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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

October, 1914.

The Month.

The Great War.

SINCE we last wrote the news from the seat of war has been almost uniformly favourable to the cause of Great Britain and her Allies. The German invasion of France is being steadily rolled back, whilst Belgium, devastated and ruined by one of the most cruel and wanton invasions known to history, is being slowly freed of the devastating enemy. In the Eastern theatre of the war Russia has done magnificently. She has so crushed the Austrians that it is doubtful whether Austria can continue to exist as a military Power; and the next stage in the campaign will be the march on Berlin. Of the final issue of the great war there never has been any doubt. Germany set Europe ablaze for no other purpose than that she might become a world-power, and in her mad lust her armies have been guilty of barbarities which have covered her name with infamy. A war waged for such a purpose and by such methods could not be successful; if it were, it would mean the triumph of evil over righteousness. Great Britain and her Allies are defending the cause of right against might, and by God's good help we will conquer. The war has had a wonderfully steadying effect upon the nation, and has called forth the best traits in our national character. The young manhood of the country has offered nobly and willingly for active service, counting no sacrifice too great for King and country. Earl Kitchener's appeal has been fully responded to,

and as long as men are called for there will be no lack of recruits. And the solemn purposefulness of the nation has been splendid. There is the spirit of determination to see this thing through at whatever cost. Best of all, there has been a widespread recognition that in and through this war God is speaking to the nation. We do not say that there is not still much to lament in the daily life of the people in some of the poorer districts—for example, there has been a lamentable increase of drinking amongst women—but it is the testimony of all engaged in Christian work in our great cities that a keener readiness to listen to the claims of religion is clearly discernible. It will be the earnest prayer of all who are religiously disposed that the nation may come through this trial strengthened, purified, and ennobled.

Why we are at War.

Our people are firmly convinced of the righteousness of our cause. The issues are not complicated; they are so clear that all can see and understand them. Nevertheless, we welcome the many pamphlets which have been issued setting forth the principal facts which led up to the conflict. The fullest statement of Great Britain's case is contained in the remarkable volume issued from the Clarendon Press, "Why we are at War" (2s. net). It is the work of Members of the Oxford Faculty of Modern History, and, as we should suppose, is free from all prejudice and bias. It deserves the closest study, and is clearly calculated to become the standard work on the causes of the war and the principles at stake. Specially valuable are the documents quoted from the British White Book and the German White Book. Among the more popular treatises should be mentioned Sir Edward Cook's pamphlet, "Why Britain is at War" (Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 2d.), whilst to many others Sir A. Conan Doyle's "To Arms!" with a telling preface by Mr. F. E. Smith, K.C., M.P. (Hodder and Stoughton, 1d.), will strongly appeal. The sermon by the Headmaster of Eton (Dr. E. Lyttelton), "What are we Fighting for?" (Longmans, Green and Co., 6d. net), also puts

the issues clearly and freely. It is of the highest importance to place the true facts well to the front, and we rejoice that Bishops and clergy are seeking to keep their people fully and accurately informed. The following passage from the Bishop of Durham's letter is much to the purpose:

"I am old enough to remember the Crimean War, and, of course, the great conflicts since—the war of the Indian Mutiny, the Egyptian Wars, the South African wars. This, the most tremendous struggle of all by far, is one as to which (putting the suppression of the Mutiny aside) it is more possible than, as to any other, without one reserve, for the Christian Englishman to pray for ultimate victory, supreme and overwhelming, as for a thing certainly well pleasing to God. Our State has entered on the struggle with a conscience clear as the day. It has gone to war that the *parola Inglesa*, 'the Englishman's word,' may be kept at all costs. It has stood out, if ever in history such a stand was made, for right against violent might, for truth against infamous untruth, and now (alas! that it must be written) for civilized liberty against worse than barbarian outrage."

Mr. Asquith's Speeches.

The war has brought out all that is greatest and noblest in British statesmanship. It was a never-to-be-forgotten incident when Mr. Asquith and Mr. Bonar Law stood together on the same platform at the Guildhall to uphold the honour of the country, and their speeches on that occasion struck a common note. The war has drawn political parties together in a wondrous manner, and we would fain hope that henceforth the lines of difference may be less marked. After all, when both parties are concerned for the welfare of the State, friendly co-operation between them ought to be possible, and a more frequent display of the "give-and-take" principle on both sides would redound to national usefulness. This is a theme upon which much might be written, but our present purpose rather is to emphasize the greatness and grandeur of the speeches made by the nation's leaders in this grave crisis of the nation's destiny. The Prime Minister has spoken twice—once at the Guildhall, the very heart of the Empire, and more recently in Edinburgh. Nothing could have been finer or more spirited than Mr. Asquith's denunciation at the Guildhall of the infamous violation by Germany of Belgian neutrality. The depth of his feeling may be gauged by the

strength of his words. "Sooner," he said, "than be a silent witness, which means in effect a willing accomplice of this tragic triumph of force over law, and of brutality over freedom, I would see this country of ours blotted out of the page of history." And to this statement the nation lends its determined assent. At Edinburgh the Prime Minister was equally emphatic. His terse and vivid recital of the reasons why we are at war must be quoted:

"We are at war for these reasons. In the first place, to vindicate the sanctity of treaty obligations and of what is properly called the public law of Europe; in the second place, to assert and to enforce the independence of free States, relatively small and weak, against the encroachments and the violence of the strong; and in the third place, to withstand, as we believe in the best interests not only of our own Empire, but of civilization at large, the arrogant claim of a single Power to dominate the development of the destinies of Europe."

These words are well spoken, and the nation is unanimous in the view that there must be no sheathing of the sword until these great purposes are absolutely and entirely fulfilled.

A Simple Parable.

Mr. Lloyd George's speech at Queen's Hall was, without doubt, the greatest and most moving oration he has ever delivered. No other statesman has the same "popular" gifts, and his well-merited trouncing of the Kaiser as "the road-hog of Europe" will live in the minds of the people. But his peroration was on a grander note: it can only be described as sublime:

"May I tell you in a simple parable what I think this war is doing for us? I know a valley in the north of Wales between the mountains and the sea—a beautiful valley, snug, comfortable, sheltered by the mountains from all the bitter blast. It was very enervating, and I remember how the boys were in the habit of climbing the hill above the village to have a glimpse of the great mountains in the distance, and to be stimulated and freshened by the breezes which came from the hill-tops, and by the great spectacle of that valley. We have been living in a sheltered valley for generations. We have been too comfortable, too indulgent, many, perhaps, too selfish, and the stern hand of fate has scourged us to an elevation where we can see the great everlasting things that matter for a nation—the great peaks of honour we had forgotten—Duty, Patriotism, and—clad in glittering white—the great pinnacle of Sacrifice, pointing like a rugged finger to heaven. We

shall descend into the valleys again, but as long as the men and women of this generation last they will carry in their hearts the image of these great mountain-peaks, whose foundations are not shaken though Europe rock and sway in the convulsions of a great war."

The Welsh Church.

We view with the keenest and profoundest regret the conduct of the Government in passing the Home Rule and the Welsh Church Bills. In the matter of the Welsh Church Act, their action will never be forgotten and never forgiven. If we are asked why we distinguish between the two measures, we reply, first, that the Government are pledged to pass an Amending Bill before the Home Rule Act becomes operative, and, second, that they have given an undertaking that Ulster shall not be coerced. Of the purpose and sincerity of these pledges we have no doubt. We attach importance also to Sir Edward Carson's decisive declaration, "We will not have Home Rule—never!!" for we see in it the clearest indication that, whatever the Government may or may not do, the people of Ulster will not allow themselves to be brought under the domination of an Irish Parliament. Rightly or wrongly, therefore, we believe that the safety and independence of the loyal Protestants of the North is assured. But with the Church in Wales the case is different. The passing of the Government Bill has inflicted upon it a staggering blow from which we see very little hope of recovery. The Act will come into force twelve months hence—or, if the war should not then be over, as soon thereafter as it is finished—but the preliminary inquiries and preparations will presumably have to be taken in hand at once. The blow has been struck swiftly, suddenly, and unexpectedly, and there is no redress.

What can be Done?

There is already talk of repealing the Act. We wish we could believe that such a course is possible. If the opinion of the country could be taken upon it—even if the opinion of Wales alone could be taken upon it—we should have no fear about the verdict. But, as far as one can see, the General Election, which is due next year, will not

be fought on Home Rule or Welsh Disestablishment, or any other domestic issue; it will be a "Khaki Election," pure and simple, and in those circumstances the result will not be doubtful. Still, the country must be made to realize what has been done. By Act of Parliament the Church has been deprived of £157,000 per year—that is to say, money now used and most urgently needed for God's work is to be applied to secular purposes for which it was never given and is not needed. The deepest sympathy will of course be felt with the brave little Church in Wales in the unspeakable calamity which has befallen it, and we are quite certain that as far as possible English Churchmen will give practical effect to their feelings. We hold, however, that this is not the time when any suggestions can usefully be made concerning what steps should be taken to repair the financial ruin which has been inflicted upon the Church. In due course, and after full deliberation, the Archbishops, in conjunction with the Welsh Bishops, will, we presume, put forth a statement of the more immediate needs, and how they can best be met. For that we are content to wait, knowing full well that such appeal will meet with the warmest and widest response, for the heart of the Church of England is stirred to its deepest depths by the cruel and deadly blow which has been inflicted upon the Church in Wales.

