modern History," vol. i. (by Dr. Cunningham).

[3] Much that is most interesting on this subject will be found in the following chapters of Beard's "Hibbert Lectures": (iv.) "The Principles

Another question arises in connection with the effect of the Reformation, or rather in connection with thc effect of its individualistic tendencies, upon the welfare of the poor. To some extent the Reformation synchronizes with the rise of capitalism; that is, with the growing power of capitalism.[1] Side by side with this, and not independent of it, we see the effect of individualistic conceptions in the growth of competition in trade. The facts are these: The countries which largely accepted the principles of the Reformation became, on the whole, the chief commercial countries of Europe, those in which trade rapidly increased; indeed, one might go a step farther, and say that in these countries the chief commercial centres became the great strongholds of advanced Reformation, or Puritan, principles. In these countries, and especially in these commercial centres, we find competition in trade—often with disastrous effects upon the poor—becoming more and more accentuated. I simply place these facts before my readers, leaving them to see connections and draw conclusions for themselves.[2]

The Reformation had many indirect results, among these the most important for our present purpose was that it revolutionized the conception of charity. The policy of the Reformers set very strongly against indiscriminate charity, which had become nothing less than a curse to society during the later Middle Ages. For instance, Luther laid down the two following principles: First, "Begging is to be rigidly prohibited; all who are not old or weak shall work. No beggars shall be permitted to stay who do not belong to the parish." On the second principle it seems as if he would relieve the

of the Reformation"; (v.) "The Reformation in Relation to Reason and Liberty"; (x.) "The Growth of the Critical Spirit"; (xi.) "The Development of Philosophical Method and Scientific Investigation." See also chap. xix. of vol. ii. of the "Cambridge Modern History."

[1] See chap. ii., book v., "The Intervention of Capital," in Cunningham's "Western Civilization."

[2] The whole subject of the connection between individualism in religion and in commerce is one which deserves more study than it has yet received. Studied historically, the subject might prove enlightening and instructive.

Church entirely of its responsibilities to the poor, for he says: "Each town should provide for its own poor people . . . poor householders who have honourably laboured at their craft or in agriculture ought to be given loans from the public chest; and this aid shall be given to them without return, if they are unable to restore it."[1]

History is full of examples showing how easily the pendulum swings from one extreme to the other. It seems to have been so in regard to almsgiving during the Reformation. Instead of lavishness, we find absolute niggardliness; instead of too much charity, we find callousness towards the actual needs of the poor. In the celebrated Sermon of the Plough, preached by Bishop Latimer at St. Paul's in 154$\frac{8}{9}$, we read: "In times past men were full of pity and compassion, but now there is no pity; for in London their brother shall die in the streets for cold; he shall lie sick at the door between stock and stock . . . and perish there for hunger. In times past . . . when any man died they would bequeath great sums of money toward the relief of the poor . . . now charity is waxen cold, none helpeth the poor."[2] Again, in a letter to Cecil, Bishop Ridley writes: "I must be a suitor unto you in our good Master Christ's cause; I beseech you be good to Him. The matter is, sir, alas! He hath lain too long abroad in the streets of London, both hungry, naked, and cold."[3]

But before I enter upon the effects which the Reformation had upon the treatment of the poor in England, I would point out two most valuable lessons which we may learn from the two greatest Continental Reformers: The first from the *work* of Luther, which should be of the nature of an extremely strong warning; the second from the *teaching* of Calvin, which is already having, and I trust may continue to have, a far-reaching influence for good.[4]

[1] "Christ and Civilization," p. 367.
[2] Quoted in Leonard's "English Poor Relief," p. 29, note.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 32.
[4] I refer, of course, to the "social principles" and "social teaching" of the Bible.

I showed in my last paper that when the Reformation dawned there was in various parts of Europe, and arising from many different causes, a very considerable amount of distress; among the peasants of Germany this distress was particularly acute.[1] For many years there had existed a condition of growing discontent, which finally came to a head and broke out in the Peasants' War of 1524-25. What I would now consider is the part which Luther took in regard to this revolt. I cannot here enter at length into the history or the causes of this rebellion; briefly, it was due to poverty, which was the result of heavy burdens imposed by feudal services, pernicious game laws, growing taxation, and exactions demanded by the ecclesiastical courts. Probably the nobles were themselves suffering severely from the changes in economic conditions, and therefore they tried to shift the burden from their own shoulders on to those of the poorest of the people, a device which has been attempted at various times.[2]

Possibly, Luther's own teaching, in which he had denounced not only the exactions of the Papacy, but also merchants and lawyers, as robbers, had helped to fan the flames.[3] We must remember that in the earliest demands of the peasants there was nothing revolutionary; on the contrary, they were reasonable in themselves, and were couched in moderate language.[4] But as the movement grew, its objects undoubtedly widened; its language became more passionate, and its tone more and more extreme. At first, also, there was among many of the leaders a distinctly religious spirit, one of which the nature was quite excellent. It must, however, be conceded that though, especially at first, the great majority of those taking part were peasants with very genuine wrongs, another element was gradually absorbed into the movement. I refer to that section of the

[1] For a brief account of these see "Christ and Civilization," pp. 340 *et seq.*

[2] It is well known that the burden of increased taxation generally falls ultimately upon the very poor.

[3] See T. M. Lindsay, "Luther and the German Revolution," p. 170.

[4] "They were expressed in religious phraseology, and supported by arguments drawn from the Scriptures" ("Christ and Civilization," p. 341).

population which includes a number of the criminal classes, and is always ready to participate in disorder.[1] Though the movement was essentially an agrarian one, it did to some extent affect the towns. These were generally divided in their sympathies. Usually the mass of the people held with the peasants, while the richer classes, represented by the Council and the leading citizens, were against these.[2] The movement, as we know, was ultimately crushed by the ruling powers. It was crushed with the most heartless ferocity,[3] and largely by the help of foreign mercenaries. It ended in what can only be termed a massacre, in which not less than 100,000 of the peasants fell by the sword.[4]

Luther's attitude towards the movement, and the permanent effects of this attitude upon religion in Germany, are extremely instructive. In fact, I know of few episodes in the whole course of history from which a clearer and more instructive warning may be learnt. This is my chief reason for bringing the episode before my readers.

At first Luther's sympathies were undoubtedly with the peasants.[5] Before the revolt broke out he had inveighed in no measured terms against the misgovernment of the Princes and ecclesiastical rulers, also against the growing luxuriousness of the wealthy.[6] Thus, to a certain extent, if unintentionally, he was certainly a contributory cause of the outbreak. When this actually occurred, Luther adopted at first what appeared to be a more or less neutral position. On the one hand, he expressed not only sympathy, but actually a measure of approval of the demands made by the peasants; on the other hand, he warned these that if they resorted to violence the movement must end in disaster.

Luther, of course, was in an extremely difficult position. He knew at heart that the original demands of the peasants were just, that they were actually asking no more than the right to live.

[1] "Cambridge Modern History," p. 182. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 185.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 191. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 194.
[5] "He had sympathy with the demands of the 'Twelve Articles'" (T. M. Lindsay, "Luther," p. 183).
[6] *E.g.*, in his "Appeal to the Nobility of the German Nation."

But he could not (so he judged) do without the help both of the Princes and also of the well-to-do and official classes, among whom his theological opinions had chiefly spread.[1] But when, at this juncture, Luther was content to impart what has been termed "spiritual" advice to the starving peasants, he was committing an error which many a well-intentioned religious leader has committed since then. When men are hungry, they are not in a mental condition to appreciate, much less to be content with, such advice. Thought is doubtless spiritual, but you cannot think without a brain, which is a physical organ, and consequently demands regular physical nourishment.

Luther, however, did not long remain in a neutral position. In April or May of 1525 he issued the vehement (and indeed infamous) tract, "Against the Murderous Thieving Hordes of Peasants," in which he called upon the Princes to crush the revolt. I know that when the immediate circumstances—*e.g.*, the fiery proclamations of Münzer and the campaign of destruction which followed these in Thuringia and the Harz[2]—are remembered, something may be said for Luther; but that others, under the severe pressure of actual want, had resorted to violence was no justification for the language which Luther used, not in speech, which may be uttered in the heat of the moment, but in writing, which was printed and issued. The following extract from Luther's pamphlet will show its nature and its spirit: "In the case of an insurgent, every man is both judge and executioner. Therefore, whoever can should knock down, strangle, and stab such, publicly and privately, and think nothing so venomous, pernicious, and devilish, as an insurgent. . . . Such wonderful times are these that a Prince can merit heaven better with bloodshed than another with prayer."[3]

The evil results of Luther's action at that time have never passed away; they actually affect religious life in Germany at the present day. This, as I have already said, is my reason for

[1] "Cambridge Modern History," p. 178.
[2] Lindsay, "Luther and the German Reformation," pp. 184 *et seq.*
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 186.

dwelling upon the subject. The immediate results of Luther's policy were: First, the peasants were alienated from Protestantism; some relapsed back into Roman Catholicism, but the majority drifted into unbelief.[1] Secondly, the Lutheran movement ceased to be in any sense national; it depended henceforth for its very existence upon the support of political powers. Melanchthon was compelled to admit "that the decrees of the Lutheran Church were merely platonic conclusions without the support of the princes."[2]

Luther's conduct—indeed, his policy—was not inspired by any high principle or lofty ideal. It was governed by considerations of interest; it was based upon what he believed to be the necessities of the moment; it was purely utilitarian, and that not the highest, but rather in the lowest, sense of the word.[3] Its permanent results have been: First, that neither Lutheranism as a system of religion, nor the Lutheran Church as its expression, has ever been in a true sense either the religion or the Church of the German *people*. Lutheranism has been a State religion, protected by the State, and consequently under the control or overlordship of the State.[4] Its clergy, as a body, have never been able to be quite independent witnesses for God, and truth, and righteousness. Secondly, the Lutheran Church has never, as a Church, been able to identify itself with either the principles or the work of Christian social reform. Individual leaders, especially during the last two generations, have doubtless championed the rights of the poor, but as a Church it cannot be said to have stood for those rights. It has been the Church of the rulers rather than the Church of the subjects. Thirdly, the anti-Christian character of almost all forms of German Socialism has been an abiding result of Luther's unhappy policy.[5] Those who have been on the side of social progress have too often felt

[1] "Christ and Civilization," p. 344.

[2] "Cambridge Modern History," vol. ii., p. 194.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 195.

[4] "Luther's deep distrust of 'the common man' . . . prevented him from believing in a democratic Church, and led him to bind his reformation in the fetters of a secular control to the extent of regarding the secular Government as having a quasi-episcopal function" (Lindsay, *op. cit.*, p. 189).

[5] "Christ and Civilization," p. 344.

that they must look elsewhere for sympathy and practical help. How could they look for assistance to a Church whose interests are so palpably bound up with the interests of those who have, and whose chief aim is too often simply to retain, at once their position and possessions?

More than once, as we shall see in the course of subsequent chapters, the Church of England has, since the Reformation, succumbed to the same temptation—to be guided by a policy of present interest; and more than once she has suffered severely from this choice. The history of the English Church, especially during the second half of the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth century, furnishes only too many examples, both of isolated actions and courses of policy by which she lost, as she deserved to lose, the affection of the poorer classes. The danger of the Church still making mistakes in this direction has not entirely passed; hence it is well to have our memories refreshed upon the part played by Luther during the Peasants' War and upon the disastrous results of his conduct.

From Luther I turn to Calvin, whom we do not as a rule regard as primarily a social reformer, though in this, more than in any other sphere of activity, I think Calvin's greatness was revealed. I am not going either to enter into Calvin's interesting history, or to deal with his theological opinions. I am only concerned with him here in connection with the great principle he laid down (and which he zealously tried to put into practice) in regard to the true method of dealing with the social problem, and, as part of this, as to the best way of helping the poor.

To understand Calvin we must remember that he was trained as a lawyer; he was primarily a great jurist, and also a great moralist. At the same time he was a great "humanist." His earliest work was a commentary on the "De Clementia" of Cicero. In this commentary Calvin's character is revealed. He is a man "with a passion for conduct, moral, veracious, strenuous." [1] To

[1] "Cambridge Modern History," vol. ii., p. 352. (The chapter on Calvin is by the late Dr. A. M. Fairbairn.)

have "clemency is true humanity," and Calvin applies this doctrine socially. Man pitiful to men will be sensible of their rights and of his own duties. It has been said of Calvin, probably in view of his cast-iron system of theology, that "he never changed"; but this is not to say that he did not develop.[1] His strong conviction that religion must (in the sense of "inevitably") be translated into morality or conduct may have made him harsh, and in one well-known instance it made him positively cruel.[2] Throughout his career he was governed by this conviction. To most people, as I have already said, Calvin is pre-eminently the founder of a theological system (which is not the fact); actually he is much rather a great statesman, a great educationist, and the reformer of the morals of Geneva. These are Calvin's true titles to greatness. The key to his conduct is to remember that he "conceives the Gospel as a new law which ought to be embodied in a new life, individual and social."[3] Of course, to understand Calvin's work we must have some knowledge of the political, social, and moral condition of Geneva when Calvin arrived there for the first time.[4] I cannot, however, stay to describe these here further than to say that the moral conditions were very much what we knew to have been those of a city under ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the middle of the sixteenth century. There are those who are apt to assume that with the advent or acceptance of Protestantism moral conditions would necessarily improve. But Fairbairn admits that, though at least two months before Calvin's arrival Geneva had sworn to live according to the holy Evangelical Law and Word of God,[5] it had not actually become any more moral in character. It had simply "changed its mind" in religion.[6] What Calvin set himself to organize was not simply a city which should also be a Church—which was the old Geneva idea—but a Church which should be efficaciously moral.

[1] Dr. Fairbairn says: "Few men may have changed less; but few also have developed more."

[2] I refer, of course, to the death of Servetus.

[3] "Cambridge Modern History," vol. ii., p. 357.