Church of England Next.

But whilst we must do our utmost to render to the Church in Wales such help as may be required, it will also be the imperative duty of Churchmen to take in hand at once, seriously and deliberately, the defence of the Church of England. Let there be no mistake on this point—that the next attack will be on the Church of England as a whole, and there is the gravest possible danger that it may find us unprepared to meet it. The capture of the outpost will greatly encourage its opponents to assail the citadel. We have no doubt at all that the Church of England is strong enough to repel the attack if only we are properly led and our leaders get to work in time. The mistakes in the Welsh Church

defence campaign must not be repeated. The Welsh Bishops were alive to the danger from the very first, and fought bravely and persistently all through, but they were not supported by the English Episcopate to the extent they should have been, in the earliest—that is to say the most important—stages of the campaign. And when the English manifestoes were issued, what feeble things they often were!—excellent, no doubt, for drawing-room meetings or parochial tea-parties, but of no force as rallying cries to Churchmen to repel the enemy already at the gate. It was said, of course, that the united Episcopate could not speak with a strong voice because a few of the Bishops were favourable to the Government Bill. The excuse was as unworthy as it was unreasonable. The Bishops favourable to Disestablishment and Disendowment should have been told quite frankly that they must stand aside; in any case, it was intolerable that fear of offending them should have hindered the adequate prosecution of the Church's campaign. We hope there will be no dilly-dallying with the defence of the Church of England If there are Bishops on the bench to-day who cannot wholeheartedly and unreservedly work in its cause, they need to be told in the plainest terms that they are a source of weakness, and not of strength, to the Church's efficiency. Days of stress and turmoil are coming upon the Church—sooner, perhaps, than we think—and we shall need to know who are our real friends. It is, indeed, a serious question whether Bishops who cannot conscientiously defend the Established and Endowed position of the Church of England, from which, be it remembered, they reap much advantage, ought not to resign their sees and make room for those who can.

The Authority of Scripture in the Church.

By BERESFORD PITE, F.R.I.B.A.,
Member of the House of Laymen for the Province of Canterbury.

WHETHER the authority of the Bible depends upon its message or upon its messengers is a question which perhaps unduly obtrudes itself to-day. But having been asked, it demands some attention. Though "taste and see" is a prescription of high authority which can certainly be applied to the Scriptures, their authority, though mysterious, must be sufficiently evident, from whatever source it be immediately derived, in order that the message of the book may generate faith in the hearer.

The message of the Scriptures is challenged by modern thought with an analysis which recognizes only intellectual authority, and every ground of orthodox faith claiming to rest upon the Bible is examined with the apparatus of historical and literary criticism by its inquisition. A specialized ecclesiastical school of modern thought, on the other hand, offers in the authority of the Church a security to the message through the successive qualification of messengers, and proffers this authorization as one of the mysteries of the Catholic faith. Thus the breaches in the harness of traditional beliefs made by the darts of criticism are to be covered with the ample vesture of the Church and the credal formulas reassume their apparent force. This authorization "per bearer" is a product of devotion to ecclesiastical precedent; an antiquarian ideal of original purity is thus created in the clerical devotee, somewhere in the Middle Ages, a long way short of Apostolic simplicity, and is not dissimilar to the enthusiasm evoked in the breast of an architect by the artistic perfection of a Greek or Gothic style. This appeal to the authority of precedent, when pursued through all the delays of process, lies with St. Paul's civil cause at the court of Rome.

The spiritual and experimental theology which was both the outcome and essence of the Reformation derives fruit-

fulness from the deeper roots of its faith in the supreme authority and freedom of the Scriptures. The fashionable neglect of the study of the Protestant controversy with Rome by the theological schools is dangerous, because an important testimony to the primary basis of security and fruitfulness in religion is not explored and penetrated, and the necessity of the Word of God as the first requisite of spiritual independence and life is not perceived.

The Reformers, in their struggle with the hitherto unchallengeable claims of the Church, had been compelled to take up a position external to Rome upon a foundation which is no more a negative Protestantism than is the Bible itself. The Reformation was more than the religious phase of the Renaissance, and ultimately became a witness not only against the corruptions of the medieval Papacy, but of the distinctive and essential truth of the authority of God's Word and of freedom of conscience. It may be admitted that the Counter-Reformation in the second half of the sixteenth century practically healed the moral sickness of the Papacy in the first half, and that the continuance of Protestantism thereafter was mischievous if it was merely a corrective force. In spite of initial reluctance to separate from the Church of Rome, in spite of anathemas and persecution, the investigation of the authority at the foundation of a superstructure so full of failure, when effectually commenced, did not cease until a satisfactory footing had been laid upon the authority of the Scriptures. The Reformation issued in the assertion of this supremacy over all other, and the Reformers rebuilt the wall upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, having the true corner-stone of Zion rather than the vicarious one of Rome.

The appeal of the Reformed Church of England is to this determining authority in Holy Scripture, for it is the ground of all repudiation of doctrines, practices, and claims, from the initial document of 1533 down to the royal declaration prefixed to the articles in 1628. This was drafted by Laud, and concludes : " that all curious search be laid aside and these disputes

shut up in God's promises, as they be generally set forth to us in Holy Scriptures and the general meaning of the Church of England according to them." The present form of clerical subscription, which Bishop Gore elects to interpret as a liberating formula, cites the Word of God only as the test of the doctrine of the Church of England, and necessarily agrees with the Ordinal which conditions all authority by a persuasion and determination that is entirely loyal to Scripture.

The Thirty-nine Articles stand in direct antagonism to the decrees of Trent, which co-ordinate Scripture and ecclesiastical tradition, a position echoed in the platitude, "The Church to teach and the Bible to prove." The Articles assert that the Word of God is sufficient to determine all that is requisite to the one way of salvation, to warrant the creeds—that which warranteth being greater than that which is warranted—to qualify a Church, to limit its authority, and to rule the decisions of Councils. The same proof of Holy Writ is taken to condemn doctrines such as the invocation of saints as repugnant, while "the plain words of Scripture," "our Lord's ordinances in the Gospel," and St. Paul's sayings, are brought to bear on the meaning and methods of the Sacraments. The characteristic symbol of the ministry at consecration and ordination is the delivery of the Bible, not the chalice, and to it the resolution of all obstacles to "the unity of true religion" is referred.

It is a clear deduction that for the Church of England authority resides in the Scriptures. No other claim is allowed to compete with this, and its own formulas have effect only "according to them." The denial by the Church of Rome of authentic catholicity to its ministry, and consequently of validity to its Sacraments, is immaterial to a Church protesting and submitting to the supremacy of God's Word, and to this position the Church of England by its history and documents is confined. The uncovenanted mercies, perhaps, do not after all happen to those who hold their title-deeds in scriptures; but what will be the refuge of those whose prescriptive rights are disputable, and to whom the Vicar of Christ says, "I know you not"? If the Church of

England does not rest upon agreeableness to the Word of God, and it is obvious that she is denied agreeableness to Rome, without one or the other resource, by what is this stray Church to be authorized? From the Catholic East to the Orthodox West no appeals lie, and unauthorized singularity and schism are dangerously alike. Without Catholic sanction, in mistrust of the Reformation principle of the sufficiency of Holy Writ, will the Church of England follow some of her modern guides into the negative Protestantism of the critics? In resisting the supremacy of the Scriptures from opposite points of view, the critics and the Vatican are strangely at one, and it is a singular portent that there are Anglicans willing to submit to the dictation of a rationalistic criticism, and yet swallow the camel of Roman Catholicism. But while in "a Protestant-minded country" authoritativeness is contingent upon agreeableness to God's Word, the Church of that country is secure.

But the question must now be asked whether the foundation which to the Reformers was as a hard flinty rock is of the same texture to us. Is this well-worn rock proving, after all, only a laminated sandstone, incapable of withstanding perpetual storm, denudation, or of sustaining loads which are *contra-naturam?* Our rock is not as their rock if it resolves under critical analysis into constituent elements of sand or clay. Is the Bible to-day only a natural specimen of great interest for the investigation of its formation, owing to the fossils which lie embedded in its soluble aggregate? To bear the weight superimposed upon the Bible by the Reformers and by the Church of England, the rock foundation must needs be an outcrop of eternity, though in the field of time, of imperishable certainty for foundation or anchorage amid the uncertainties of human speculation; a fulcrum affording to the religion based upon it the strength of revelation.

The security of this once indubitable foundation is therefore the immediate question. Has the supremacy of the Scriptures of the Old Testament diminished under criticism into the substance of a convention? Does their primacy only hold good

in a comparison with similar compilations, and has their special and unique authority for the determination of that which is final in religion vanished silently away?

The altered value which present-day teaching in the Church allows to Bible authority is shown by the proposals in Convocation to limit the scope of the Ordinal declaration of unfeigned belief in all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament. Dr. Gore regards much in the Old Testament, and Dr. Sanday much in the New, as requiring the explanation that myth, legend, and poetry, may be presumed where historical truth used to be assumed. With reliance on St. Augustine's maxim as to the interrelation of both Testaments, the assertion may be ventured that Dr. Gore's defence of the New Testament miracles must qualify Dr. Sanday's doubts of those of the Old, and the latter's hesitation to accept any miracle which is temporarily conceived to be unscientific may invalidate the conclusions of his Bishop. Where is the authority to determine these positions and obtain the perfect understanding which both desire, and upon which unfeigned belief can rest?

It is not necessary to deal separately with the conclusions of modern Historical or Textual Criticism where both invalidate the original position of the Church of England relating to Scripture; it is obvious that where these results have the force of truths they are the rediscovery of facts which were also true in the days of the ministry of our Lord and His Apostles, but it is essential to ask if the use made of these true facts by the Great Teacher was not only authoritative, but fair and candid. Does He corroborate the true views of the Creation story, the Flood, the Patriarchal lives, the giving of the Law, and the Prophetical voices? Did our Lord express views upon the Old Testament which the clergy can now be properly urged not to withhold any longer from their flocks? Does His example support the exclusion from the Lectionary or Psalter of Scriptures supposed to lack historical or moral authority?

The answer to such questions cannot lie anywhere between relative and absolute truthfulness. Kenotic limitations cannot

attach to the Lord's post-resurrection converse with those whose understandings He opened that they might understand how authoritative were all things that were written in the Law, Prophets, and Psalms, concerning Him. These Scriptures were made by Him to bear witness to fuller truths than the monotheism and nationalism on which the Jews relied. The secret in the sacred documents, which underlay the perpetuation of the nation, was the hope of the promise made of God unto the fathers. This had been identified and revealed when He told the authorities of that Church, "If ye believed Moses, ye would believe Me, for he wrote of Me; but if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe My words?"

The criticism which attenuates the essence of the prophetic testimony and character of the Old Testament withdraws faith, necessarily, from simple reliance on the omniscience of the Lord to place it on the science of modern theologians. Unless the personal authority of Christ can be distinguished from that verity which He induced His followers to attach to the words of the Scriptures, the dilemma must be faced, On whose authority do you unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament? On that of the Son of God or on that of the critics? Will not the reply of Paul be accepted, "Yea, let God be true, and every man a liar."

That the Scriptures possess the infallibility imputed to them by Jesus is a formula which waives aside what is otherwise undefined as to the extent and quality of inspiration and canonicity. He is the Key which proves the authority of the Lock; and while we continue to know in part, we can be sure that full reliance on His infallibility cannot violate the righteousness of any intellectual conviction.

The Spirit of Truth at Pentecost also attested the authority of the Scriptures, for the Apostolic foundation of the New Covenant was laid on that made with the fathers. The doctrine of Peter, Stephen, Paul, or Apollos, of the writer to the Hebrews and of John the Divine, rests on those things which God showed by the mouth of all His prophets. Without the authority of

the Old Covenant, Christ and the New are unrelated to the Divine plan. It might at first appear that the authorization of the New Testament cannot be as emphatic as that which Christ personally bore to the older Scriptures; but this is not the case. The record of Him who spake as never man spake has primarily a unique value and implicit authority. This is akin to, but greater than, the record of Moses and the Prophets. Christ gave an explicit attestation to these records which does not allow their authority to be questioned, and the Holy Spirit's outpoured presence similarly provides an explicit attestation of the revelation of Christ in the Gospel. The broad issue is that the word of Christ places the Old Testament beyond the reach of derogation by human authority, and that the work of the Holy Spirit in the heart does the same for the New. The mission of the Comforter is not only as the Remembrancer of the record of the Saviour's life and teachings, but also to elucidate and apply them to the Church. His effectual action upon the obedient conscience creates and develops a faith in the Gospel which, without turning fictions into facts, gives truths the force of realities. This is the authoritative witness of the Spirit of God to the reality of Christ, to that fact which is the burden of the New as well as of the Old Testament; and while these Scriptures exist the Person of the Son will not be without the authoritative witness on earth of the Holy Ghost. John, witness and Divine, describes the possession of "an unction which teaches concerning all things," and enunciated its effect in not uncertain language: "We know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know Him that is true; and we are in Him that is true, even in His Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life." This confession of Jesus as Lord by the Holy Ghost, by fulfilling the Divine purpose of the Scriptures, manifests their authority. In the conflicts of the Church Militant, in the stress of intellectual criticism, in the doubt-laden atmosphere known as modern thought, He seals, comforts, and secures the faith which admits His authority to fulfil the assur-

ances of Christ to doubting and troubled disciples. The Holy Spirit, who spake by the Prophets, has spoken also in the record of the Apostles and Evangelists, for the new witness of the Christian Church is to the same fact of the Son of God. The sanction of the whole Bible is the verity of Christ. To Him the Old Testament witnessed, and to Him personally it was authoritative and true. To Him the New Testament witnesses, and by the ministry of the Holy Ghost becomes the Gospel of our salvation. Christ is alike the Object of the Former and the Subject of the Latter Covenant. The status of the New, therefore, is similar to the Old; both are the "testimony of Jesus."

The authority of the Scriptures being intrinsic and attested by the witness of the Holy Spirit, any investigation of the operations of the Providence which formed and sealed up the canon of the New Testament would not affect the substance of the books or their eventual authority, and would now be too belated to be conclusive. The human instruments of this canonizing Providence were doubtless the Churches of Christ, which are related to the structure of the New Testament as the Jewish Church was to the Old. That Church had an unchallenged and unique succession from the fathers, and was the Divinely-appointed witness and keeper of Holy Writ, and upon this ground presumed to an authority to limit its use and interpretation. With this assumption over Scripture our Lord's ministry was in constant opposition, and that Church ultimately vindicated her ecclesiastical authority over the Scriptures by fulfilling them in crucifying Him. The inheritors of the New Testament have in their turn assumed a similar authority, and by it have killed prophets and stoned them that were sent, and it was through fiery sufferings like their Master's that the Reformers based themselves upon the supremacy of Scripture over the Church.

The Word of God is not bound. The Church as a witness and keeper is not an authorized gaoler guarding the ingress and egress of an imprisoned ambassador, for the inherent spirit of the Word has continually vindicated an effective supremacy over

the power of the Keys and of the Keeper throughout the history of the Church.

It is, however, a common assumption that the Bible, and particularly the New Testament, is a record which belongs to the Society of whose origin and institutions it bears witness. We are told that it was manifestly our Lord's purpose to found a Society, and not merely to provide materials for a book—a presupposition which is held to govern all theories both as to the authority and interpretation of this book of the Society. Some interesting results follow this reversal of the position which the formularies of the Church of England assign to the Scriptures. The primacy is transferred from the Bible to the Society. The Society becomes the truth which the record attests, and the Old Testament having been transferred from the elder Society to the younger, the whole Bible is possessively and actively the word of the Society, and only in a secondary sense, derivatively and passively, the Word of God. The assumption which induces such conclusions depends upon the identification of the Society of Authorization. The use of the indefinite term Society, instead of the Scriptural equivalent Church, is more ingenious than just. It appears to sweep away the cobwebs in order to resume the idea of a simple and primitive fact, but it imports a notion of proprietorship, if not of copyright and rights of translation. The difficulty is thus shirked of the existence of rival Societies or Churches having conflicting standards of interpretation and authority. If the Bible belongs to one Society, which of all of these is Micah's mother, and who are Danites? The problem of the Society is greater than that of the Book ; and if the testing of the Society is by its catholicity and orthodoxy, from whence are these standards to be derived if not from the Word of God?

If it could be granted that an historic identity by succession exists, it would not dispense with the necessity of an external examiner to assure that the Society witnessed consistently with its Scriptures. Then, the deciding factor must be the consistency of the Society with its Scriptures. If this Society,

justifying its claim to authority over the Bible by its integrity and holiness, is the Catholic Church known to human history, nothing but blind ultramontism would prefer its eccentric record to that exercised by the Bible as a witness to the truth of God. It is indeed necessary to the theory of the Society's primacy to avoid exactness in its description and escape identification with the Papal Society, whose inconsistent witness occasioned both the Reformation and the necessity of the clear statement of the authority of Scripture which characterizes the Church of England.

The New Testament describes multiple Churches on earth of the Seven Spirits of God, having an identity of faith and calling, but in need of prophetic warning against apostasy; but no organized Society capable of defining the canon or of authorizing the Scriptures can be discerned in the Bible.

This unsatisfactory and complicated theory can be dispensed with in view of the broadly simple and larger inversion that the Society is the product of the Word, not the Word the property of the Society. The Church of God is that blessed company who take His Word as the authorization of their faith, and who by it are knit by invisible but real bonds to their Head, and are known on earth by the practical symptoms and sacramental tokens of that attachment. The Church as a human society depends upon the supernatural and Divine elements in the Scriptures, and has a ministry of proclamation of their message as her vital function. Wherever experimental faith in the Gospel is working in the Church a conviction of the sanctity of the Bible, and of its integrity as the gift of the Spirit of Truth, there its ministry of proclamation will not halt for any doubt or want of inherent authority.

Oxford Nearly Fifty Years Ago.

By an M.A. of Oxford.