[4] *Ibid.*, vol. ii., pp. 358 *et seq.*

[5] *Ibid.*, vol. ii., p. 363.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 367.

Now I come to the special point in which Calvin demands our attention in connection with our present subject. Briefly, Calvin made the Bible at once the foundation, the textbook, and the inspiration of his whole social system. Its teaching was not simply the best, but the only true guide to social reform. The way he approached the subject was thus : The Bible contains the revealed will of God ; therefore a State, or a social polity, should be founded upon the teaching of Scripture. A theocracy meant nothing more or less than a State founded and built up upon this teaching ; it meant "the application of the truths of the Bible to civic and political life." Of course, "in claiming that the Bible was a textbook of sociology[1] as well as religion Calvin took up a position which was destined to produce revolutionary ideas in the future."[2] The establishment of this theocracy was to be the joint work of Church and State. The State so constituted and established possessed supreme power over the individual, and the individual had no rights against the State. This naturally followed, from the obvious fact that there could be no appeal against the law of God. The difficulty lay in the application of these principles. One point upon which Calvin insisted was "that the individual is bound to sacrifice his own interests for the interests of the community. On the other hand, Calvin taught that the State made itself responsible for his well-being. As an application of this Calvin held that the State must find useful employment for every man that could work. As a practical application of this particular conviction Calvin introduced new industries into Geneva.[3]

The principle enunciated by Calvin, that the Bible must be the supreme rule in every department of Church and State, is in agreement with the whole spirit of the Reformation—in fact, it

[1] Unfortunately, the word "sociology" is used to-day with very different meaning. See the essay "On the Origin and Use of the Word Sociology" in "Sociological Papers," 1904 (Macmillan and Co.). Here the word is tantamount to "the science of the constitution of society."

[2] The position is really at the basis of all forms of so-called "*Christian Socialism.*"

[3] "Christ and Civilization," pp. 349 *et seq.*

is simply an application of its most comprehensive doctrine—the supremacy of Holy Scripture.[1] But at once the question arises: How is it to be worked out? Undoubtedly Geneva offered a particularly favourable field for doing this, because by tradition at Geneva there had always been an exceptional unity of Church and State;[2] also from the small size of its territory, and the limited number of its inhabitants, Geneva offered a manageable field for a social experiment. That a considerable measure of success did attend Calvin's efforts cannot be denied.

The principle which Calvin enunciated has had an influence far beyond his own age. It has, if under different forms, been strongly revived during the last few years, and its influence in several directions is yet growing. The difficulty, as in the case of every comprehensive principle, lies in its application to actual needs and circumstances. If we admit that the "social" teaching of Christ is the heart and essence of the "social" teaching of Holy Scripture, and if we say that the teaching, both of Christ and of Holy Scripture, must be spiritually interpreted, then we may claim that the supremacy of the social teaching of Holy Scripture is the principle for which all the Christian Societies and Unions for Social Service, which are so active at the present time, are contending.

But we may go a step farther than this in the direction of Calvin's teaching, and say that actually (*e.g.*, in the teaching of Christ, and in the great principles enunciated by the Old Testament Prophets) in Holy Scripture the laws of social welfare are for all time enunciated; and further, that these laws are as irrefragable, and their issues as inevitable, as are such scientific laws as those which govern the motions of bodies, as the laws of light, or heat, or electricity. We must, however, be extremely careful in our application of this faith or conviction. We must remember that we are dealing with substances and forces besides which all other substances and forces are extremely

[1] To Calvin the supremacy and authority of Holy Scripture was based upon the concurrent witness of the Holy Spirit in the Written Word and in the believer's soul. See his "Institutio," book i., chap. vii.

[2] "Cambridge Modern History," vol. ii., pp. 358 *et seq.*

simple. Suppose we look upon the social course which under any particular set of circumstances should be pursued as a problem to be solved, we must remember that the number of "variants" in the problem is extremely great; also that both our knowledge of the nature of these variants (which are composed of human nature), and also our knowledge of the forces under the influence of which these variants act, is even yet extremely limited.[1]

The danger to a nature like Calvin's, which had been accentuated by his legal training, was to regard the whole Bible as a legal code, every part of which was of equal authority. The critical-historical spirit by which we seek to distinguish what is essential to the teaching, from what is merely accidental to the age, of a Biblical writer had not been as fully developed in Calvin's time as it has in our own. At the same time we cannot exaggerate the truth or value of the great social principles (the principles of social righteousness) which underlie the teaching of the Hebrew Prophets. This is very far from saying that we can regard the legalistic code of Judaism as a standard of conduct for the present time. It is in noticing the chasm which separates essentials from accidentals that we see that, while "the spirit" of the social teaching of the Bible "giveth life," a rigid application of "the letter" of that teaching may actually be productive of destruction.

Those who accepted the doctrines of the Reformation could no longer accept the medieval "theory of charity," which we have seen had been the growth of several centuries. The chief motive from which the greater part of the charity of the Middle Ages had been bestowed no longer existed for the Reformers.

[1] This may not be the place to enter into a present controversy of very considerable importance, but in the present reaction against a so-called "mechanical theory of the universe" there is at least a danger of the pendulum of thought swinging too far in the opposite direction. A "spiritual" interpretation of the universe, to use a current and popular phrase, is not necessarily a conception of the universe from which very definite fixed laws are necessarily excluded. Probably, however, these laws may not be so simple or so easy to state as was at one time supposed.

The doctrines of penance and of good works were no longer accepted by them. The consideration of personal reward or advantage to the giver of charity, either here or hereafter, could not now enter. No one who believed in the teaching of the Reformers could regard the bestowal of charity or the establishment of a hospital as a means for procuring a mitigation of the sufferings of purgatory. When people now give charity they must do so from purely altruistic motives. They must think of the needs and sufferings of the poor and of their duty to these; they must not consider any advantage which, by giving, they themselves may reap.

But while it may be a comparatively easy thing to take away a certain motive, it is often an extremely difficult thing to put another motive of equal strength in its place. This was very practically proved during the period of the Reformation. As I have already shown, a very serious check was given to the flow of charity, and undoubtedly, at least for a time, this was the cause of very real suffering. Also, unfortunately, this happened during a season of exceptional distress among the poor, quite apart from any causes connected with the Reformation. It is during such seasons that charity, if wisely given, is most useful. But at the time of which we are speaking the chief source of charity of every kind was suddenly cut off. In England neither alms nor food could any longer be obtained at the monastery gate; the wayfarer could no longer find shelter in the *hospitium;* the sick were no longer tended and cared for in the monastic infirmary, because the monastery itself had ceased to exist. Not only had the monastery gone, but its possessions, part of which at least were the patrimony of the poor, had also gone. In a few instances, but very few, a portion of these possessions had been saved for purposes directly or indirectly connected with the poor; but in the vast majority of instances both monastic lands and monastic revenues had been entirely alienated from every charitable purpose.

In my next article I shall try to show what new methods of dealing with the problem of the poor were tried during this period.

Authority in Religion.

By the Rev. H. A. WILSON, M.A.,
Vicar of St. Peter's, Norbiton.

I. Authority of Church and Bible.

IT is a strange fact that though men instinctively chafe at authority in the ordinary affairs of life, in religion it is the one thing of all others they most demand. A religion which comes forward with some definite and clear-cut authority, with categorical "thou shalt's" and "thou shalt not's," with a system clearly elaborated, is sure to gain a large following.

This is clearly one of the chief reasons of the popularity of the Roman Church with many minds. It has a definite answer to give to almost every question; it can assure its adherents that, provided they do this and do that, it will do the rest. It is a religion in which authority is developed to the highest degree, and systematized in the most minute fashion. In plain words, it is an easy religion for this very reason.

Just as Continental travel has been facilitated by tourist agencies, by which inconvenience and responsibility is lifted off the shoulders of the individual, who has nothing to do but follow his guide and rely upon his interpreter, so there is always a tendency in religion to create an authority which will in the same way relieve the devotee of the duty of thinking and acting for himself.

It is just in this very direction that the Reformation made its greatest and farthest-reaching reform. The establishment of the principle of the right of private judgment cut at the very root of what might be called the tourist agency system of the Church; for it did not merely defend the right of the individual conscience, but carried with it the responsibility of the individual to exercise the private judgment thus secured to him in ascertaining the truth.

Men were thus thrown back upon themselves, the Church

declining the responsibility of the task ; each man had his soul returned to him, so to speak. But he must have some guide to show the way, some authority to correct and control him. Where was he to look for such a thing ?

Now, it is a generally accepted conclusion that the mere destruction of a belief, however erroneous it may be, is quite indefensible unless there is something more true offered in its place. If the Reformation had merely cut away the authority of the Church and left nothing as an alternative, it would be an indictment against it of the gravest kind. It is not our purpose to inquire what the reformers held to be the final authority in religion, except to remark that the common observation that they put an infallible Book in the place of an infallible Church is not strictly correct. We shall leave out of count the reformers, and inquire what their fundamental principle, the right of private judgment, necessarily and inevitably involved in this direction. As the ultimate outcome of their position, whether recognized by them or not, what became the final authority over faith ?

By an authority we understand "the control of an individual, of his thoughts and activities, by a knowledge larger than his own."[1]

It is also necessary to get, first of all, a clear idea of what we mean by belief. A lengthy examination of the question is not possible,[2] but it will clear the ground somewhat if we can elucidate the main principle underlying it.

The verb πιστεύειν "is used in the New Testament of *the conviction and trust* to which a man is impelled by a certain inner and higher prerogative and law of his soul."[3] That is to say, belief is the product of the deepest parts of our nature, and is related inseparably with the loftiest and noblest qualities we possess, such as love, trust, hope. It is important to safeguard the word against a misuse which is very common. A mere

[1] Grubb, "Authority and the Light Within," p. 11.
[2] But *vide* Inge, "Faith and its Psychology."
[3] Grimm-Thayer, "Lexicon of New Testament."

acquiescence, non-intelligent and detached from any moral implications, is not belief in the true sense—it is assent. "For this belief, νομίζειν, was the regular word in classical Greek, indicating acceptance of statutory beliefs rather than any warmer sentiment." But belief in Christ among the early Christians, as also among Christians to-day, implied a great deal more than this; it "included moral devotion and self-surrender to Christ, a firm conviction that by uniting themselves to Him they would find remission of sins and eternal salvation, and intellectual conviction that certain Divinely revealed facts are true."[1]

Using the term "belief," then, in this sense, it follows that we can only believe what we know; for "to know a thing is . . . to bring it into relation with ourselves, with what we already know, with the present content of our own minds";[2] and belief, as we have seen, is to bring a fact into the most intimate relation with ourselves. Therefore, belief is an intense form of knowledge.

Furthermore, the only sure ground of knowledge is experience. Without experience knowledge can never be real; it is little better, if any, than assent. I cannot really know that ice is cold except by the evidence of my own experience, and then I know it with such conviction that no arguments could shake the belief.

So, then, we start from the point that we can only believe what we know, and we can only really know that which we experience.

The Protestant Churches are faced by the duty of finding an answer to this crucial question: In what direction can a man look for an authority to control and direct his belief? We have cleared the ground in one way by making clear that real belief is something of the most intimate kind, not the mere assent to theological formulæ, not the mere acquiescence in creeds, but a personal and conscious and heartfelt appreciation of God through

[1] Inge, *op cit.*, pp. 3, 4, 23.
[2] Illingworth, "Reason and Revelation," p. 89.

Christ. But though the ground is thus cleared, the question is made much more difficult, for the area of belief is thus extended over the whole of a man's nature and down into the deepest part of his being.

The most popular answer to the question, "What is the authority to govern and control faith?" is—"*The Church.*"

It is quite surprising to note the tenacity with which this view is held by many, and undoubtedly it is partly because there is a certain amount of truth in it.

On examination, this answer really means that not the general congregation, but the ministry itself, is the authority.

The Roman view that the infallible authority rests ultimately in the Pope need not detain us for long. To every impartial reader it is completely discredited;[1] nor has the way of escape from the absurdities of its position devised by Newman been of any permanent value to the Roman Church.

But what is more interesting to us is the position adopted by High Anglicans.

Their theory of the authority of the undivided Church is quite their own, but as a matter of fact the losses involved by its acceptance are in great excess of the gains. It makes the revelation of the Church merely static. By this we mean that "a supernatural revelation was at some time past granted to mankind, which now persists only in its effects."[2] The Church *did* speak with authority generations ago, but it has long ceased to do so. We are thus anchored fast to the past, and progress and increased enlightenment denied us now.

Bishop Gore's statement of his view leads us to this unsatisfactory result. In his attempt to combat the error of the doctrine of development, he states that "the authority of the Church . . . is the subordinate authority of a witness to the truth, a guardian, a teacher of it; she has no authority to pro-

[1] See, for instance, Martineau, "Seat of Authority," book ii., chap. i., and Salmon, "Infallibility of the Church," lecture xiv., "The Blindness of the Infallible Guide."

[2] Inge, *op. cit.*, p. 96.

mulgate or reveal new truth."[1] This really means that the Church has no living authority at all, for it simply performs the office of an ecclesiastical measuring-rod, and we can hardly speak of the authority of a yard measure! With all its dangers, the doctrine of development is preferable to this, for it does recognize the living voice of the Church. The Church, as the blessed company of all faithful people, in whose midst the Spirit of Christ dwells, must have a life and a voice; it cannot have ceased to speak. It may well be that its authoritative pronouncements in the past are adequate for present-day use, but to completely and finally stereotype the expressions of the Church is to deny its vitality and mission to the world of to-day.

Now, when regarded in an ideal light, there is certainly an impressiveness about the authority of the Church: what has been held for truth by everybody, always, and everywhere, must have immense value. But the Vincentian formula is valueless for us now. The Church to-day consists of a number of sections of believers more or less in disagreement, and there is no united voice; and the selection of the branch of the Church upon whose judgment we propose absolutely to rely is an exercise of personal opinion. So it follows, of necessity, that the ultimate authority upon which an individual relies who professes to accept the judgment of a Church is that of his own personal opinion.