THOUGH University life probably changes less than most things, there must be some alteration in manners and customs and speech in nearly half a century. A few reminiscences of life in the sixties may be interesting. I[1] matriculated in October, 1868, on the same day as Bishop Hannington. Like all freshmen of that day, I set to work to read for "Smalls." In that October the standard was unexpectedly raised, and scholars of Balliol and of other colleges, as well as humble commoners, like myself, were ploughed. It was commonly reported that Mr. Gladstone had years before failed in this examination. I heard of a man who, having failed himself, wrote to ask him if it was true that he was "ploughed in Smalls." His secretary replied that he was requested by Mr. Gladstone to inform him that "he did not fail to satisfy the examiners in Responsions."

A curious thing happened at this particular October examination. A commoner of one college arranged to read with a scholar of another college in the Christmas vacation. They were both in for Responsions, and left together to read before the result was announced. When the news reached them, it informed them that the pupil had passed and the coach had failed!

At one time I coached with Mr. Morfill, the well-known coach of that day and after. As I stayed up for an Easter vacation, he very kindly took me once a week during that time. One day he gave me an ode of Anacreon, and told me to turn Herrick's "Thine eyes the glowworms lend thee" into the same metre. He said he would do another set, and we could see which was the best. Of course, there was no question on this point; but he had not noticed that the first line of the Anacreon

[1] Will the reader excuse the first person? It is more graphic.

ode was an exception in scansion, and all his stanzas were wrong in the first line. He said the two combined would make a good set. He was very amused with a Latin line of parody I wrote, "Cantavit juvenis coram proctore togatus," and added for the beginning of the next line, "Cum pileo."

I took some verses to Professor Conington, the famous Latin scholar, and have his corrections with his initials "J. C." Towards the end of my third year I found that if I could pass in the six books of Euclid, I could take my degree a year sooner than I expected. I had six days before me, and as I had done them all at school, I ground up a book a day and went in for the examination. At that time there was viva voce as well as written work in Euclid. I sat before that awful (I use the word literally) wide table, with its dark blue cloth so well (and tremblingly) known to Oxford men, and overheard this conversation: "I do not think he has done enough," said one examiner. "He has done all right in the fourth book," said the other. "Well, let us try him with one more." I knew that proposition well. I got my testamur and my degree, and set to work to read for Law and History, then united in one school. I remember asking a tutor of my college how the examiners studied such a book as Clarendon's "History of the Rebellion." He said that they got up the index. I did the same. Instead of reading it through, I studied all the headings in the index with the references. The paper on Clarendon was the best I did.

The only time I was proctorized was after I became a Bachelor. The Proctor was shy, and when I told him I was a B.A. he did not know what to do. He took my name and college, and the next day wrote me a polite note asking me to call on him. This was at a different time from the ordinary men who were to see him as Proctor. He said that though I was a Bachelor, I was still *in statu pupillari*, and that if he found me without cap and gown again he would fine me.

In our college a long Latin grace was said in Hall by one of the scholars. On several occasions there was no scholar present. Sometimes one of the Fellows would say "Benedictus

benedicat," but sometimes they waited, and it fell to me twice, as the senior, to read the grace. This was not an easy thing to do. The scholars always gabbled the words as fast as they possibly could, and the words looked quite different in print from what they sounded when thus read. The old porter-custodian of all the good—and bad—old customs said that for thus reading grace as a Bachelor I could claim from the Bursar a bottle of the college's best port. I did not make the claim.

A man was sconced—*i.e.*, fined a quart of beer—if he talked shop, or quoted Latin, etc., in Hall. If he could drink off the whole quart at one draught, he could fine his sconcer double. I saw two men do this, and a most disgusting sight it was. A great deal of drunkenness took place at wine-parties and on other occasions. I once (only) attended a bump supper. I left early, as a song was sung I did not like. I heard afterwards that every man at the supper, with my single exception, was up before the college authorities for disorderly conduct. I hope and believe that things are considerably improved in this direction.

We had chapel, of course, and were expected to attend once a day; a sermon was preached now and then.

The head of the college invited each undergraduate to breakfast once a term. Oh the horror of that ordeal! How thankful were we to the Barnabas among us who was the chief speaker, and who got us on the subject of the circulation of "A Row in Dame Europa's School." This was the time of the Franco-Prussian War, and that brochure had a tremendous vogue. We took some little share in preparing lint and bandages for the wounded. When the militia assembled in the city, some of us would help at the teas and services given to them. One Sunday the Bishop preached at a service in the Town Hall, and had to do this before the prayers. He exhorted the men to stay. *One* man dared to get up and go out, and was followed by nearly half the men.

City friends would sometimes ask us to "perpendiculars,"

which were crowded evening parties, and gained their name from the fact that all men had to stand. Stiff old dons would occasionally invite us to a stiff breakfast party. Cards were left on the host the next day or day after. Mr. Christopher would sometimes send out invitations to an "at home" to hear some good speaker; they were marked "we do not dress," and astounding replies sometimes came from those who did not appreciate the good Rector of St. Aldate's efforts. On one occasion the house was so crowded that men had to sit up the stairs, and one was, so it was alleged, found asleep on one of the beds of a bedroom.

At the 'Varsity Sermon we had many good preachers, such as Bishop Wilberforce (Soapy Sam), Bishop Alexander, Dean Stanley, Dr. Pusey, who was then a great power in Oxford. One of the most effective I remember was Thomas Leigh Claughton, Bishop of Rochester. In the course of a sermon he told of a young officer who wrote to his mother from the battlefield, and said: "I was not afraid, for I knew you were praying for me at home." I noticed that many an undergraduate wiped his eyes with the back of his hand that morning. I had the great pleasure of telling the Bishop the effect of his sermon.

Dear old Mr. Christopher (not then Canon) was at St. Aldate's with his Saturday prayer-meeting, which was well attended. His famous Missionary Breakfast had been established some years. I attended it in 1869-70-71-72. It was then held at the Clarendon Hotel. Canon Linton was Rector of St. Peter-le-Bailey. A missionary prayer-meeting was held at his house every Friday afternoon. The name of Bishop French and his colleague, Rev. J. W. Knott, always came in. The Canon gave away valuable books, which we were called forward to choose from, and, I fear, grab at. Canon Linton was, so I heard from a niece of his, the original of a well-known story: An undergraduate met him one day, and greeted him so cordially that the Canon invited him home to lunch, though he could not remember his name and did not like to ask it.

After lunch the Canon offered him a book. The man asked him to write his name in it. "And how do you spell your name?" "Oh, without an 'e.'" The name was Brown.

Bazeley of Brazenose and J. G. Watson of Worcester and others would have open-air services at the Martyrs' Memorial. It was on one of these occasions, when a 'Varsity man had interrupted, that Bazeley gave out so beautifully:

> "If some poor wand'ring child of Thine
> Have spurn'd to-day the voice Divine,
> Now, Lord, the gracious work begin;
> Let him no more lie down in sin!"

The chief Christian work then carried on by undergraduates was teaching in the Sunday-schools and working a Tract District—I had the privilege of sharing one for a little while with the present Bishop of Liverpool. There was then no O.I.C.C.U., nor Oxford Pastorate, nor Missionary Campaigns, nor Children's Special Service Missions to take part in. We carried on, with more or less success, a daily prayer-meeting, and in college some of us had a weekly meeting for prayer and study of the Bible. On one occasion some eighteen or twenty of us met one evening in the rooms of one of our number. Two men came quietly up and sported the oak. We rushed to the door to try to open it. They held it with their feet. It was in the month of November, and one of them put a lighted cracker through the slit for letters. Fortunately, this was seen and extinguished before it exploded close to our faces. The two men outside could not hold out against so strong a force. They gave way. We pursued them across the quad and through the gate into the garden, which happened to be open. Someone told the porter that the garden gate had been left open. He locked it, and unconsciously imprisoned the two men. From my room I heard one of them begging the man in the room above mine to lend him a hand in climbing up the ivy so that he might get back into college. This was, perhaps, not a very creditable bit of our muscular Christianity.

The chief exercises were rowing, cricket, fives, and football. There were no bicycles. Lawn tennis made its appearance towards the end of my time. I never played at Oxford. Golf was unknown in England except at Blackheath. I used to do a good deal of sculling. When first I went out in a canvas skiff and came back without mishap, I was expected to pay one shilling that the men at Salter's might drink my health. One time I was coming back in a skiff, and had reached the awkward bit where the upper river flows into the lower, when a town eight came along. I saw they were running into me. I shouted, "Look ahead, sir!" But it was all of no avail. They ran into my rowlock, knocking the sculls out of my hands. I quite expected an upset, but I managed to recover my sculls and to pull in. All this was in sight of Salter's. The boatmen saw that this was the townsmen's fault. As I got no bill for the damage done to the boat, I thought they had sent it to the Town Boat Club. However, about six years after I had gone down I got a bill, "To damage to one boat, 10s."

Among my contemporaries I can remember the Bishop of Coplestone, who was President of the Union; Arthur W. Poole, who became first Bishop of Japan; E. N. Hodges, Bishop of Travancore and Cochin; Jayne of Jesus, now Bishop of Chester; and Chavasse, Bishop of Liverpool. One man who was spoken of as likely to make his mark was "Asquith of Balliol." I do not think we indulged in those days in the very extensive slang used by 'Varsity men now. We did not talk about "Brekker's and Lekkers," and we certainly should not have called the Prince of Wales—King Edward of loving memory—when he was up just before our time, Pragger Wagger.