But the repudiation of the infallibility of Church authority by the Reformers had a vital and essential principle behind it. The power of the Church had been wielded with deadly effect. Goodness and orthodoxy had become practically interchangeable terms. A "good son of the Church" would be buried with the benedictions of the Church, although he had died with the execrations of his fellow-creatures. Correct thinking, or, even less, assent to orthodox formulæ, was sufficient guarantee of good Churchmanship. Truth was regarded as a parcel made up and put in the charge of the Church, and not as something to be

1 "Roman Catholic Claims," ed. 1900, p. 42.

assimilated into the spiritual being, and to find its expression in holy living and Christ-like conduct.[1]

Now, we must state with emphasis that the office of creeds is not to test the reality of belief. They exist as a standard of orthodoxy and the authoritative statement of how fundamental truths should be expressed, but their repetition can no more be regarded as a proof of real faith than the recitation of the marriage service would be of the reality of a man's love for his wife.

But grave though the danger may be of confusing goodness with orthodoxy, we must not fall into the opposite error of under-estimating the value of ecclesiastical formulæ.

The Church expresses its authority in creeds and formularies of various kinds. Those creeds and formularies are the outcome of a long process which has been going on for a number of generations. They are really the expressions of the religious experience of vast bodies of Christian people, and, as such, their value as a norm, by which to check and test the views of individuals, is clearly very great, and with considerable justice it can be claimed that variation from that standard should be viewed with grave suspicion. An illustration will make this clearer. The temperature of the blood in the human body is ascertained to be 98·4° F. This result has been arrived at by the process of averaging the temperatures of an immense number of healthy individuals under normal conditions. Consistent variation from 98·4° F. is justly regarded by doctors with suspicion, it is an almost certain indication of disease.

So, making full allowance for the possible misunderstanding of the language of creeds and formularies, and eliminating those articles which do not meet with the general agreement of Christian Churches, we may fairly regard a creed—*i.e.*, the authority of the Church—as a test of great value in determining truth. We would give it an even wider application. When the Church, or a Church, speaks to-day, its authority is not to be lightly regarded. "The Holy Spirit is a present possession

[1] Forsyth, "Principle of Authority," p. 34.

of the Church, and . . . in the unity of the Christian consciousness there is an authority not absolute and final, but real and living, which has its place in correcting the vagaries of individual illumination."[1]

When the position is advanced that the Bible is to be regarded as the final authority, it is at once challenged by the supporters of the former theory. It is the Church, they say, which has placed its imprimatur upon the Bible, and the acceptance of the Scriptures as inspired therefore presupposes the infallibility of the authority which has accredited the Scriptures.

Now, there is just enough truth in this to make it a very awkward argument to answer. It must be freely admitted that the Church had no small share in the preservation and safeguarding of the inspired writing, but a careful reading of the history of the Canon fails to disclose any clear consciousness on the part of the Church that it possessed an infallible discriminating power.

So far as the Old Testament is concerned, the Christian Church found the Canon practically completed and authorized before its birth. The questions still under dispute were, curiously enough, settled about the end of the first century A.D., when there appears "to have been some sort of an official declaration by the Jewish Rabbis that finally determined the limits of the Hebrew Canon."[2] When the Church did use its judgment on the Hebrew writings it was not always correct, for in the third and fourth centuries it commonly quoted and used Apocryphal writings as Scripture, and, so far at any rate as our Church is concerned, that judgment is now repudiated.

As for the New Testament Canon, the best that can be said is that the Church was very long making up its mind as to which were, and which were not, the inspired writings. Books accepted in one Church were rejected by others, the selective process stretched over several centuries, and there is a reluctance

[1] Grubb, "Authority and the Light Within," p. 25.
[2] Ryle, "Canon of the Old Testament," p. 182.

on the part of the Church as a whole to make up its mind, which is suggestive of inability to do so. One of the best accredited lists of canonical books is the Muratorian Fragment,[1] which Westcott says "may be regarded, on the whole, as a summary of the opinion of the Western Church on the Canon shortly after the middle of the second century."[2] In this list 1 John, 1 and 2 Peter, James, and Hebrews are omitted, and the Apocalypse of St. Peter given partial acknowledgment. It was not till the Third Council of Carthage, in A.D. 397, that the Church exercised legislative power on this question.

Nor did the Protestant Reformers regard the Scriptures as owing their authority to the ecclesiastical imprimatur. They could hardly do so consistently, for, having rejected the dogma of the infallibility of the Church, they could not with any reason base the authority of Scripture upon an authority which they began by repudiating. "When the Reformed Confessions of Faith enumerate the canonical books according to traditional usage, they are careful to add, without exception, that these books are held and recognized as inspired by God and the norm of the faith, 'not so much because of the unanimous consent of the Church, as in virtue of the inward witness and persuasion of the Holy Spirit, by whom we are made wise to discover and set apart these from other ecclesiastical books.'"[3]

These remarks are sufficient to prove that it is only with very considerable qualifications that we can allow the common expression: "The Church gave us the Bible." The Old Testament books were already selected for the Church, and the New Testament books won their way by their own intrinsic excellence, and not through any specific ecclesiastical pronouncement. Indeed, the inspired writings were constantly appealed to by the Church as an authority superior to itself; the Old Testament was so regarded by the Apostles, and the New Testament by the Councils.[4]

[1] *Circa* A.D. 170. [2] Westcott, "Canon of the New Testament," p. 212.
[3] Sabatier, "Religions of Authority," p. 159.
[4] *Cf.*, for instance, Gelasius, "Hist. Con. Nic.," quoted by Westcott, *op. cit.*, p. 428, "the books of the Evangelists and Apostles and the utterances of the Prophets clearly *instruct us* what we ought to think of the Divine nature."

But though we may be justified in regarding the Scriptures as an authority superior to the Church, our way is not sufficiently cleared to put the Bible in the position of an infallible authority to which every individual can appeal. We must now briefly examine this.

Such an attitude towards Scripture involves four implications:

1. That God did infallibly express Himself to men.

2. That those men infallibly apprehended the revelation given.

3. That the revelation has been infallibly transmitted.

4. That each reader can infallibly interpret it.

Assuming 1 and 2, the third proposition admits of no argument whatever. The existence of the science of Textual Criticism is enough to dispose of it entirely. The fourth proposition is in an equally unhappy position; it involves the infallibility of the individual ultimately. Individuals vary in interpreting Scriptures so conspicuously that it is unnecessary to labour the obvious deduction. Indeed, the very existence of a commentary is sufficient to prove that the judgment of the individual upon the meaning of Scripture is precarious.

But, having made every allowance for these questions, the fact remains that the Scriptures stand, and must stand, in an unique position. Difficulties remain, corruptions of the text may occur, but, after all, it is generally agreed that the main teaching of the Bible is clear to even the most unscholarly of readers, so much so that even "wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein." In them we can learn the authentic Gospel from Christ and His Apostles.

"The New Testament is the authentic and sincere expression of Christianity in the freshness of its earliest days. It gives us a clear idea of the essence of the Gospel, enables us to discern it with accuracy, and thus to apprehend it in its pristine truth. It is the first link, so to speak, in the Christian tradition; but because it is the first, this link dominates all that follow. No single Church could give up the Bible thus understood without

cutting itself off from communion with the original source of its life."[1]

But the point which requires explanation is, how do the Scriptures operate as an authority?

The authority is that of the Living Christ, who mediates Himself to us through the Scriptures—that is to say, the Bible is not itself the authority, but rather the instrument used by the one and only Authority. As we read, the Divine Spirit takes of the things of Christ, and shows them to us; our understanding is enlightened, deep answers to deep, the sacred truths find us, and as we close the Book we feel we have seen unspeakable things. This is surely what we mean by the inspiration of Scripture, that it inspires us.

So, too, but in a lesser degree, it is with Church authority. We have seen that the Holy Spirit lives within the Church, and always has done so; and that venerable Society which has comprised all those who name the Name of Christ is a witness to truth whose authority we dare not lightly repudiate. But here again it is the authority of Christ, who uses the Church as His instrument, to which we bow, and not to the institution as being potent in itself. It is the Spirit of the Living Christ witnessing to our spirits which we acknowledge and acclaim.

If the exigencies of present-day thought in the criticism of Church and Bible have driven us back to this great truth it is good. "The present criticism of Church and Bible is, on the whole, providential," says Dr. Forsyth.[2] But we must remember that this is not because tortured and harassed faith, driven out from other refuges, has in desperation fallen back upon this expedient. This and this only ever has been the only ultimate authority for faith, the Living Christ in the heart of the believer.

[1] Sabatier, *op cit.*, p. 248. [2] "Principle of Authority," p. 22.

The Racial Outlook of the Four Gospels.

By the Rev. J. T. LEVENS, M.A.

THE most difficult and at the same time the most attractive problems which face a student of the New Testament are those concerned with the composition of the Four Gospels. To assist in their solution there is now accumulated a whole library of critical writings, compiled by some of the ablest scholars of the Old World and the New. The critics exhibit a surprising variety of opinion, but amidst much difference there is practical agreement on certain points. All are agreed, for example, that the order in which the Evangelists wrote is not that in which they are found in the New Testament, and that St. Mark was written first, followed by St. Matthew, then by St. Luke, and then by St. John. It is also universally believed that there existed contemporaneously with St. Mark's Gospel, and probably prior to it, a book of Logia, or Sayings of Jesus (including also some of His actions), which for convenience is known by the symbol Q, and which is embedded in the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke. There is also a growing inclination to postulate St. Matthew as the author of Q, and to ascribe the Gospel which bears his name to an unknown writer. The Lucan authorship of the Third Gospel is established, but in regard to the Fourth there is serious difference of opinion, although English-speaking scholars are almost unanimous in ascribing it either to St. John the Apostle, or to John the Presbyter of Asia. The criticism which has reached these results is mainly of the higher or non-textual order, and its chief tools are comparison and analysis.

A field in which experts have been diligently labouring for years is not likely to yield any vacant ground for a tyro like the writer of this article, but as it appears to him that there is one corner which has been overlooked, he ventures to draw the reader's attention to it, and to describe it as "The Racial Outlook of the Four Gospels."

Each of the writers of the Gospels was a Jew, and his whole

outlook was coloured by his nationality. This characteristic is more marked in St. Matthew than in any of the other three Evangelists, but it is unmistakably present in them also. To this, however, sufficient value has already been attached by critics. What they have not valued is the fact that each Gospel was written with a particular intention. The Gospels and Epistles were alike in this, that though fit for universal circulation, they were in their first issue addressed to a definite destination. Each Evangelist had a particular "public" in view, and wrote in the first instance for its information. It was with this end that he set about his task, selected his materials, and arranged them. If it can be shown, as I believe it can, that each Gospel was written for one of the four great races of the Roman Empire in the first century, some fresh light will be thrown on the New Testament.

If we can transport ourselves in thought to the first century, and ask what motives would be likely to act on the Evangelist St. Mark, and urge him to write the life of Jesus, we shall find that these motives were partly Christian and partly Roman. He wished to write a Gospel for Christians who were subjects of the Roman Empire. Jesus Himself had been a Roman subject, and had been put to death by Roman soldiers with the sanction of a Roman Governor. It was needful, therefore, to tell the story of His life so as to show that He had been a loyal subject, who taught no sedition, and whose claims were not hostile to the Roman Empire. If, as appears almost certain, St. Mark wrote his Gospel in Rome,[1] we may surely conclude that he would be profoundly influenced by his surroundings, and desirous of commending the Gospel to all Romans who were willing to give it an unbiassed hearing. When we remember that the first apologies for the Christian faith were addressed by Justin Martyr to the Emperors Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius, it lends some probability to the supposition that the

[1] Harnack, in "The Date of the Acts and of the Synoptic Gospels" (III., c. 7), argues that St. Mark may have written the Gospel before he came to Rome, and revised and issued it there. He rejects Wellhausen's conjecture that Jerusalem was the place of composition.

earliest Gospel was written for the instruction of Roman Christians and their sympathizers. It is also probable that the late tradition that St. Mark wrote originally in Latin arose not merely from the older tradition that he wrote at Rome, but from the known fact that he wrote for Roman Christians.[1] The Latinisms found in St. Mark lend no probability to the tradition that he wrote in Latin, but they do add another proof for our theory.

In Roman literature there existed a well-marked distinction between commentaries and histories. The former were jottings made at the time the events dealt with occurred, or written shortly afterwards, and their authors were eyewitnesses or those who gathered their material from eyewitnesses. These commentaries were direct, vivid, simple, and brief. They were popular productions, and though not attaining to the level of history, they formed the material out of which history might be composed. The most famous examples are the Commentaries of Julius Cæsar, which were widely circulated in Rome a few years before the composition of St. Mark's Gospel. Cicero, who was no friend of Cæsar, yet praised the style of his Commentaries, noting specially their "brevity, accompanied with simplicity and clearness."[2] It is no extravagant supposition that St. Mark may have been acquainted with Cæsar's Commentaries, either in their original tongue or in a Greek translation. Certainly his Gospel belongs to the same class of narrative, and possesses the same directness of diction, the same wealth of movement and incident, the same simplicity of language, the same absence of comment and reflection. The people who relished the style of the Commentaries of Cæsar were not likely to be indifferent to the style of the Gospel of St. Mark.

There is nothing in the Gospel to which a Roman citizen could take exception as savouring of rebellion or disorder. The

[1] Some modern critics hazard the conjecture that St. Mark wrote in Aramaic. The guess is a very wide one, as they have to admit that St. Matthew and St. Luke knew St. Mark in a Greek translation only. *E.g.*, Archdeacon Allen in "Studies in the Synoptic Problem," p. 295.