These fragmentary reminiscences may remind some senior men of old Oxford days, and may give younger ones some idea of what happened in their 'Varsity nearly fifty years ago.

The Textual Criticism of the Pentateuch.

By HAROLD M. WIENER, M.A., LL.B.,
Of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law.

"Volebam in appendice critica omnes differentias inter Vulgatam Clementinam atque textum Hebraicum et Græcum lectoribus proponere. Colligens autem variantes lectiones magno cum stupore cognovi, appendicem criticam plus spatii occupaturam esse quam ipsum textum sacrum."—HETZENAUER (Preface, dated November 1, 1913, to "Biblia Sacra Vulgatæ Editionis," Ratisbon and Rome, 1914).

THE extract from Hetzenauer which I have placed at the head of this article draws attention to a phenomenon which is of dominating importance for the Old Testament text, and consequently—though this fact is not yet sufficiently grasped—for the literary, documentary, and historical criticism of the Bible. It is generally assumed and stated that the text of the Vulgate is practically identical with our received Hebrew —the Massoretic text. From this supposed identity inferences are drawn as to the history of the text, and on these, again, are built theories of composition and authorship. A recognition of the true state of affairs, which has hitherto been realized by comparatively few students, would dawn on most people as on Hetzenauer *magno cum stupore*, for it involves consequences that go to the root of our conceptions of most branches of Biblical study.

The general theory on which most modern writers have proceeded is that the Samaritan and the Septuagint are the surviving representatives of an unofficial recension, and that the text of Jerome and the other younger versions represent with the Massoretic text an official recension. As the Massoretic and Samaritan Pentateuchs do not differ among themselves very largely, this carries back the witness to the text to the point of separation of the Samaritan tradition from the Jewish. The date of this is unknown, and opinions vary as to the relative probability of *circa* 432 and *circa* 330 B.C.; but on either view the text was fixed with a considerable amount of

certainty at least some seven or eight centuries before the time of Jerome. As he was the great apostle of the *Hebraica veritas*, it is inconceivable on this theory that his text should differ materially from the common basis of Heb-Sam, and the fact that in reality it does so is destructive of the theory.

The usual view of the relations of the Samaritan and the other texts which has been outlined above rests largely on the issue of a great controversy which arose when the Samaritan Pentateuch became known in Europe. This was closed by a monograph of Gesenius on the subject which appeared in 1815, and was allowed to pass unchallenged till 1911, when the present writer pointed out the vices of his method in an article which was published in the *Expositor* for September of that year. As nobody has ventured to utter a syllable in defence of Gesenius's method in the controversy which has since arisen, it may be taken that even those who most ardently desire to uphold his view regard the fault as too palpable to be supported. For he only considered the relationship of the LXX. to the other two texts when these differed among themselves. With unimportant exceptions, he ignored the overwhelming number of cases in which the Greek differs from a consensus of the other two; and this is a most material factor in the comparison, especially as the Greek divergencies are sometimes of a startlingly recensional character. Hence his conclusions were unsound, and that part of the theory could not be upheld. The differences are of such a nature as to suggest that the text of Egypt, represented by the LXX., belonged to one recension, and the text of Babylonia and Palestine to another. As there are differences between the Palestinian and Egyptian texts in other books—notably Samuel and Jeremiah—of so striking a kind as to suggest that the books must have been long current in Egypt before the translation was made, it seemed natural to assume that the same explanation applied to the Pentateuch. The position which the Law has always held in Judaism and the appeals to it in Jeremiah make it very unlikely that the Jews who settled in Egypt in his time would not have had a

copy with them. It cannot be suggested with any sort of probability that they had an edition of Jeremiah, but none of the oldest and most revered portion of the canon—the Law. Nor is it intelligible that they should have read the prophet's writings, and not have read the authority to which he refers. There is therefore an antecedent probability that the Egyptian stream of textual tradition began its separate course in the time of Jeremiah—long before the Samaritan schism and its resulting text of the Pentateuch.[1]

Recent discussions have done very much to render this more probable, for the evidence of the Vulgate is of a singularly illuminating character. Some of the most striking of its divergencies in the text of the Law suggest that the ritual legislation has been heavily glossed by Temple commentators, who were naturally particularly interested in its interpretation, and that these glosses are incorporated in our present Hebrew. But the Vulgate lacks many of them, though they are present in the Samaritan, and in this the Vulgate is sometimes supported by the testimony of other parts of the Massoretic text itself, by Septuagintal witnesses, by internal evidence, and by the superior clearness of its readings and the fact that phrases and sentences which it lacks possess the characteristic marks of glosses. Some details which are too long for reproduction here will be found in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for October, 1914. The credit of having first drawn attention to the importance of the Vulgate to the critical controversy—albeit in another connection—belongs to Father Hugh Pope, O.P., who contributed a notable article, entitled "Where are we in Pentateuchal Criticism?" to the *Irish Theological Quarterly* for October, 1913. A recent attempt by Dr. John Skinner to answer Father Pope has resulted in complete failure, and it is now certain that the *Irish Theological Quarterly* article is destined to be one of the landmarks in the history of Old Testament criticism.

[1] See further "The Pentateuchal Text: A Reply to Dr. Skinner." London: Elliot Stock. I hope to deal with Dr. Skinner's most recent criticisms in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for January, 1915.

The conclusions suggested by a comparison of the texts are, therefore, that the Massoretic and Samaritan Pentateuchs are descended from the recension in use in the Temple; that the Vulgate comes from a copy which, while belonging in general to this recension, had not incorporated all the notes and comments which had been embodied in the Temple manual, and so helps us back to an earlier text; and that the Hebrew of the Septuagint—*i.e.*, the text of Egypt—branched off at a much earlier date. These conclusions are confirmed by other considerations. The story of the Samaritan schism is intimately connected with one Manasseh, who was the son and brother of Jewish high-priests, and had officiated at the Jerusalem altar. He had married a daughter of Sanballat. The narrative in Josephus, which is our main authority, distinctly connects the schism with the desire of Manasseh and Sanballat to have in their family a high-priesthood similar to that which was the chief dignity in the Jewish nation of that period. It is obvious that in such circumstances Manasseh would model the ritual and the Pentateuch, which was to be the authority for that ritual, on the Temple manual. The basis on which he would work would undoubtedly be a copy of the recension in use in the Temple of his own day. Hence the close resemblance between the Samaritan and Massoretic texts in all ritual matters; hence, too, the divergence of the Vulgate, which has been less affected by the Temple text, though descended from the Babylonian-Palestinian branch of the tradition. It will be seen that, if this view is sound, a careful and scientific study of our authorities will in many cases enable us to go behind the text of the second Temple, and work back to the text of Jeremiah's day. Having regard to the discovery of the Book of the Law in his time, we should be able to attain to a very pure form of whatever was included in that book. It was doubtless a very old volume, dating, perhaps, from the time of Solomon, and may not have been removed by many copies from the original autograph.

There are many corollaries of the utmost importance to the

view outlined above. While our extant Hebrew manuscripts mostly reflect the Massoretic text, it is known that some of them come from non-Massoretic sources, and confirm the ancient versions in numerous readings. Unfortunately, the collations on which we have to depend were for the most part made in the eighteenth century, and do not satisfy the requirements of modern scholarship. It is greatly to be wished that fresh collations, or possibly, in the case of the more important manuscripts, facsimiles, might be published. Kennicott, in speaking of the subject, quotes Jablonski to the following effect: "Incredibile dictu est, in veteribus codicibus ad Masoræ leges reformandis, quam isti se operosos præstiterint. Multa ibi literarum millia jugulata videas, nec fere pauciora superne vel in ventre literarum addita." It seems certain that a rich harvest awaits the scholarship of the future in this direction; and it seems hard that, while the Samaritan Pentateuch is thought worthy of a sumptuous new edition, nothing adequate should be done for the Hebrew Bible. The idea of such an edition should be to select those manuscripts which differ most from the Massoretic text, and to publish a thoroughly scientific collation of them, proceeding on the lines of the larger Cambridge Septuagint, and not on those of Ginsburg or Kittel. The Karaite manuscripts in the British Museum should be included in such a work. The last great massacre of variants was due to the final triumph of the Massoretes, and included readings good, bad, and indifferent. Much labour will have to be expended, and the material will have to be filtered through many minds, if we are to secure the best text of the Bible possible on the Hebrew materials that survive.

Another result of this view is to assign much greater importance to the variants of the ancient versions, and to give an intelligible account of the frequent superiority of their readings. I cannot but think that textual studies must produce a far more intelligible picture of the ancient history of Israel, and consequently make the Bible a more potent religious instrument. We live in an age which does not love the unintelligible, and the clearer and more vivid the ancient records become, the

greater will be their appeal to the modern mind, and the firmer the religious grasp that they can exercise. I believe that the result of such studies must be to make the Biblical books far more suitable instruments for developing the religious perceptions of our generation than they are in their present form. Indeed, all history, properly understood, shows the writing of God's finger.