[2] "Brutus," cap. 75.

non-political teaching of Jesus is clearly set forth, and His attitude to the Roman Government declared in the great sentence: "Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's." Professing to set forth the Gospel of the Son of God, it does so, not by demonstration but by narrative, and it is remarkable that at the climax of the story it is a Roman officer who utters the declaration that Jesus was verily the Son of God.[1] The character of the Gospel becomes altogether intelligible when we realize that it was written for Roman Christians, in order to tell them the facts about Jesus which they most desired to know. It is a fact, at least, that St. Mark's Gospel proved specially acceptable to the Latin races; and it continued to be their favourite Gospel, and the one they cherished as peculiarly their own, until St. Augustine lent the great weight of his authority to the erroneous opinion that St. Mark was but an abbreviation of St. Matthew.

It is a commonplace of New Testament criticism to describe St. Matthew's Gospel as the Gospel of the Jew. Its atmosphere is that Jewish-Christian one which we find also in the Epistle of St. James. The writer had clearly before his mind the needs of Christian Jews, or of Jews inquiring into the claims of Jesus to be the Christ, and he wrote the Gospel to meet their needs. He shows how Jesus, the son of David, the son of Abraham, fulfilled the ancient prophecies contained in the oracles of Israel. Like another and greater Moses, He gave from a mountain-top the laws of a new kingdom of God. The relationship of the new to the old economy is carefully defined as being one of fulfilment and not destruction, and the permanence of the old law is assumed. The stern anti-Pharisaism of the writer reveals the strength of his feeling against the bigots of his own nation who rejected the claims of Jesus. Everywhere the privileged position of the Jew is recognized as being the first to be called into the kingdom and as furnishing the nucleus of an inner and spiritual Israel. Other evidences might be given that St. Matthew's Gospel was the Gospel of the Jew; but it seems unnecessary to labour a point so manifest and so widely admitted.

[1] St. Mark xiv. 39.

The Evangelist's aim—to write for the Jew—had a deep influence upon the character and contents of his Gospel. It furnished a criterion by which he tested the material at his disposal, and accepted or rejected it as necessary or useless for his purpose. The limitations of the Evangelist, especially his apparent inability to conceive of the Gospel as an emancipation from the Law of Moses, were largely the result of his racial outlook as well as of his racial prejudices.

The Third Gospel is as much the Gospel of the Greek as St. Matthew's is the Gospel of the Jew. The writer is the only Evangelist who declares in a preface the reasons that moved him to write his Gospel, and although he does not directly say that he wrote specially for Greeks, it is self-evident that he had a larger public in view than the Greek to whom the Gospel is addressed. If Theophilus was acquainted with the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Matthew, he may not have found either of them entirely satisfactory. His cultured taste may have disapproved of the style of St. Mark, with its bareness of narrative and its absence of literary grace, even as his Greek prejudices may have recoiled from the Jewish character of St. Matthew's Gospel. He may have hinted to St. Luke that there was room for a third Gospel—one so written that an educated Greek might read it with pleasure. Be this as it may, St. Luke's Gospel is such a work. It is the literary Gospel of the New Testament, and it has evidences of careful and artistic workmanship, alike in the scheme of its composition, the arrangement of its contents, the order of its sentences, and the choice of its words. The broad humanism of St. Luke has frequently been noticed. He is singularly free from Jewish prepossessions, and it seems as though his Gospel was designed to show to the Greeks that Jesus was the Friend of humanity and the Redeemer of all mankind. This characteristic of St. Luke is perhaps most plainly seen in those passages which are peculiar to his Gospel. These are often *obiter dicta* or sayings or deeds arising from chance questions or what look like accidental encounters. St. Luke chronicled such things, in preference to set discourses or official utterances, as better revealing the nature and character of Jesus. They were

just the things to appeal to a Greek, who might be unimpressed by the signs of power which were detailed by St. Mark, or the fulfilment of prophecies pointed out by St. Matthew, but who could not fail to be impressed by the wisdom, compassion and grace which were conspicuous in Jesus as He appeared in the Gospel of St. Luke.

The Fourth Gospel stands in a class by itself, as even the most unlearned of readers cannot fail to see. The portrait of Jesus which it presents is from a new point of view, and the artist has a distinct method and aim of his own. He was acquainted with the works of the other three Evangelists, but he did not borrow from them nor was he influenced by them. He wrote towards the close of the first century, when the expectation of the immediate return of Christ was growing fainter, and the eschatological beliefs of the Church were undergoing a change. The appearance of certain heresies while these changes were in process made it necessary to review the whole Christian conception of the person and work of Jesus. It was a purpose of the Fourth Gospel to present this revised conception, and to show that Jesus was none other than the Word of God Incarnate. But just as each of the Synoptists had his particular "public," for whom in the first instance he wrote, so also St. John had—we may assume—a particular "public" in view. Already there existed a Gospel for the Roman, a Gospel for the Jew, and a Gospel for the Greek, but there was one great race to which none of these Gospels specially appealed. It was the Oriental race, inhabiting the eastern provinces of the Empire, and found side by side with the Greeks along the coastline of Asia Minor and Syria. This race had its own religious ideas and beliefs, and amid much that was degrading and superstitious there existed a nobler creed which expressed the spiritual hopes and needs of elect souls. There was, for example, the recognition of light as the natural manifestation and true symbol of goodness, just as darkness was of evil; the belief that life was a Divine gift and had in it something Divine; the idea of the need for a new and spiritual birth by which a man might be initiated into a higher life and truer knowledge;

the practice of sacramental meals by which a worshipper was brought into union with his Deity; the belief in immortality through death. Some of these beliefs had travelled across the bridge of Asia Minor into Europe, and were apparent in the mysteries of the Greek religion. In Asia Minor itself there was one city where East and West met together, where the Greek philosopher was face to face with the Eastern Magian, and where the wonderful temple of Diana harboured a worship which was less that of the Grecian goddess than of the Oriental faith in the fruitful principle of life. It was Ephesus, the home of St. John and the birthplace of the Fourth Gospel. What more reasonable than to suppose that its author would be impressed by the needs of the Oriental race amongst whom he lived, that he would be conversant with their religious beliefs, and that he would be anxious to show them that the Lord Jesus in whom he believed was not merely the Messiah of the Jew or the Saviour of mankind, but also the Divine Word who was the complete revelation of God, in whom was life—and the life was the light of men—whose flesh was meat indeed and whose blood drink indeed, and who was the giver of life eternal and the conqueror of death? The great ideas of the mystery religions of the East are found in the Fourth Gospel, but are found transfigured, spiritualized, and Christianized.

All commentators on the Fourth Gospel seem willing to grant that its author was of the school of St. Paul, and strongly in sympathy with the great Apostle's presentation of the Gospel. That sympathy, however, was not likely to be confined to the substance of St. Paul's teaching; it would extend also to his manner of presenting the Gospel, and we know from St. Paul's own words what that manner was. To the Gentiles, he tells us, he became as a Gentile, that he might gain them for Christ. That is to say, he met them on their own ground, he accepted their religious ideas, in so far as these were in any degree right, and he showed them how Christ fulfilled and summed them all in Himself. A similar method was followed by St. John. He, who had pondered for years over his recollections of Jesus, and had been guided by the Holy Spirit into a profound under-

standing of the truths he had preserved, had also brooded over the chaos of ancient mystical beliefs which he found in the Eastern faiths around him, until he saw clearly that the Divine Word had come forth from God to bring order and light to these also.

In bringing forward the supposition that the Fourth Gospel was written specially for the Oriental race, and that the nature of its contents is best understood on this hypothesis, I am well aware that I advance what has the disadvantage of novelty and may at first seem too far-fetched to be reasonable. But the Gospel itself is so complex a problem, and there are so many threads in its intricate web, that it may chance there are some which have escaped notice or examination. It seems evident, also, that the disposition to credit Philonism with the inspiration of the Fourth Gospel is rapidly decreasing amongst critics. Dr. Julius Grill, in his recent work on the origin of this Gospel, has shown that its leading ideas are Life and Light; and Harnack has argued with reason that the Prologue to the Gospel is an afterthought or postscript, rather than a preface or programme which is elaborated in the contents. Elsewhere he has said that the Logos of St. John has "little more in common with that of Philo than the name, and its mention at the beginning of the book is itself a mystery, and not the solution of one."[1]

The fact that no commentator on the Fourth Gospel hints at the solution I have proposed does not affect one who believes that this Gospel has not yet come into its own. The last of the Four Gospels to be written, it remains the last to be interpreted. Western criticism, analysis, and comment it has had in abundance, but much of it still remains to us an enigma. It awaits, perhaps, the interpretation of the great race for which it was first written. When the Crescent wanes in the East, and the Cross is planted on the ancient shrines of Hinduism, then it may be that the wisdom, patience, subtlety and mysticism of the Oriental mind will assimilate and interpret to the West the full meaning of the truths concerning Jesus which are contained in the Fourth Gospel.

[1] "History of Dogma," I., 97.

Atonement and Character.

By the Rev. BERNARD C. JACKSON, M.A.,
Rector of Farnborough.

IT is not the purpose of this article either to formulate a theory of the Atonement or to define the essential elements of Christian character. It simply attempts to show the connection of the doctrine of Atonement with the formation of character and to illustrate this connection at several important points. The current of religious thought to-day is flowing in practical channels. It is constantly said that character and conduct are more important than faith. And the tone in which it is said often betrays impatience with doctrinal religion. Clearly, then, if the doctrinal position of Christianity is to be maintained, the utmost care must be taken to present doctrine in the closest possible connection with ethics.

There is no point in the whole range of Christian doctrine where this connection is closer than in the doctrine of Atonement. The reason is plain. The doctrine of the Trinity is very largely veiled in a cloud of mystery, into which the human mind can only penetrate a very little way. But the Atonement can, to a much greater degree, be intellectually understood, for it is that part of revelation where God discloses Himself in direct answer to man's present need. It is true that even here our knowledge is very limited, and we constantly need to correct our theories of the Atonement by the great guiding truths of God's sovereign love and man's moral freedom. But there is no interpreter like a felt need—in this case the twofold need of forgiveness and life. And the urgency of this need, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, led the varied minds of the New Testament writers to think out for all time those main lines of truth, along which we may feel our way towards the fulness of the doctrine of Atonement. In fact, Holy Scripture is much more explicit about the Atonement than about any other part of the Christian Revelation, and for this reason only it ought to be possible to

present this particular doctrine in close relation to practical life. But besides this, the more we insist on the importance of Christian character, the more we are driven back upon the Atonement as its foundation and essential condition. "The conquest of sin," says Dr. Illingworth, "is the first condition of Christian life. Sin is the disease that is killing us, and it must be removed before we can live. Hence the primary place which is occupied in Christian ethics by the consideration of sin. It must come first. Everything must be postponed to it. It is a flaw in the foundation of human nature, which must be dealt with before any moral superstructure can be begun."[1] How God deals with this flaw and remedies the disease the doctrine of the Atonement seeks to explain. There is, therefore, a direct connection between atonement and character, and this is seen particularly in three points: first, the Atonement deals with the one great hindrance to moral progress; second, it awakens the strongest and most enduring motive of moral effort; and, third, as the revelation of Divine ethics, it furnishes the highest moral ideal.

1. Every man is more or less conscious of some great hindrance to moral progress. "The good that I would I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do." We do not all feel the hindrance in the same way or call it by the same name. To some it is the sense of burden—the burden of sins committed in the past; to others it is the sense of being under a cloud—the cloud of God's displeasure; while many are only conscious of a vague feeling of unrest, and that, it may be, only when physical weakness or some sudden sorrow stills the noises of the world around us. It matters not how we feel it, the hindrance is the same. We cannot climb the upward path of moral progress until we have been set free from the burdening sense of guilt. We cannot be "imitators of God as beloved children" until we have recovered the sense of the Divine Fatherhood by restoration to Divine favour. And we can make no real moral progress until the heart is at peace. But in Christ's

[1] Illingworth's "Christian Character," p. 9.

Atonement we find the answer to this threefold need. We turn to the sufferings of Christ, utterly inexplicable except as the willing bearing of the sin of the world, and we see that our burden has been borne, and therefore borne away from us, by One who had a right to take our place, because He was "the Son of man." We turn to the living and ascended Christ, who identified Himself with us in His birth and in His experience, and "is not ashamed to call us brethren," and we see in His acceptance before the Father the pledge and assurance that we too are "accepted in the beloved." Thus the work of Christ on the Cross removes the burden of guilt, and the fact of Christ's presence at the throne restores the sense of God's favour; and from these two things there flows as a natural consequence that inward peace which is so absolutely essential to moral progress.

2. Thus the first effect of the Atonement is the removal of a hindrance. But this is only the negative aspect of salvation, and its whole worth lies in opening the way for positive moral progress. The assurance of forgiveness and acceptance with God through Christ sets the spirit of man free—but only that he may set out unhindered on the way towards holiness of character. Here arises the second practical need of our spiritual life. The spirit is weak, slow to respond to the "upward calling of God," and easily daunted by the difficulties and hardships of the way. We must have a strong and enduring motive. Experience in general shows that the strongest motive is not expediency, and not fear, but love; and Christian experience, in particular, shows that the only sure secret of love is the revelation of God's love to us in Christ. "We love because He first loved us." The clearest revelation of that love is in the Atonement of Christ. It touches us at that point most deeply, because it is love suffering and love working out our forgiveness. So the Atonement answers our second need, awakening within us that motive of love which "never faileth" and "fears not pain or death."

3. The third need of the spiritual life is a perfect and attractive moral ideal. We are accustomed to look for this in the

Incarnation, because we believe it to be the revelation of the character of God. And so it is. But the Atonement, always presupposing and, in a sense, including the Incarnation, carries us a step farther; for it is a revelation of God's character in its activity. And, as real human goodness is tested and revealed in our dealings not only with "the good and gentle, but also with the froward," so the most profound disclosure of Divine goodness is in God's dealings with human sinfulness and self-will. In fact, the Atonement has something to teach us about our relation to our fellow-men, as well as about our relation to God. And this ethical significance of the Atonement may be seen in three things: first, in the love of the Father; second, in the sympathy of Christ; and, third, in the Divine method of salvation.

The love of the Father is the initiating cause of the Atonement. But it is often misunderstood and misrepresented. St. Paul, in defining the Gospel, says that "therein the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men" (Rom. i. 18). And yet in the same epistle he says that "God commendeth His love toward us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us" (Rom. v. 8). Evidently, therefore, the love of the Father, so far from being that easy-going disposition of mind which can lightly overlook sin, is a love which must express its wrath against sin, while it is striving to redeem the sinner. There is a perfect harmony between the Divine wrath against sin and the Divine love towards the sinner. The only reason why it presents a difficulty to many minds is that in ordinary experience we know so little of the love that can discriminate between a wrong done and the wrongdoer. But this is just what the Atonement can perfectly teach us. Human love is seen at its best in a parent whose righteous indignation is roused to punish a child for some wrong done, and yet whose love for the child is so tender and so unwavering that he feels the shame and pain of it all more than the child. But such instances are rarely seen, and always point us onward to the only really perfect

example of discriminating love—the love of the Divine Father, who hated sin as no human parent could, and yet so loved the sinner that He gave His only-begotten Son. The ethical lesson is easy to see, but hard to learn. We are to persevere in love to the wrongdoer, though his actions are revolting to our moral instincts, remembering that our sins are still more revolting to the Father who loves us. And—hardest lesson of all—we are to learn to be patient in our love towards those who wilfully do wrong to us or to someone dear to us, remembering in our judgment of others that our sins slighted God's love, crucified God's Son, and yet He loves us. We can only learn it in God's presence. There, in the recollection of the Cross, we come to view things more dispassionately, and gain the power of discriminating between wrong done and the wrongdoer. We do not hate sin less, but rather more, because we have learned to love the sinner more truly, more penetratingly, and more as God loves.

If the Father's love is the initiating cause of the Atonement, the sympathy of Christ is its operating principle. It is the explanation of the vicarious character of His death and of its power to put away our sin. But what do we mean by the sympathy of Christ? As the disciples watched Jesus going in and out among the sufferers at Capernaum, the impression left on their minds led them to see the meaning and reference of Isaiah's words, "Himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses" (see St. Matt. viii. 17). Christ's sympathy with others was the bearing of their sufferings and their sins. By His perfect, penetrating, all-embracing sympathy,

> . . . "hearing oftentimes
> The still, sad music of humanity."[1]

He came to feel, and so to bear, the burden of our sin and suffering, as if it were His own. This has a profound ethical lesson. It is a revelation of the perfect solidarity of humanity and of the wonderful saving power of true sympathy. Of

[1] Wordsworth, "Tintern Abbey."

course, the perfect holiness of Christ's manhood and the power of His Divine nature gave the sacrifice which He offered a potency and comprehensiveness to which we can never approach. But when we call to mind the extraordinary power of sympathy and patient love, in the parent, who wins back the wayward child; in the philanthropist, who purifies and uplifts the outcasts of society; or in the missionary, who civilizes and evangelizes peoples once hostile to him and to his message; and when we recollect that in each case the sympathy and patient love derive their power from a self-emptying, which is the very essence of true sacrifice, then we can in some measure understand what St. Paul means when he speaks of his sufferings as a filling up of "that which is lacking of the afflictions of Christ, for His body's sake, the Church" (Col. i. 24). In fact, true sympathy is the same in us as it was in Christ. It is the inner principle of sacrifice. And, though in us it can never have the power to redeem others, it may exercise the power to lighten sorrow and to sweeten and ennoble character.

I have spoken of the Father's love as the initiating cause of the Atonement and of the sympathy of Christ as its operating principle. In conclusion, let me call attention to its method of activity—justification by faith—as also affording an ethical lesson. It is a curious fact that this very doctrine has been criticized as immoral. Tell people that they are saved not by their own righteousness, but by their faith in Christ, and they will despise the goodness of God, and think more lightly of sin in the future. Such is the criticism, and it rests on a complete misconception of justification by faith. The reason why we cannot earn salvation is, not because it is such an easy thing, but because it is so difficult that it could only be obtained by the perfect righteousness of Christ acting for us. Moreover, the faith by which we are justified is not, as the objector thinks, a merely formal acceptance of certain truths, but the awakening of the soul in response to the touch of the Spirit of God; and, when this takes place, the soul abhors

the sin that crucified Christ and thrills with a new desire for holiness. A faith that has not these characteristics is not the faith that justifies, and the criticism falls to the ground. Rightly understood, justification by faith is a glimpse into the ethics of redemption and a wonderful revelation of the wisdom of God. He treats us as righteous because He looks on us as identified with Christ by that faith which at once claims Him as substitute, representative, and example. And, discerning the end from the beginning, God sees in the soul's awakening faith the promise and prophecy of a real personal righteousness which shall gradually unfold from that tiny germ. Is not the method capable of imitation in human life? Surely in our moral training of the young, in the evangelistic appeal from the pulpit, and in the exercise of personal influence in social life, there is a practical wisdom in appealing to the best side of the nature and in treating others as if they were what they ought to be and what they probably long to be. If the truth were known about the reclamation of those who were once social outcasts, we should probably find that the most potent force had been faith. Someone dared to believe in them, and gradually that faith awakened an answering faith within them. They began to believe they could be pure and good; and that was the first step in their regeneration. The same principle applies all through life. We must believe in others if we are to do them good. This is the ethical lesson which underlies the old doctrine of justification by faith. And the more we work out the ethical lesson in common life, the more shall we realize the essential truth of the old doctrine.

A Canterbury "Peculiar."

By M. PAIGE WOOD.

SELDOM has a place of equal prominence in its day left so little record on the written page of history as the ancient Archiepiscopal Manor of Mayfield; and few stories have been more generally forgotten than those relating to the part it played over a long period in ecclesiastical affairs. From the position of importance it occupied throughout the Middle Ages, Mayfield has declined to a present quiet obscurity shared with villages of the Sussex Weald which have no such notable past behind them. But until it was shorn by Parliament, some sixty years ago, of the last vestige of privilege accruing from its fallen state, it ranked with certain other parishes in the environing See of Chichester as a Canterbury "peculiar." Its clergy had been answerable previously to no authority save that of Canterbury, whose Archbishops continued to exercise sole prerogative and jurisdiction within its bounds as they had done from time immemorial, long after the lands over which they claimed such right had passed from their possession. The Act of 1849, which, with a few exceptions, abolished "peculiars" and the abuses to which their anomalous independence was liable, restored Mayfield after more than a thousand years to the diocese in which it is geographically situated, the seat of whose Episcopate was transferred from Selsea to Chichester in 1075.

When Cranmer, at the Reformation, made a virtue of necessity and granted "his chief manor-house" of Mayfield to the King as a sop to Cerberus, in the hope of securing other revenues of the Church from sequestration, he was relinquishing to the exigence of his day a title vested in his predecessors since the time of the Saxon Heptarchy. Mayfield formed part of the great Manor of Mellinges, or Malling, given to Christ Church, Canterbury, by a grant confirmed at a Council held by Egbert, King of Wessex, at Kingston-on-Thames in 838. The strip of

land so bestowed extended from Lewes to the Kentish border, and included, besides Mayfield, the ancient collegiate foundation of South Malling, and the Chapels of Buxted, Glynde, Edburton, and Lindfield.

Ten miles to the south of Tunbridge Wells, and served by a single line of rail connecting it with that place and with Eastbourne, Mayfield to-day is one of the prettiest of the many hill-villages of the Weald. Coventry Patmore, who loved it with a poet's fervour, calls it "the sweetest village in England." It occupies a rounded eminence in the midst of undulating, wooded country, boasting, despite devastation wrought in the past by extensive iron-smelting in the district, remnants of the vast forest of the Andredeswald, which in earlier times covered the whole of Sussex save its chalk downs and seaboard marshes. Abounding in the picturesque, and arresting the visitor's interest by its many survivals of departed greatness, Mayfield affords material to the artist and the archæologist alike in the irregular variety of roof-line and house-front displayed along its steep, wide street, its ancient chimneys and ornate gable-ends, and the fine examples it possesses of stone and timbered dwellings preserved to hale and serviceable old age. Conspicuous on the south side of the High Street is the elaborate Elizabethan frontage of the "Middle House," bearing the date 1575, while that of the "Stone House," close by, is 1641. Opposite these the massive masonry of the parish church is hidden away behind a row of tenements, whose delightfully quaint backs abut on the churchyard and allow little more than the rather dwarfed proportions of a shingled spire to appear above their tiled and time-worn roofs.

Eadmer, the historian monk of Canterbury, in his "Life of St. Dunstan," records the building by the great Churchman, about the middle of the tenth century, of a church of wood or wattle at Magavelda for the evangelization of the wild men of the Andredeswald, together with a Bishop's house, which may have been little more than the enlargement of an existing cell from the monastic college at South Malling. From Magavelda

or Magefeud, subsequent orthography has rung the changes on Magefeld, Maghfeld, and Maighfeld, until it has evolved the pleasant English of Mayfield, with the less euphonious form of "Mefful" it takes on the broad tongue of Sussex.

Needless to say, no traces of Dunstan's primitive structure remain; but by the twelfth century more substantial buildings had replaced them, and the parish church was by that time dedicated to the Saint. A devastating fire in 1389 left little of the town or of this second church standing, although the adjacent Bishop's palace was uninjured by the flames. With the exception of its tower, of particular strength and solidity, and parts of the west end, which still show stones discoloured by the burning, the present fine church belongs to the last decade of the fourteenth and the beginning of the fifteenth centuries. Its large east window is a flamboyant type of Decorated rarely met with in parish churches in England. At the east end of the south aisle was formerly a chantry, probably that of St. Alban. The present font dates from 1666, but one of much greater age has been recently recovered from secular uses in a cottage garden. The palace, situated in the direct line of communication between Canterbury and Lewes, doubtless served at first mainly as a convenient lodging during archiepiscopal journeyings, but was added to and rebuilt by one and another of its founder's successors until it became a frequent and favourite residence of the primates of England in medieval days, where, as an old account sets forth, they kept "in those times a prodiguous Ritinue and lived in great State and Splendour." The present village has grown up on the hill-side about the church and palace, which, in wood or stone, have crowned its summit for nearly a thousand years.

St. Dunstan's memory is jealously preserved at Mayfield, where the Archbishop, whose puissant figure had long dominated the Court and policy of the Kings of Wessex, sought privacy and quiet in his later days, and where he exercised upon Sussex iron his earlier skill as a craftsman. There, local tradition has it, the Evil One, with singular lack of inventiveness, appeared to him at his Mayfield forge, as he had done before on Glastonbury

Tor, in the alluring guise of a fair woman, to suffer the same penalty at the hands of the doughty Saint. The tongs with which St. Dunstan wrought, and, it may be, tweaked the Devil's nose, are still preserved at Mayfield, and may be seen of the curious; while the hot chalybeate springs ten miles away at Tunbridge Wells bear witness to the Brobdingnagian stride the Archfiend made to cool his outraged feature in their waters.

The earliest existing deed executed at Mayfield is one dated from the palace by Archbishop Boniface of Savoy in 1260, having reference to a Charter of Fairs and Markets obtained by him from Henry III. It fixed a weekly market, and a three days' fair on the vigil, feast, and morrow of St. Dunstan's Day. combining, as was customary in those days of difficult travel, the religious observance of the patronal festival with secular business and amusement.

The steep streets of the medieval town witnessed an amount of traffic with the great world beyond that would amaze the quiet village of to-day: when the Primate kept his state in the hall of the palace above, and its massive gate-house echoed the coming and going of panoplied knights and Church dignitaries, of King's equerries, as well as barefoot friars, at such times as the Archbishop exercised the hospitality enjoined on his office, or received the homage of his greater tenants. Among the latter there came in 1279, during the primacy of John Packham, Henry de Berham, a great-nephew of the fierce Fitzurse, who had taken a bloody part in the sacrilegious murder of à Becket at Canterbury nine years before. To St. Thomas à Becket is credited the introduction of the fig-tree into Sussex, where he first planted it, tradition says, at his palace of Mayfield. Certainly some venerable trees there still flourish and bear fruit, as do the lineal descendants of others said to have been planted by him where the famous fig-gardens of West Tarring now stand.

Royalty did not disdain to lie at Mayfield in those early days, and all the town may well have been agog over the presence of the King of England, and the housing of his knights and servitors on the three occasions when Edward I. visited the palace while

Robert de Winchelsea was Archbishop. Some years later, in 1332, town and palace were called upon to furnish accommodation for Bishops and clerics from all parts of Southern England, who, with their retinues, demanded suitable lodging during the Provincial Synod, known as the "Concilium Maghefeldense," convened there by Archbishop Meopham for the purpose of enforcing a more decorous observance of festivals and holidays than at the time prevailed. Ordinations were frequently held at Mayfield throughout the fourteenth century. Nor is the palace without its notable death-roll, since three Archbishops passed away within its walls—Simon Meopham, in 1332; Stratford, his successor, in 1348; and Archbishop Islip, who resided almost permanently at Mayfield, and to whom the palace owes it great Gothic Synod Hall, in 1366.

Some confusion has been made for historians by a John de Wycliffe who was Vicar of Mayfield from 1361 to 1380, and was contemporary with his better-known namesake, the herald of the Reformation and translator of the first complete English Bible. Both were Wardens of Oxford Colleges, which was a prime factor in entangling their biographies; but later research has clearly established the distinct identity of the Mayfield Wycliffe, who died at Horsted Keynes a year before the death of the famous reformer took place at Lutterworth in 1384. The records of deeds executed at Mayfield by a long succession of prelates between the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries, as contained in the Archiepiscopal Registers, makes varied reading. Among mandates and citations dealing with purely ecclesiastical matters, or concerned with the temporalities of probate and licence, is sandwiched the entry of a royal marriage, the imposition of a tax upon the town to subsidize the Scottish wars of Edward I., and prayers and thanksgivings for the success of English arms against the Spanish Fleet in 1350.