Another consequence is the complete shattering of the theories of composition and authorship which have been based on the Massoretic text. Of the problem of the Divine appellations in Genesis it is impossible to speak within the limits remaining to me; and those who wish to study this matter further must be referred to my other publications on the subject, and to the reply to Professor König which begins in the October number of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*.[1] But it is not merely Astruc's famous clue that is affected.[2] In further investigations even in the field of the Divine appellations, I have found that textual criticism abrogates current notions of the development of Old Testament theology, and when the field is extended all sorts of other supposed criteria of authorship are found to be worthless. The long lists of words supposed to be characteristic of various sources which the documentary critics are so fond of parading must undergo the most profound modifications, for in many instances they are due to late glossators. There never was much cogency in the so-called literary argument, because any number of redactors and the most improbable divisions had to be postulated to get it to work at all, and even then it was

[1] See also an interesting article by Professor Nathaniel Schmidt in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* for March, 1914 (vol. xxxiii., part i., pp. 25-47), which only came into my hands after this article was written. The views it advocates, while not identical with those here presented, show how a section of the higher critics are moving towards sounder positions than those from which they started. I would most heartily endorse the closing words of his article: "Science is not concerned about the maintenance of any theory. Its most urgent demand upon its votaries in this field at present is that methods of textual criticism, at least as rigorous and exact as those recognized and employed in the elucidation of other Biblical books, shall be applied also to the study of the Pentateuch" (p. 46).

[2] "Astruc's clue may prove to be worthless, yet the distinction in style and thought remains" (Schmidt, *loc. cit.*).

a mass of subjectivity. But even such cogency as it could be supposed to possess is entirely destroyed by textual criticism. Moreover, many of the supposed contradictions and chronological difficulties are found to be due either to marginal notes that have accidentally got into the text, and are often lacking in one or other of our ancient authorities, or to the accidental corruption of one or more letters which can often be detected with the same aids, or to the erroneous resolution of abbreviations (real or supposed), where again we may have old witnesses to the true reading. This last cause is not yet sufficiently appreciated by students of the Old Testament, but the evidence of extant manuscripts as well as of versions shows that it is extremely important, and stress is rightly laid on it in Ginsburg's Introduction. It is extremely unfortunate that the Old Testament introductions in use in this country mostly take no account whatever of textual criticism, and that no manual on this subject has yet appeared.

Before passing away from the corollaries to the general view of the textual history taken above, mention should be made of one very fascinating line of inquiry which it suggests. How far does the Vulgate represent a new translation by Jerome, and how far does it incorporate earlier Old Latin renderings of the Septuagint? It is true that Jerome was the great apostle of the *Hebraica veritas*, but he also professed to incorporate much older work; and, for the book of Daniel, G. Hoberg has shown in his "De Sancti Hieronymi ratione interpretandi" that this is so. In the preface to the latest edition of the Vulgate, an extract from which stands at the head of this article, Hetzenauer writes, "Nam 'Hieronymus pro timida sua natura, inquit Cornill, non satis energice manum immisit et tradita sæpe intacta reliquit, etiam ubi ea falsa esse cognovit' ad offensionem populorum vitandam," quoting from Cornill's "Einleitung," 1913, p. 315.[1]

If this be so, it follows that in many instances the text of

[1] The passage will be found on p. 534 *et seq.* of the English translation, "Introduction to the Canonical Books of the Old Testament."

our printed Vulgate is really the Old Latin—with or without modifications—and the Old Latin is a translation from the early Septuagintal text, before Origen and the other later editors had taken any systematic steps to bring it into accord with the Hebrew of their days. Further, Jerome antedates even our oldest Greek manuscript of the LXX., so that both in the type of text that he represents and in actual date he is presumably often our earliest witness to the Septuagintal text where no quotations have been preserved by Philo or other earlier authorities. The difficulty is to know how much is Jerome and how much is Old Latin; but comparison of his readings with the apparatus of the larger Cambridge Septuagint should make it possible to do much work in this direction. Surely English scholarship should find here a thoroughly congenial field of research. The work of the Cambridge University Press has put the materials within easy reach of all who have the training and inclination and some leisure to give to the task of studying and restoring the best text of the Bible now attainable, and the great English tradition of textual criticism should inspire many able workers.

In conclusion, attention should be directed to one other branch of textual criticism that still has a great future. The narratives and laws of the Pentateuch are not at present in their original order, and internal indications as well as the references in other Biblical books often give us clues to the solution of the difficulties. This work is extremely puzzling and baffling, and it is necessary to have regard to numerous small indications. The best example of what I believe it to be possible to achieve in this direction is to be found in the discussion of the arrangement of certain chapters of Numbers on pp. 114-138 of my "Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism." The persistent attempt of the higher critics to ignore that discussion, unfortunately, makes it necessary for me to do everything in my power to draw attention to it. Other instances will be found in the "Origin of the Pentateuch." It seems to me that, if fresh minds could be induced to consider some of the remaining

problems of the Pentateuch in the light of these methods, great progress might easily be achieved. No one man can hope to notice every point, but advances might be made through the contributions of different workers; and here again a fruitful field awaits those who are willing to devote study of the right kind to the problems. Renewed investigation generally shows that our difficulties are due to quite simple causes, and that the inevitable tendency to miss the obvious is responsible for much of our trouble. Once men free their minds from the thraldom of the higher critical theories, and approach the Pentateuch in a spirit of candid and scholarly investigation, they may hope to make discoveries that will remove the stumbling-blocks of many generations.

Self-Knowledge.

By the Rev. WALTER R. WHATELY, M.A.

THERE are few things in the life of man more tragic, and perhaps none more strange, than his ignorance of his own heart. The heart of man, no doubt, is full of mystery. It is like some half-discovered country, of which part lies open to the sun, and part is wrapped in mist and covered by dark forests, whose innermost recesses few have ever explored. We need not wonder, though we must lament, that this darker region, this dim mysterious *hinterland* of the soul, lies so largely outside the normal range of man's self-knowledge. More strange, and far more perilous, are the errors that he makes in the open country. There many a false oasis, green and fertile, spreads itself before his eyes, where in reality is nothing but desert sand. It is here that the tragedy principally lies. Mere ignorance is less dangerous than delusion, especially when that delusion lies on the side of self-satisfaction. The worst peril is not the darkness, but the mirage.

The importance of attaining to a true knowledge of self is admitted, I suppose, by all serious-minded people. But there are probably multitudes who fail to realize that such knowledge is very difficult of attainment, and who neglect the subject, not because they underestimate its importance, but because they fancy that they already know themselves sufficiently well for all practical purposes.

Yet one might suppose that the experience of life would teach even a superficial observer that real self-knowledge is a comparatively rare possession, and therefore presumably one that is not very easy to acquire. How often and how completely do men deceive themselves in this matter, not only on points of detail, but with reference to their whole moral and spiritual status! It would seem as if that awful vision of self which followed hard upon the first transgression had grown dimmer as the centuries rolled by, and man had lost by degrees the

consciousness of his unfitness for the presence of God. Not that there is any matter for surprise in this. It was the inevitable result of a growing alienation from God. The one true guardian of the moral sense is the consciousness of God, and it was because men refused to retain God in their knowledge that they lost the true conception of sin, and with that truth the power to read their own hearts aright. It is, therefore, where religious ideas are most debased that self-deception appears in its most striking forms. The self-righteousness of the animistic heathen is almost past belief. Warneck tells us that the pure morality of the Gospel makes little impression at first upon the degraded Battaks of Sumatra, not because they do not recognize its goodness, but because they cannot be made to realize that they fall short of it.

In Christian lands the light of the Gospel has, of course, done much to dispel the mists of self-deception from the mind. Yet, even among Christians, how widespread and sometimes how deep the darkness is! It was to a Christian Church that the solemn words were spoken: "Thou sayest, I am rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing; and knowest not that thou are wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked." And here, also, let us note, the error had its root in loss of touch with God. It is a strange and solemn picture. Within the house all is wealth and comfort and complacency, while He Who is Lord and Master of all, Whose household the Church is, stands in the street outside, and knocks unheeded at the door!

There are, of course, intermediate moral causes of self-deception. Some of these are too obvious to require comment. The pride that resents criticism, though conscience itself be the critic, the moral indolence which neglects even to raise the question whether all is well, the habits of sin which blunt the finer perceptions of the soul, the cowardice which shrinks from peering into the dark corners, and tries to forget the spectres by which it knows, or fears, that they are haunted—all these are familiar to us.

But there are other causes, distinct from these, though often blended with them, causes which are not in themselves directly ethical, not sins, in fact, but temptations, and, perhaps, for that very reason, more apt to escape our notice. I propose to glance at three of these—temperament, circumstances, and religion—considering under each head one or two specific examples.

1. Let us take first the imaginative temperament. The chief danger, I think, which besets the imaginative man as such, is the habit of living mentally in a world of his own making, a world more congenial to his feelings, especially to his self-esteem, than the real world around him. This construction of an ideal world leads almost inevitably to the construction of an ideal self within it, an imaginary actor upon an imaginary stage. The man becomes "the hero of his own epic"; a halo of romance is round his head; he goes from strength to strength, and from victory to victory. And all the while, it may be, upon the real battle-ground of life, the tide of victory is running the other way, and he is all unconscious of the disaster. "Strangers have devoured his strength, and he knoweth it not."