The secularized manor granted to the Crown by Cranmer came twenty years later into the hands of Sir Thomas Gresham, builder of the Royal Exchange and founder of Gresham College. Queen Elizabeth, during a progress through Kent and Sussex

paid her trusty councillor a visit at the palace, which imposed on her host the obligation of constructing a new staircase for Her Majesty's use in the north tower, and closed the record of Mayfield's royal guests and long familiarity with pomp and pageant—unless we add to it an unostentatious pilgrimage made to the ruins nearly three centuries afterwards by Queen Victoria as a girl of fourteen, when, with the Duchess of Kent and a party of friends, the young Princess rode out from Tunbridge Wells to a picnic in that historic spot.

The "Old Place," as it came to be locally designated, was subsequently purchased by the Baker family, owners of the "Middle House" in Mayfield, and was occupied by them until, in 1730, a Mr. Michael Baker utilized such of its materials as could conveniently be removed to build himself the "Lower House," at the west end of the village, leaving the more massive portions of towers and walls naked and roofless to the ravages of time and weather. The gate-house, its lofty arch built up with stones from the ruined palace, was let as a dwelling to humbler tenants. All that was standing when, in 1863, the Duchess of Leeds acquired the site for a Roman Catholic Convent and Novitiate, and the late Edward Pugin undertook the task of restoration, was masonry of a sort to defy alike the depredations of men and of the elements. After more than a century's neglect and vandalism, the walls and arches of the great Synod hall, the spacious fifteenth-century porch, with its ribbed vaulting and floriated central boss, lower portions of the west tower, and the private apartments communicating with a wide stone staircase in the south-east wing of the palace, remained intact.

While the palace contains work of much earlier date, the architecture of the great hall belongs to the middle of the fourteenth century—the best and purest period of Decorated Gothic. The finely proportioned windows occupying three of its four bays are beautiful examples of the particular form of tracery distinguished in the adjoining county as "Kentish." Three arches of noble span and peculiar depressed construction support the

roof; their counterpart is, it is believed, only to be found in England in the single stone arch of the smaller fourteenth-century banqueting-hall at Ightham Mote, not twenty miles distant in Kent. The weight of these immense arches and the roof timbers they were constructed to carry was in part borne by others built longitudinally between the buttresses of the outer walls. Corbels and doorways of the interior are enriched with sculptured figures and foliage of admirable design and workmanship; and some fine stone diaper-work, once forming the back of the Bishop's throne at the upper end of the hall, was found uninjured behind a covering of plaster when the restoration began, and is preserved and shown with St. Dunstan's tongs and anvil and a few other relics of Mayfield's historic past. Three arches at the lower end of the hall formerly communicated with the kitchens of the palace and the servants' lodgings above them.

Pugin's restoration of the great Council hall as the convent chapel, and the careful adaptation of other parts of the ruined palace to the uses of cloister and offices, following as closely as possible the plan of the original buildings, has crowned Mayfield again with the irregular mass of roof and turret that was once its glory. Parish church and convent chapel, though no longer in one communion, rise in picturesque proximity from the hill-top, with only the low boundary wall of a quiet God's acre between. A community of the Roman Catholic Society of the Holy Child Jesus entered into occupation of the palace in 1863, to which a large convent school is now attached. Roman Catholicism would seem to have been busy of late years establishing its educational outposts upon the wooded crests of this fair corner of Sussex, where tradition lingers round the grey stones of an historic past, for in direct line with Mayfield meadows a Xaverian college stands sentinel above the trees to northward, and, in turn, looks out across the valley to another convent school which tops the ridge at Bletchingley, a few miles distant, and owes its foundation, like that of Mayfield, to the zeal and liberality of the late Duchess of Leeds.

The stranger admitted by the portress within the great gate-house of the whilom palace, whose lofty, iron-studded doors close jealously on the village street, can scarcely fail to be conscious of an harmonious environment, linking the ancient buildings with the ordered calm of their present setting. A tranquil stillness, far removed from the restless spirit of to-day, broods over smooth-shaven lawns and paths, bordered by sweet-smelling box, which lie before the grey south front of time-worn stone and Gothic tracery; while from the vaulted shadow of the chapel porch echoes faintly the sonorous Latin of the daily offices familiar to its founders long ago. Out of the vicissitudes of Time, in the hushed evening of their days, the venerable walls that have looked down on conclave and feasting of yore, and through the hundred winters were left gaunt and desolate to the mantling ivy and the hooting owl, are come to a fair peace, broken by no harsher sounds than children's voices and the chanting of the nuns.

SERMON OF THE MONTH.

BY THE REV. J. R. DARBYSHIRE.

"In the beginning God."—GEN. I. I.

ONE rarely hears the Pentateuch mentioned in these days without thinking at once of questions of historical and literary criticism: Are the narratives true? Did Moses write them? How far have they any obligation upon us? For our present purpose I am going to sweep questions of that kind aside, and not discuss at all the vexed question of authorship; I shall say very little about the historical character of the books. I shall not ask you to consider whether one passage is later or one passage earlier in their character than another. We will just take the books as they stand, and see what the books as a whole have to teach us, remembering that as we treat them in that way we are regarding them as our Lord regarded them, and as all those who loved the Lord in those days regarded them, for they were the most precious portion of the Bible of the Jews, they were kept jealously from all danger of corruption of text, and read earnestly Sabbath by Sabbath in the synagogue, till every Jew who was worthy of the name knew the books thoroughly in his heart.

And, after all, these questions of historical and literary criticisms are very subsidiary. Those who had new theories to propound were forced, I suppose, to regard them as the most important part of the study of the books from their point of view, and those who had to defend the traditional view were compelled to pay most attention to history and to the literary criticism, in order to reply to the men who had new views to put forward; but it would be a sad thing for us if we were to lose our hold upon the spiritual beauty of the books because other men were forced by circumstances to fight a battle about their history or their literary history.

One thing should be always urged, however, and it is that we are not justified in taking a violent position on either side, and saying that he who refuses to accept new views must necessarily be wrongly interpreting the books, or that he who does accept new views of the authorship of them is acting unworthily of inspiration and of belief in the Holy Ghost, for we can tell from experience that the men who have adopted new views and have taught them, have not lost their appreciation of, or their belief in, the Old Testament; rather it is not too much to say that in the great majority of cases, in England at least, it has proved to them and those to whom they taught their views, an enlightenment, so that the Old Testament became to them more precious and more valuable; for these views have exhibited, even more wonderfully than was seen before, the gradual leading of the people of God by the guidance of God into their peculiar position as the Chosen People, and the chosen witnesses of Himself to the world. And these new views have certainly appeared to many to bring God's methods of dealing in revelation into line with His known methods of dealing in history, so that we feel that the God who led Israel, the God of Bethel, is indeed our God to-day.

But, on the other hand, there is a great value to be attached to the tradition of the Mosaic authorship; whether we accept it as historical or not, we must not forget its great value—namely, that these five books do represent the mature teaching of Moses. They stand for all that Moses stood for, and the work of Moses is for ever enshrined in them. I would almost say that the pivot of the Pentateuch is the story of the Burning Bush, where Moses received his call to go back into Egypt and tell the other people that the Lord is Israel's God, the God of their fathers and their Father, the Friend of their fathers, and their Friend, a God who is alive and makes alive, a God who is full of love for His people, and is coming to redeem them. And while Moses is to give that message of consolation to the Israelites in Egypt, he is to give them another message, that Israel belongs to God, and Israel is to be faithful to Him,

and to be His witness to the nations, witness alike of His love and of His power. The mediator is to be Moses: Moses is to stand for God to the people, and for the people before God. The vision thus is from Moses to the people, and from the people outwards to the world.

The Book of Genesis comes first in these five books that enshrine that vision, naturally and appropriately; for it tells at its very start that the purpose of God is a universal, world-wide purpose of love. The theme of Genesis is the universality of God's plan, God's power, God's process, of loving revelation. This is the message of the earlier chapters. In the development of it the story is first occupied with the history of the Patriarchs, as the work is seen to be assuming an apparently narrower scope in the special preparation of a chosen people who are to be God's witnesses of these loving purposes; Exodus then comes second as the book of the calling into being that nation which is to be the chosen witness. Third comes Leviticus, to give the terms of the consecration of this people. Then the Book of Numbers tells the history of their training; and last, Deuteronomy contains an exhortation to the people to maintain their faithfulness to this high calling.

To come back to Genesis, it is the book that proclaims the universal theme, and it does so in two main divisions, chapters i. to xi. being concerned with the origin of mankind, chapters xii. to l. with special instances of God's loving plan, power, and process, as shown in the lives of the Patriarchs.

The first chapter states the theme—God's loving plan, God's almighty power, God's system of process. For we are told that God created the world: He created it by the power of His almighty will out of nothing; He created it in an orderly fashion; He created it with a loving purpose, for He saw that all things that He had made were good; and He peopled it with mankind, to whom He gave His blessing, that they should multiply and increase upon the earth. There is, then, the theme started, the theme of plan, the theme of power, the theme of process.

But soon a conflicting element appears, for from the third

to the eleventh chapters we have a sad story of the way in which men could thwart the plan, could hinder the power, and could prove rebellious and impatient of the process.

As we come to the third chapter, we find ourselves asking even more than in the first chapter: Is the thing true? Is this story of the fall of Adam and Eve history?

Does it matter to any single one of us whether it is history or not? When we read that story, is the thing that really matters, whether one man in the remotest ages sinned that sin, or is the thing that really matters to us this, that as we read the story we say, "That exactly illustrates my case?" Do we not feel the sinful power of curiosity, do we not suffer from the effects of sinful companionship, and the temptation that is brought by our desire to experience what others have experienced? We, too, find that the fruit that was to be so sweet brings only the knowledge of shame. We, too, hide ourselves from God. And good will it be for us, too, if we learn that God, in the cool of the day, misses His human companionship and calls to know where we are.

The teaching of this chapter of Genesis is absolutely independent of historical fact; I am not saying the story is not true, but I am saying that the real truth of that story is that it describes the universal experience of mankind, and as it describes it in terms so easy to be understood, it warns us for the future, and it wins us to new penitence as we read of God's love unquenched even by our sin.

Similarly through all those chapters down to the call of Abraham, we read in the narratives of Noah and the Tower of Babel expressions of our own experience, and so learn from them where we must be on our guard, and wherein we must put our trust.

Then from the twelfth chapter to the fiftieth, the story is resumed again, the theme is reannounced and worked out in that wonderful series of stories in the lives of the Patriarchs. God resumes His plan though man had failed, for He calls Abraham from a far country, and brings him to the Holy Land

and settles him there, and promises His blessing; yea, though Jacob has to travel far from home, God prepares him also, to be the father of the chosen flock, and trains him in that awful night of wrestling in prayer, till he who was Jacob has his name changed to Israel. Not less plain is the plan in the story of Joseph, scorned by his brethren, cast in the pit, tempted in Egypt, forgotten in prison, raised to the princeship, till he could be the saviour of his people.

God not only resumes His plan in these great chapters, but He vindicates His power: even the man who believed and staggered not at the promises of God, and was counted faithful and righteous because of his faith, even Abraham cannot imagine *how* God can raise him up a seed in whom all the nations should bless themselves. And when Jacob went out an outcast from his home, did Jacob foresee the wondrous experiences that would bring him home a wealthy man to be the father of the Twelve Tribes? Or when Joseph was cast in the pit did not the brethren think the story had ended there? But no, as God's is the plan, so is the power God's. Men may try to thwart, but they cannot in the end annul the purposes of God. As He is determined how He will save the world, so He will show His power in its redemption.

Again, there is shown in these chapters xii. to l. a very remarkable method of process. It was natural for people to think that once a line was founded, the process might go on. Abraham himself had that idea, for he prayed when God promised a son, that Ishmael might live before Him; then there was Esau, and then all the elder sons of Jacob, and finally there were the two sons of Joseph; and yet in all these cases it was not the elder, but the younger what was chosen, as though God would say to Israel, "It is not your idea of progress and process that is going to save the world, but Mine; I will choose whom I will for My purposes, and for the purpose of the winning of the world I have chosen and loved Jacob, and Esau I have discarded and hated." For all through this book there throbs not only the idea of the ultimate salvation of Israel, but the

ultimate winning of the world. The Gospel of Genesis is the Gospel of the third chapter, that the Seed of the woman shall fight the seed of the serpent, and the serpent shall bruise the heel of the Seed of the woman, but the Seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head; and in that early warning of a conflict there lies the promise of a victory. And so Genesis, no less than all the other books of the Bible, is a book of missionary import to all the world.

There remain in the last place a few special points to notice about this book:

First, its remarkable frankness; it makes no attempt to gloze over the sins of the Patriarchs, but frankly tells us of their failure, how even Abraham, the saint of God, the man of faith, disbelieved, and how Jacob and Isaac and Joseph all failed inasmuch as they were human; the Bible is not squeamish, but the Bible takes sin as a fact that must be faced.

So far is it from being squeamish, that there have been people who have not scorned to say of the Bible that it contains passages which are not fit to be read. But that accusation superficially true is fundamentally false; as we study this book we find it to be instinct with the spirit of consecration to God, a book of absolute stainless purity of tone, and as we compare its early stories with the early stories of other nations, we find the wonder growing stronger—there are no wicked gods in Genesis, but only the one, true, faithful, loving All-Creator. And it is there that we shall find the inspiration of the Bible, for it is the one Book of all ancient books that is absolutely consecrated to the highest end: the glory of God, and the winning of men back to God. And as we feel its consecration, we shall realize more truly its reliability; and as we feel its reliability we shall hear in ourselves the call to place our trust on the revelation that is contained in it, and we shall find ourselves called to accept God's plan, to acknowledge, to welcome, and to submit to His power, and in the end to accelerate His process of redemption by co-operating with Him, as He gives us power, in making known to all mankind the Truth that He has shown to ourselves.

The Missionary World.