We need not wholly condemn such day-dreams. They may have, in some respects, a salutary influence upon the mind. But they do tend, I think, to obscure a man's vision of the real world, and of his conduct in that world. And the false estimate thus formed is formed all the more easily because it is not wholly false. The thought of heroism, however egotistic its form, implies a love of heroism. The error is, that the man has isolated one element in his character, and mistaken it for the whole.

Similar in its working, however different in its nature, is the sanguine temperament, the spirit which, in all departments of life, persistently assumes that all is going well, and which, more from optimism than from egotism, revolts from the very conception of failure. It was this spirit, I think, more than pride (though that, no doubt, was present also) that prompted the Apostle Peter to say, "I am ready to go with Thee to prison and to death." The same optimism which at one time forbade

him to believe that his Master was really going to be put to death, at another time forbade him to believe that he himself might fail in the hour of trial.

Here, again, we have the half-truth which is usually the most dangerous of lies. The courage with which Peter credited himself was a real element in his character. Probably he was ready then—he certainly was on a later occasion—to face imprisonment and death in his Master's cause. We think often enough of the thrice-repeated denial in the High Priest's house, but we forget the garden of Gethsemane, and the brave disciple who drew his sword single-handed in the face of an armed mob to protect the Master whom he loved. His confident declaration was no mere idle boast, but it revealed a very imperfect knowledge of his own heart. He made the same error that the man of imaginative temperament makes: he mistook one element in his character for the whole, the fitful impulse of his nobler moments for the fixed and dominant habit of his life.

2. The second cause of self-deception is the meretricious glory shed upon our good deeds by an improvement in our outward circumstances. The point will be familiar to readers of Mozley's "University Sermons." A man of small means gives, let us say, a tenth of his income to the poor. His affairs prosper; from comparative poverty he rises to abundant wealth. He still gives away a tenth of his income, but that tenth, which was formerly £15 or £20, is now £500. In the world of religion and philanthropy he makes a larger figure than before. Is it not likely that, partly because of the applause which he now receives, he will make a larger figure in his own eyes also? Yet what is this but self-deception? His generosity has not really increased; it has only been set in a more conspicuous light. Nay, it has actually decreased; for while the proportion of his giving remains the same, the self-sacrifice involved is less than before. He has forgotten our Lord's comparison of the rich men's gifts with the poor widow's farthing contribution. He has mistaken a gift for a grace, and thinks that he is going forward in the path of virtue, when he is really going back.

And this is an error against which we all need to guard ourselves. It is not peculiar to rich men, or confined to the sphere of charitable giving. There is a chronic tendency in our nature to tamper with the ledgers of the soul. We debit our environment, all too readily, with a large portion of our sin, but we seldom give it a corresponding measure of credit for our supposed virtues.

3. The third cause is what I have somewhat vaguely called *religion*. I mean by this a religious profession, more or less earnest, but not necessarily rising to the level of vital Christianity.

The danger here involved is that of enlisting our faults in the service of our religion, and thinking that by so doing we have transformed them into virtues. This tendency is especially rampant in religious controversy. How prone we are to think that where the defence of the truth is concerned, the wrath of man does work the righteousness of God! How much there is that passes current as pure and holy zeal for truth, which is really alloyed, and that in no small measure, with bad temper, narrow-mindedness, and lack of charity! It is not surprising, perhaps, that we should be deceived in this way. Human nature is extraordinarily susceptible to the influence of names. In every department of life—political, social, religious, or other —men allow themselves to be taken in by specious designations, behind which the real facts are hidden. We can hardly expect that the sphere of character should be immune from this tendency. Just as the old rebel society is reconstituted under a new title, and the old heathen idol is baptized with the name of a Christian saint, so it is with the denizens of the human heart. Within the walls of Mansoul the Diabolonians linger on with feigned surnames, and the vices of the old man are enrolled among the virtues of the new.

I have left myself no space to dwell on another cause of self-deception—the adoption of an inadequate standard of moral conduct, an error which arises from neglect to study the moral teaching of the New Testament, and which leads men to an unduly complacent estimate of their own characters. Now,

whatever be the right method of acquiring self-knowledge—a question which we shall discuss presently—it is obvious that the first requisite for such knowledge is an honest and prayerful study of Christian ethics. How can we gauge the nature or extent of our shortcomings unless we know accurately what it is that we come short of?

By what method is the much-needed knowledge of our own hearts to be acquired? A method very commonly advocated and practised, and supposed to be enjoined by St. Paul, is that of self-examination. But the command "Examine yourselves" does not, I think, go beyond a broad and simple recommendation to persons who must have known that they were sinning, to ask themselves plainly with what motives they were coming to the Lord's Supper, and (in 2 Cor. xiii. 5) whether they were even "in the faith." They do not, surely, sanction the minute and anxious introspection which is sometimes recommended as a regular habit of the Christian life. Nor is such a habit easy to reconcile with the attitude of mind enjoined in Phil. iv. 8.

The dangers of minute and habitual introspection are surely obvious. It is almost certain to lead either to discouragement or to self-satisfaction. And the danger in the former direction —danger of weakened witness for the Gospel, of distorted judgement, and perhaps even of deranged intellect—is increased by the widely prevalent delusion that discouragement is the work of the Holy Spirit. The natural result follows. Over this Bridge of Sighs man passes to the other side, the side of self-complacency. Nay, he occupies both positions at once: he is self-complacent over his very self-condemnation; he is proud, not, perhaps, actually of his sins, but of his consciousness of them. There are spiritual invalids who do really "*enjoy* bad health," and who seem never to face the searching question, "*Wilt thou* be made whole?"

It is never desirable to make either sin or self a principal object of contemplation; habitual meditation either upon our sin or upon our virtue is unhealthy—on our sin because it is sin, on our virtue because it is ours. Whatever precise form

the practice of introspection takes, it is always exposed to the dangers of egotism and morbidity, because it concentrates the attention upon self more than upon God, and upon sin more than upon holiness. One or both of these errors will inevitably intrude, and either involves self-deception.

And this last point is the crucial one. The method stands condemned by the simple fact that it does not yield the desired result. It does not really lead to self-knowledge. It may, no doubt, bring to light certain faults the existence or the extent of which had not before been realized. But a minute acquaintance with certain details is not only very inadequate to compensate for a distorted view of the whole, it is actually a principal factor in producing the distorted view. We fail to see the forest for the trees. We get, at best, a sort of Japanese picture, precise in its details, but false in proportion and perspective. The method is too analytic for the subject-matter. Human personality cannot be assessed in this way. It is not the sum-total of our acts and thoughts, or the net total when good and bad have been weighed against each other and a balance struck. It is something other and greater than that. The deepest and most vital thing in the life of the soul is its relation to God, and where this relation is not known, there is no self-knowledge worthy of the name.

This fact alone, then, is sufficient to condemn the introspective habit. For it is just here that it is most important not to lose the forest in the trees. The natural man needs to learn that the disappearance of particular vices does not necessarily mean an improvement in the essential condition of the soul. It may mean the very opposite. Reform without repentance is a movement away from holiness and from God. It turns the prodigal son into an elder brother, the publican into the Pharisee. The Christian needs, more often, to be reminded that particular faults unsubdued are not necessarily proofs of a state of alienation from God. God accepts the heart as a living whole, whatever rectification of details may yet be required. In other words, we are justified by faith. (This last phrase

should remind us that a false theory of self-knowledge is really part of a false theory of salvation.)

Conviction of sin is not, therefore, in the Christian the whole of self-knowledge. It is not so even in the natural man. For the soul of man is not only sinful, but precious; it has a value for God; and this all-important fact throws light upon its nature. But more than this must be said of the spiritual man. Regeneration for him is no mere potentiality; it is a fact; and it is the deepest fact of his soul; it is his character. And because the habit of introspection tends to rob him of his assurance of salvation, it militates against real self-knowledge.

The main reason, I suppose, why this method fosters self-deception is that it is too internal and subjective. At every stage the investigation is hampered by the pride, the fears, and the prejudices of the investigator. A trial is seldom well conducted when the defendant sits on the bench. To reach a satisfactory result a man would have to stand at once inside and outside his own personality.

For criticism from without, however useful in its right place, cannot make up what is lacking in the internal method. We cannot get an harmonious view by mechanically combining two different standpoints, even when the two verdicts do not clash; and when they do—which is a frequent occurrence—a third tribunal is required to arbitrate between them.

What we want is a method which combines the intimacy of self-consciousness with the objectivity of outward criticism, a knowledge which is at once immanent and transcendent, which is our own, yet not our own. The very statement of the problem suggests the solution. God alone can stand in such relation to the human soul. Self-knowledge can only come by Divine revelation. And the conclusion reached in this way is surely also in accordance with the teaching of Scripture. What else is meant by the Psalmist's prayer, "Search me, O God, and know my heart," and by the New Testament promise, "If in anything ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you?"

How different is this revelation by the Spirit of truth from

our own amateur self-scrutiny! How much healthier the process, how much more trustworthy the result! The one humbles a man, but does not crush him; the other is all too apt to crush, but has no real power to humble.