AS the world grows smaller through increasing facilities of communication it is being recognized that the force which influences one land influences all. To quote a familiar instance, the war between Japan and Russia had an effect upon every nation in the East, and even in lesser measure touched Africa. From kindred causes, there is an increasing interchange of influences between Churches and missionary societies at the home base. With added opportunities for contact, such as that afforded by the Conference of the Representatives of British Missionary Societies last month, and with the warmer fellowship which has prevailed since the Edinburgh Conference, what affects one for good or for evil has a reflex influence upon all. No society now lives to itself, or can look on its own things alone. This fact adds importance to the news which has been made public concerning the C.M.S. Conference of Committees held at Swanwick from May 27 to 31. It has a relation to the missionary service of the whole Church of Christ.

* * * * *

In many ways the Conference was unique. It came as the climax of the delegation's work in Japan and China, and during the whole winter strenuous preparation had been made for it by investigating committees at Salisbury Square. It was, further, representative to an unusual extent, all its members standing not for themselves alone, but for local associations or for central committees. But the thing which made the Conference was independent of all this, and might have come without it. Twenty "Swanwicks" could not of themselves have brought it to pass. It was a time when God Himself moved upon His servants, and touched them with His breath of life. The sense of that dwarfed all else. The resolutions passed by the Conference, after careful discussion and much prayer are, being considered throughout the country, and will come up to the General Committee of July 8, reinforced by the opinion of local associ-

ations everywhere. They comprise a call to "a strong move forward," to a return to "a more Christ-like simplicity of life," and "such deliberate limitation of personal expenditure as may release more of the resources with which God has put" each one in trust; a pledge in response to the call of God to secure "strong permanent advance"; and an appeal for the immediate raising of one thousand gifts of £100 each, in order to remove financial hindrances to advance. About £12,000 were promised before the Conference broke up, and news keeps coming in of further offerings, some marked by true self-denial, such as the sacrifice of hardly-earned savings. Money is being given, not to a "special fund," but in response to a claim direct from Him who for our sakes became poor. It behoves all who observe this working of God among His people to watch humbly, to listen honestly, and to obey unflinchingly, lest His purpose should be stayed by unbelief, or checked by hardness of heart. The movement, if cherished in faith and prayer, may penetrate not only the great mass of C.M.S., but may spread throughout the Church.

* * * * *

The whole situation as regards the spread of the Kingdom is charged with significance at this time. Men are being moved singly and in masses by a Power outside themselves towards great issues which as yet they dimly perceive. At the home base the old rule of missionary committees is expanding into intelligent control by the whole body of responsible local workers; abroad the missionaries are no longer units, or even "agents of a Society"; they are combining, as the work of Dr. Mott during last winter has demonstrated, even if only for advisory purposes, into great groups containing the foreign and native leaders of the Church and representing the forces of the Kingdom within a nation. If the old functions and the parental rule of the Societies at their home base and among their missionaries are threatened, new and far more important functions are emerging instead. Committee-rooms will become the meeting-ground where active enterprise and fearless thought from the home and the foreign

side become related, where living issues are studied, directed, and combined. The delegation of work and of authority will result in a claim for organized central leadership of a more far-seeing and far-reaching kind. It is impossible to forecast the issues just below the horizon which may at any moment appear. The desire to oppose and the desire to initiate are alike stricken from us. God is abroad among us. We wait for His voice; we desire to follow at His call.

* * * * *

In view of all this, a deep importance attaches to the missionary aspect of the Keswick Convention this month. If that gathering is brought into living fellowship with the purposes of God as they are emerging in the Church and in the world; if the possibilities of believing prayer latent in the multitude of men and women present are released; if lesser interests and problems are merged into united faith and expectancy; if a vision of the unmeasured love of God in Christ imposes a new rule of self-sacrifice and a revised standard of personal expenditure, then the great Convention will have renewed its youth, and will lead on into further experiences of practical holiness to the Lord. A great outflow of prayer and sacrifice must precede a fresh inflow of grace and life.

* * * * *

The *Japan Evangelist* for April contains an article by the Rev. H. V. S. Peeke, dealing with the preparation of an evangelistic missionary, which has special interest in view of the number of men and women who will shortly be sailing for the Field. He speaks, of course, primarily for Japan, but his words are applicable to the work of a general missionary in other countries also. He points out that the language is not the chief difficulty which confronts the missionary. After the two or three years spent in language study there is still a wide field of preparation before he can render himself acceptable to Japanese taste and etiquette, as well as to Japanese comprehension; and, since there is no royal road to knowledge of any kind, he must learn Japanese manners and customs, etc., by

ceaseless practice, even as he can only gain proficiency in the Japanese tongue by talking it incessantly at the risk of becoming wearisome. He must be prepared to face physical discomfort, especially in the matter of food and habits of living; to practise intellectual self-denial and discipline, since there is little time to spare for mental culture; and to exercise a steady persistence and wise ingenuity in order to bring his message into the hearts and homes of all classes of the people, realizing that direct evangelization is the first necessity of missionary work. But difficult as the work unquestionably is, Mr. Peeke has found that it holds splendid possibilities for the man who, in simple dependence on God, is willing to plod.

Mr. Peeke's closing paragraph is worth quoting:

> "Especially must he cultivate Japanese acquaintances, intimacies, and friendships with every sort and condition of man. He must learn how to do these things by simply doing them unceasingly, and he may expect that in due time, if he maintains a correspondence fixed with heaven, God's Spirit will work through him, transforming savingly the lives of others."

Dealing with the same subject from the more personal standpoint of the missionary's own life and character, we note an article in the *Student Movement* for June by the Rev. H. W. Oldham, of South China, on "The Life of a Missionary."

* * * * *

The missionary magazines for June are for the most part filled with reports of the annual meetings, that of the C.C.C.S. in the *Greater Britain Messenger* being specially interesting. The *C.M. Review*, in addition to reports of some of the speeches, has two articles dealing with the Chinese Government and the request for Christian prayer by Bishop Cassels and Archdeacon Moule, and one by Bishop Molony on "The Past and Future in China"; the Rev. J. Sadler contributes one on "The Uplift of the Women of China" in the *Student Movement;* and the Bishop of Shantung writes on "Educational Work in North China" in the *Mission Field.* The *Bible in the World* reports ten new versions added in the past year to the long list of translations, as well as an unprecedented circulation of over

7½ million copies of the Scriptures; the *L.M.S. Chronicle* reports a heavy deficiency in funds; whilst *China's Millions* has a record of great financial mercies during the past year.

* * * * *

The close intertwining of home and foreign work is illustrated by some figures recently given at a meeting to show the relation of the Mildmay Institutions to foreign missions. During the last five years the Deaconess House, notwithstanding its own needs of reinforcement, has given deaconesses for training work in Toronto, and for missionary work in China and India. Six workers for the mission field have also been in residence to gain experience. At the Memorial Hospital there have been, in the same period, 20 nurses taking training with a view to missionary work, and 3 of the hospital sisters have gone to the mission field. From the Mission Hospital in Bethnal Green, during the last five years, 9 doctors and 11 fully trained nurses have gone out; 12 women have been given short training in the wards, and 77 missionary students have had out-patient experience. From the Willows Training Home 66 students have gone abroad in five years, under 9 different Societies, to 13 different fields. Behind all these workers Mildmay puts a wealth of prayer, for the links formed during the training time endure. In the Student Home there is also an interesting succession of workers in training from the Continent—Germany, Switzerland, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, Finland, etc. G.

Notices of Books.

BENEATH THE SOUTHERN CROSS. By H. S. Woollcombe. London: *Longmans*. Price 3s. 6d. net.

Mr. Woollcombe went to Australia, South Africa, etc., as C.E.M.S. representative, and this book records his impressions of Colonial Church life. There is no claim to literary style, rather do we get a running conversational frank account of what our traveller saw and thinks. He is by no means afraid to criticize, and most young clergymen will endorse much that is said—indeed, most of them say it themselves. Mr. Woollcombe's outlook is not so entirely shut up to the Colonial Church that he has no time to deal a few thrusts at the methods of the Home Church. Pew rents, book religion, the parochial system, party spirit, unadaptability, decanal attire, over-staffed churches, "negative Protestantism," are among the features of the Church, either at home or abroad, which find themselves condemned, and even Bishops do not escape some criticism and advice. Bush Brotherhoods furnish almost the best item in the life of the Australian Church, and official literature is perhaps its greatest need. We ought to learn from both Methodism and Rome; we ought to stop quarrelling and "get a move on"; we ought to authorize different types of worship; we ought to "drop externals and quietly teach" what we believe to be the truth. The criticism is kindly given, and the spirit of humility is really present. It is not difficult to discover the author's own position, but he has long since learnt that other men may have other views and methods, and he wishes them God-speed, as we wish him.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THE JEWS and PAGANS. By Samuel E. Stokes. London: *Longmans*. Price 1s. 6d. net.

A little apologetic work of more than ordinary interest. Dr. J. F. O. Murray, the editor, tells us in his preface that Mr. Stokes is an "American who has given his life to the evangelization of India, and who prepared this book to help educated Hindus to feel that the Life of Christ and the facts of the early development of Christianity enter into the main stream of the history of the Roman Empire, and are capable of verification by the same evidence as that of the generally accepted facts of that history, and that in consequence they stand as facts on a very different ground from the legends of Krishna."

This should be enough to show the value of this modest but original attempt to establish the truth of Christianity.

A GUIDE TO ECCLESIASTICAL LAW. By Henry Miller. London: *C. J. Thynne*, 6, Great Queen Street, W.C. Price 1s. net.

The tenth edition of a manual for the guidance of churchwardens and parishioners. To say that it was compiled by the late Secretary of the Church Association is sufficient to indicate its character. Such questions as the interpretation of the Ornaments Rubric are fully dealt with, and there is much useful information in a small compass.

THE SYRIAN GODDESS. By Dr. Strong and Professor Garstang. *Constable and Co.* Price 4s. net.

This little book is a translation of Lucian's "De Dea Syria," a treatise of real value as being one of the few accounts which we have first-hand of an Oriental cult; most of our information on the subject is purely archæological, and reconstructions from such material must always contain a dangerous amount of inference. The interest of the cult at Hierapolis is twofold: it has its roots deep in the past, and Professor Garstang's lucid introduction and voluminous notes trace its connection with the Hittite religion. He scarcely seems, however, to allow for the possibility that the worship of the Mother Goddess is primitively Anatolian and pre-Hittite, on which the Khatti and their confederates grafted the worship of their thunder-god. It is at least a plausible suggestion that the Yasili-Kaya sculptures are largely political in character, representing the union of the Hittite pantheon headed by the chief god, with the earlier worship of the land, represented by the Mother Goddess and her son, followed by her train of priestesses; and this seems borne out by the prominence of the goddess at Hierapolis. But there is another interest in this and other like cults: they were the living religions of paganism at the Christian era, and contributed to the atmosphere breathed by the early Church. An exact knowledge of them is of real importance in view of the claims so lightly made that Christianity owes much of her teaching, worship, and organization to them, claims which rigorous examination is doing much to discredit. And this book is full of information germane to the inquiry. The translation is what might be expected from a scholar of Dr. Strong's reputation, and Professor Garstang's notes contain an immense mass of material conveniently arranged. There are one or two misprints, one in the Hebrew in a note on p. 21, and apparently on p. 31 "He learned" should be "He earned." But the book is a valuable contribution towards the clearing up of an obscure corner of Oriental religious development.

M. LINTON SMITH.

THE LAND OF THE NEW GUINEA PIGMIES. By Captain C. S. Rawling. Price 16s. net.

CAMP AND TRAMP IN AFRICAN WILDS. By E. Torday. Price 16s. net.

THE PASSING OF THE TURKISH EMPIRE IN EUROPE. By Captain B. S. Baker. Price 16s. net.

A TURKISH WOMAN'S EUROPEAN IMPRESSIONS. By Zeyneb Hamoum. Price 6s. net.

(All published by *Seeley, Service and Co.*, London.)

New Guinea, Turkey, Africa, all regions of absorbing interest to-day, are treated in these books by those who know them, and the books are got up and illustrated in accordance with the best traditions of the publishing firm. It would be good if the rising generation would learn to read such books as these. There is plenty of interest and plenty of information in them. They are not missionary books, but their very existence emphasizes the missionary need. For those who would know the world and its problems better, for those who are interested in the romance of nations, there is rich food here. Detailed review is impossible, but cordial commendation cannot be denied.

EVERYDAY LIFE IN THE HOLY LAND. By Rev. J. Neil, M.A. London: *Cassell.* Price 7s. 6d. net.

This book has won the commendation of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and we are not surprised. It is beautifully illustrated in colours; it is full of information—information of the kind that we rarely get in books; it makes the land of our Lord's earthly life live before us; it incidentally gives a meaning—*the* meaning—to hundreds of texts and obscure passages of Scripture. Young people will like it, and older folk will rejoice over it. It is no ordinary book; it ought to have a place in every home, and as a gift-book it should be hard to beat. We congratulate author and publishers alike on an excellent piece of work.

THINKING BLACK. By D. Crawford, F.R.G.S. London: *Morgan and Scott.* Price 7s. 6d.

Mr. Crawford spent twenty-two years of missionary life and service without a break in the long grass of Central Africa, in the land of Livingstone. If he were the poorest writer imaginable, and the book shared his poverty, we should want to read it. But neither hypothesis is truth. Mr. Crawford writes with eager earnestness, with picturesque vivacity, and with compelling interest. The book is black, the framework of the pictures is black, but the pictures are coloured, and the black is lightened generally with all the skill of the modern bookmaker. Mr. Crawford has a wonderful story to tell, and the cause of Christian missions will gain as we read or get others to read it. It is a striking book, and should gain a crowd of readers.

THE PAROCHIAL MISSION. By the Rev. W. J. L. Sheppard, M.A. London: *Robert Scott,* Paternoster Row. Price 2s. net.

The Bishop of Sodor and Man contributes a preface to this "handbook for the use of incumbents and missioners." Of course, different men will have their differing methods; but, at the same time, such a book as this—based upon very considerable experience, and dealing as it does with almost every question concerning the conduct of a mission—can hardly fail to be helpful even to the most experienced. Mr. Sheppard is not in favour of "general missions," in which he says incumbents sometimes join "merely to please the Bishop," and invite some friend to conduct the mission who has no special fitness for such work, with the result that missions are discredited. There is, we fear, only too much truth in this. The value of the book is enhanced by the inclusion of specimens of mission literature.

AFTER CONFIRMATION *and* AT THE HOLY COMMUNION. By Miss Solomon. Birmingham: *Solomon and Whitehead.* Price respectively 6s. and 1s. 6d. per 100.

Miss Solomon has written two beautiful hymns, one for use at a Confirmation service after the administration of the rite, and one for use at Holy Communion. They are both excellent, the poetry good, the diction tasteful and refined, and the teaching such as we can gladly commend. Several Bishops have expressed their approval, and we are not surprised. We specially venture to draw attention to the Communion hymn, which, set to a suitable tune, will be a real help to the devotional atmosphere of that sacred service.

THE ENGLISH CHURCH AND THE REFORMATION. By C. S. Carter. *Longmans.* Price 2s. net.

Although some might suggest that there was no room for another record of the Reformation period in the English Church, the present tendency to quietly ignore it (even if one does not "bitterly repent it") involves the danger of facts being forgotten, and makes it possible that hard lessons must be learned over again.

For a clear, impartial review of the whole period, Mr. Carter's book is just what we want. From just before Henry VIII. to just after Elizabeth we are taken through the whole story, and the important matters are pointed out to us as we go. It is a curious mixture of good and bad, of weakness and strength, of politics and religion, of ignorance and learning. Selfishness, superstition, spoliation, greed, murder, desecration, jostle and crowd each other in the same company as that which produces Tyndale's Bible, Cranmer's Liturgy, Jewell's "Apology," and Hooker's "Polity"; and the fierce wilfulness of Plantagenet sovereigns thrusts clergy and people to and from Rome in turn with motives sometimes wholly religious, sometimes wholly political, occasionally wholly personal, and frequently so confusedly a mixture of all three, that it would be difficult even for themselves to say which predominated.

That amidst all this strife in the mental, moral, social, political, and religious worlds there grew and lived a steady stream of reform which produced the English Bible, and the English Prayer-Book, and the English Articles, and the English Reformed Church, is so clearly due to the miraculous guidance of an Almighty God, that it is difficult to understand how anyone with such a history as this in his hands can ever desire the Reformation settlement undone, and Mr. Carter's book should help not a few of our younger men to make their position steadier on this point than it seems sometimes to be.

Once again we get a treatment of the Ornaments Rubric and the Advertisements, with the revived suggestion that "retained and be in use" was a temporary direction to prevent embezzlement of Church plate, etc. (now become illegal), until "other order" be given for their disposal.

The book is of convenient size, and provides a handy summary from a non-partisan standpoint of what the author truly calls a "momentous century, in which the character and position of the Anglican Church were vitally affected."

"THE MISSIONARY PROSPECT." By Charles H. Robinson, D.D. *Partridge and Co.*

The flow of new Missionary literature continues to increase, but Canon Robinson need have no fear that his book will be crowded out. It is excellent. It makes its own place, and then completely fills it. We are given an historical and statesmanlike survey of the Missionary position from New Testament times to the present day, including the Edinburgh Conference and the 1911 Indian Census. Most interesting are the chapters on Early Christian Missions of the third and fourth centuries, and on the Conversion of Northern Europe in the period A.D. 500 to 1000. Modern Missions are outlined, and the extraordinary developments of recent years

noted. Taking the figures of non-Roman Missions, it is shown that while it took one hundred years to make the first million converts, "a second million were won within twelve years, and nearly a third million within the last six years." Native Indian Christians have increased over 130 per cent. in the last thirty years; and if this same proportionate increase be maintained, the whole population of India will be Christian in 160 years. Popular objections are dealt with, and criticisms of method are examined. Mr. Allen's recent book is not mentioned, but it is clearly referred to more than once. The "would-be critic" is urged to make more prolonged study of past history and present work. For such a purpose Canon Robinson's book is ready to hand. The publishers should send a book to every English Diocesan Bishop, for surely some of them would put it into their ordination examination list, even if some less recent book had to be removed to make room for it.

MISSIONARY STUDY PRINCIPLES. By G. T. Manley, C.M.S.

Mr. Manley speaks on a subject which he has made specially his own, and we listen to him as to an authority. The whole ground is covered carefully, even minutely, and to the Missionary Study Circle leader the little book is indispensable. Here is a new movement which is going to do great things, which is already doing them, and men who want to get the best out of their lives will not disregard it. It is the new science of education applied to Church needs; get the book and begin to work.

THE ORIGIN AND ANTIQUITY OF MAN. By G. Frederick Wright, D.D., LL.D. Oberlin, Ohio: *Bibliotheca Sacra Company*. 1912. Price $2 net; postage, 15 cents.

This is a most valuable as well as a highly interesting book. Professor Wright has a great European and American reputation, on account of his splendid geological researches and delightful books. The volume here noticed is the complete result of his unrivalled knowledge of the Glacial Period, and of the extraordinary changes which attended its passing away. It contains fifteen chapters, each of which is a perfect study by itself. Dealing with the historical evidence for man's antiquity, he shows that the researches in Egypt, Chaldea, Crete, and Central Asia, carry back the age of man to nearly 6000 B.C. Next he discusses the origin of language and the origin of the European and American races. As to America, man entered the New World from Asia, both by land (*i.e.*, Behring Strait) and by sea across the Pacific. Professor Wright gives evidence to show that languages in early days may have originated very rapidly; and in another chapter he describes Neolithic man, with his rude stone monuments, shell mounds, and lake-dwellings. The earliest Neolithic men, he holds, belonged to the non-Aryan or Iberian race. Our author does not believe in the existence of Tertiary man, and declares that "Eoliths" are not of human origin. Then follow long descriptions of the Glacial Period in Europe and America, and of the skulls, bones, and implements of the men who lived when the Glacial Period was passing away. The Ice Age came on, and passed away much quicker than has been imagined, and the gravels containing man's bones and weapons were formed very quickly. The recent close of the Glacial Period

is also proved by the freshness of its markings, and by the small amount of geological changes that have occurred since it passed away. Professor Wright next discusses the origin of man, and examines both the physiological and psychological arguments for man's origin. He believes that the remains of *Pithecanthropus erectus* belong to a *man*, and concludes that science shows that man's production must have been by a sudden process, and that man's origin cannot be solved by science alone, but requires the intervention of a Creator. According to Professor Wright, man originated in the later part of the Glacial Period. Post-glacial time was probably very short, and history begins with a highly civilized condition of man. Professor Wright sums up the question of man's antiquity by declaring that man cannot be less than 10,000 years old, but need not have an antiquity of more than 15,000 years. He further states that the history of the human race gives no countenance to the doctrine of universal progress among mankind, but rather to degeneration, except under specially favourable conditions.

D. GATH WHITLEY.

ANCIENT HUNTERS AND THEIR MODERN REPRESENTATIVES. By W. J. Sollas, D.Sc., LL.D., F.R.S., etc. Pp. xvi+416. 1911. London: *Macmillan and Co.* Price 12s. net.

Professor Sollas has written a most valuable book. It is beautifully printed, and contains more than two hundred maps, diagrams, and illustrations. He begins by describing the Glacial Period, and, rejecting the human origin of the "Eoliths," he passes to the description of the men of the Pleistocene Period, earlier than which, he says, there is no evidence of the existence of man. In this period man was entirely a hunter, as no evidence exists to show that at that time he was acquainted with agriculture. The earliest men of the Lower Palæolithic Age used very rude flint weapons, as well as spears of wood. These hunters are considered by Professor Sollas as having been represented by the Tasmanians, who became extinct in 1877. These Tasmanians, although rude and uncultured hunters, were kind and well-disposed, and could readily progress in European education; in fact, they have been called a "noble race." In the Middle Palæolithic Age the men of that time, who lived in Europe with the lion, elephant, rhinoceros, and hippopotamus, have left many skulls and skeletons in the caves and gravels. They were armed with flint axes, they prepared skins for clothing with flint scrapers; they were short in stature, and their cranial capacity was about as great as that of modern Europeans. Professor Sollas calls them Mousterians, and compares them with the Australian aborigines, whom he describes in a lengthy chapter. These Australians are hunters only, and use stone axes and spears, and they possess a vague religion, as well as a belief of existence after death. In the latest (or Upper) Palæolithic Age man in Western Europe used beautiful weapons and harpoons of bone as well as stone, and was a sculptor and an artist. He carved in ivory and in reindeer-horn figures and statuettes of men and animals, and on the walls and roofs of the caves in France and Spain he painted representations of animals and of human beings. Professor Sollas compares these ancient artists with the Bushmen of South Africa, whose wonderful painted caves

and remarkable drawings of animals he describes in an interesting chapter. These diminutive Bushmen are fond of music and dancing, and are highly intelligent. The latest (or Magdalenian) men of the Palæolithic Period, whose remains are found in France, Belgium, and in England (*i.e.*, in Kent's Cavern and in the Cresswell Crags Caves) were, according to Professor Sollas, closely related to the Eskimo. In those times veritable Eskimo lived in Western Europe, from which region they were driven, and they then retired into the Arctic regions. The Azilians succeeded them, but they were probably a Neolithic race.

Professor Sollas sums up his researches into the characteristics of prehistoric man as follows: "In reviewing the successive Palæolithic industries as they occur in Europe, I find little evidence of indigenous evolution, but much that suggests the influence of migrating races; if this is a heresy, it is at least respectable, and is now rapidly gaining adherents."

D. GATH WHITLEY.

THE HEAVENLY SESSION OF OUR LORD. By Arthur J. Tait, D.D. London: *Robert Scott.* Price 6s. net.

The University of Cambridge accepted this book from Principal Tait's pen as a qualification for the Doctorate of Divinity. In doing so, the University not only honoured one of its sons, but acted in accordance with the best traditions of Cambridge theology. Ripe scholarship, clear thinking, luminous expression, and painstaking attention to detail, have long marked the succession of Cambridge scholars. Dr. Tait has learned in the same school and has found his place in the same succession. He has produced a work not only of sound and careful scholarship, but of real and practical importance.

There has grown up amongst us a mischievous heresy—we can call it no less—which has associated with our Lord's Session in heaven a doctrine of the Holy Communion which many of us have felt compelled to repudiate. Mere repudiation, however, has little value unless it be accompanied by positive statement of truth. Dr. Tait's book deals with this new heresy both positively and negatively. His book opens with a statement of his thesis, not in his own words, but in those of Bishop Westcott. He quotes from the Bishop's "Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews" as follows:

"The modern conception of Christ pleading in heaven His Passion, 'offering His blood' on behalf of men, has no foundation in this Epistle. His glorified humanity is the eternal pledge of the absolute efficacy of His accomplished work. He pleads, as older writers truly expressed the thought, by His Presence on the Father's Throne."

The whole book is a verification of the Westcott view. Dr. Tait pleads, and in our judgment proves, that if the Session of our Lord signifies the cessation of propitiatory offering, we may not think of the Intercession as a continued process of propitiation.

The first fifty pages are given to Scripture and the Creeds. Each passage is carefully examined, and clearly and briefly expounded. The basis made plain, he passes on to examine the interpretation that has been put upon Scripture by writers of every age in the Church's history. In this examination, perhaps, lies the greatest value of the book. The search for

references to the subject has been most thorough and most successful. Lest we should be overwhelmed by wealth of quotation, Dr. Tait has divided his treatment of the subject under several heads: he discusses its relation to the Person of Christ and to the kingdom of God; he considers the High Priesthood of Christ in its aspects of Propitiation and Intercession; he writes of the Session of Christ and its bearing upon His Presence in the Church; and finally he brings the Session into contact with our hopes of heaven and our aspiration to live the spiritual life. It is a valuable book for many reasons: it clearly and positively rebuts the false teaching to which we have referred; it thoroughly and suggestively deals with a not unimportant article of our Creed; it will clarify and help our thinking upon a subject over which we all rejoice, but of which we are apt to lose some of the practical value. It is a contribution to English theology worthy of a place on our shelves amid the best writings of those who have helped us most.

We hope that Dr. Tait will add to his literary labours for the welfare of the Church, and in that hope dare venture to make a suggestion. He writes so forcibly and so clearly, he is so skilled in the art of putting truth in sensible and intelligible form, that sometimes we would crave for less of quotation and more of Dr. Tait. It is a good fault, for all modern writing is not modest, but when a man has so much of his own to contribute that is valuable, we incline to deprecate the modesty which offers us so large a proportion of the wares of others. One striking inference, however, may be fairly drawn from Dr. Tait's many quotations. He is engaged in rebutting a heresy which has sometimes dared to claim for itself the title of Catholic teaching. How does Dr. Tait meet it? Not by his own logic or his own eloquence alone, nor indeed mainly, but by quotations from the Fathers and the formularies of the Church. His wealth of quotation disproves by its very bulk and character the catholicity of this medieval claimant to universal belief.

Biblical History for Schools: New Testament. By F. J. Foakes Jackson, D.D., and B. T. Dean Smith, M.A. Cambridge: *Heffer.*

Dr. Foakes Jackson is an adept in the art of making history interesting, and he has passed on his secret to Mr. Dean Smith. The result of their collaboration is a book which, if we are not mistaken, is destined to displace many textbooks of New Testament history at present in use in schools, and one which will not itself be easily displaced. The plan of the volume is strikingly good, and in the working out of the plan no pains have been spared to present a complete and comprehensive conspectus of the New Testament, marked alike by simplicity of diction and sound scholarship. As in the case of the companion volume on the Old Testament, recently published, each chapter is followed by a summary recapitulating its main contents. In addition to the general index is an index of Greek words and a useful list of books recommended for the more detailed study of each chapter.