This is not, however, the full solution of the problem. For Divine grace, though miraculous, is not magical in its working; it does not supersede human activity, but works in and through our moral and intellectual faculties. The oil of God's blessing stays when the recipient no longer provides an empty vessel. We still need a method which—however inadequate in itself, as all human methods must be—has an inherent natural fitness to serve as a vehicle and medium for the teaching of the Spirit.

Where are we to look for such a method? There is one ready to hand which fulfils, I think, the desired conditions: the contemplation of goodness in the lives of others, and especially in the life and death of Christ Himself. For as in the physical world there are some things which are most clearly seen when we are not looking directly at them, so it is in the moral world: we get the clearest view of our own faults when we are contemplating the goodness of other people. There are few sights so humbling as this. Few things bring home so forcibly to us our own weakness and selfishness, the lowness of our ideals and the poverty of our lives, as the contemplation of some life or deed of exalted heroism and self-sacrificing love.

And if the view of our own unworthiness thus presented is more searching than that obtained by the practice of introspection, it is also more bracing in its effects. The man who has lived a great life before us has done more than merely show us our own littleness; he has lifted us by the cords of humility and reverence and hope some way, though it be but a little, nearer to his own level. This is especially true of the heroes of faith. For they, more than others, speak to us not only by their strength, but by their weakness, because we know that the power which turned that weakness into strength is available for all who believe.

But we cannot rest content with the contemplation of holiness in our fellow-men. A deeper humbling and a higher

uplifting, and therefore a more perfect self-knowledge, are wrought in us by the contemplation of God Himself, and especially of God incarnate in Christ Jesus. It was the vision of Jehovah high and lifted up that drew from Isaiah the cry, "Woe is me, for I am a man of unclean lips"; and, similarly, it was the revelation of the Son of God that wrung from Peter the confession, "I am a sinful man, O Lord."

Yet this, again, would not, if it stood alone, give us all the light that we need. We have already seen that for perfect self-knowledge the consciousness of sin must be supplemented by the consciousness of salvation. For that we must go to the "place called Calvary." There, indeed, we are humbled more utterly than before. Only in the unspeakable cost of redemption do we see the full and final estimate of our sin. But it is there, as nowhere else, that we find assurance of the fact of redemption, an assurance still needing to be brought home to the individual by the indwelling Spirit, but finding its objective ground and guarantee in the atoning death of Christ.

It is, therefore, at the Cross that genuine Christian self-knowledge begins. And the Cross is no mere starting-point which we leave farther and farther behind as we progress. It is the permanent and energizing centre from which self-knowledge radiates outward through the whole life, and shines "more and more unto the perfect day."

For the sight of the Cross has a threefold value and meaning in our lives. It is the ideal of holiness, the measure of our sin, and the pledge of our redemption. It tends, therefore, to produce in us a consciousness of the true nature of holiness, of our own shortcoming, and of our nature and standing as children of God—the three necessary elements, as we have seen, of Christian self-knowledge. And the methods of cultivating self-knowledge which have been suggested in the foregoing pages, the study of Scripture and the contemplation of the lives and deeds of saints and heroes and, above all, of Christ Himself, are only so many ways of developing in our minds this threefold consciousness, so many media through which these three great

primary rays of light, into which the Cross, like a prism, breaks "the white radiance of eternity," may shine upon us and illuminate the darkest corners of our hearts and lives.

Knowledge of God, knowledge of self—the two are linked inseparably together, and as the one progresses the other progresses also. Both are present, from the first, in the normal Christian consciousness, but though present, they are not as yet perfect; there is a great work of development still needing to be done, and their full and final perfection is reserved for the life beyond, where the day breaks, "and the shadows flee away." "For now we know in part, but then shall we know even as we are known."

Who are the Poor?

By the Rev. A. SMYTHE PALMER, D.D.,
Vicar of Hermon Hill, South Woodford.

WE are all getting heartily tired of never-ending discussions about the condition of the poor, and of the hasty, ill-considered nostrums recommended for its alleviation. A vast deal of false and sentimental economics, based on theories rather than on facts, has been confidently propounded. It may be welcome as a change to extend our somewhat parochial view beyond England and her Colonies, beyond even Europe and America, and adopt a wider and more philosophical outlook which will take in mankind at large and embrace the whole round world. We shall then come to see that the natural state of man upon this earth is one of poverty. We assume on insufficient grounds that the destiny of man, as an abstract entity, is to live in comfort and affluence, with enough and to spare. As Mr. Lloyd George, with his facile beneficence, puts it: "Poverty is not the fault of Providence, which provides abundance. There are millions of men, women, and children in this, the richest country in the world, who, through no fault of their own, go through life sodden in poverty, wretchedness, and despair." He implies that this is a dismal breach in the appointed order of things. But travellers and anthropologists who have surveyed mankind with the most extensive view tell a different story. They assure us that man's natural condition is a struggle for existence—that poverty is not the exception, but the rule, if we consider humanity in its entirety. The first command to primal man, while yet unfallen, was to "subdue" the earth, as if it were an adverse power against which he would have to match himself; and he is sent forth to the encounter naked and unarmed, with a pair of hands and a brain, but without so much as a spade or hook wherewith to wage the warfare, until he learns to forge such weapons for himself.

"Of all God's creatures Man
Alone is poor,"

says Mrs. Carlyle; perhaps it would be more correct to say, he alone is conscious of it.

All early races, no doubt, like savages in the present day, in their lack of material equipment, began on this one dead level of destitution. They all started at first tool-less, fire-less, shelter-less, until some tribes of higher potentialities and native capacity sought out many inventions and attained to some measure of civilization. It was thus with the Aryan and the Semite, while the Hamite and the Polynesian lagged behind. But the teeming Hindu, content with a handful of rice as his daily ration; the Chinese labourer, who lives on the brink of ever-impending starvation, whose yearly wage is said to be equivalent to ten shillings of our money, and whose one engrossing thought is "how to get over the day"; the wandering Arab, who, when he heard from Doughty of the blessings of food and clothing commonly enjoyed by Englishmen, was filled with envious melancholy and deplored his own sad lot of life-long misery, of hunger, thirst, and homelessness; the Ainus and Veddahs, but little removed in point of comfort from the apes who share the forests with them—these are but types and samples of the great majority of mankind.

This being so, the idea commonly entertained of the position of the poor may be shown to be erroneous. We are accustomed to speak of the degradation of the poor, as having "sunk" into want and misery, and very naturally from that conception look upon them as oppressed and unfairly treated. But it would be far more correct to say that the poor are the great majority who have failed to rise above the low level which is common to man. It is not that they have fallen back into degradation or sunk into poverty from the normal state of well-being which the fewer number have managed to preserve and maintain. The truth is that they have remained on the low plain which all men once occupied. They are the unfortunate ones who have remained stationary and failed to rise, while others have pushed

onwards and upwards. The well-to-do are they whose fathers or forbears contrived by their vigour and ability to lift themselves above the mere struggle for existence, and have kept the higher level thus attained.

To one cruising amid the multitudinous islands of the South Pacific—so many little palm-crowned paradises set in a great waste of waters—the thought might occur, "What a small proportion these bear to the immeasurable tracts of submerged land which lie beneath at the bottom of the sea, lost to sight and utterly useless!" But more mature reflection would correct that first impression. Many of these beautiful islets have only come to light in recent times. They all lay once beneath the same universal level of the ocean, till they were upheaved by the working of some great cosmic forces. The normal condition of the earth was to be covered with water, and it required the fiat of the Creator to cause the dry land to appear. Those fertile islets, therefore, are exceptions to the geographical rule that the greater part of our planet is overspread with water. They are only the mountain-summits which appear, while all the valleys and plains are buried beneath the superincumbent mass of ocean. And so it seems to be with the social condition of humanity. We speak with commiseration of the sad position of the "submerged" as if they had sunk or fallen below the normal standard of comfort and prosperity. But this is in every sense a superficial or surface view; it does not go to the bottom of things. It is not that the poor have gone down, but that they have not come up. The ordinary level of man is poverty. He is born poor, and he dies poor, and between those terminal points he generally lives poor. The wealthy are those who by the working of certain physical and ethical forces—superior strength and good health, industry and perseverance, unusual ability and intellectual power—have been successful in raising themselves above the dead level; or they are the children and descendants of those thus abnormally endowed, who, finding themselves born on the high ground, have kept themselves there. Of course many, through lack of the essential

qualities of character, intelligence, and bodily efficiency, do not maintain their inherited position. These do "sink" to the lower level and reinforce the great body of the poor—for poverty is only another word for human weakness and disability. It is only in civilized communities that the distinction between rich and poor becomes sharply accentuated. The mountain in the sunshine casts a cold shade upon the valley, which thus becomes conscious of its relative depression; on the plain no such inequalities are felt. Early communities were on that plain, all being on a pretty equal footing of want. Nature is a stern mother, and gives her prizes only to the strongest and fittest of her children. Those that are the best endowed come to the top and cease to be poor. In the spirit of Pistol, one more enterprising than his fellows proclaimed, "The world is my oyster," and, while they looked tamely on, seized his flint and proceeded to open it. Such as he conquer circumstances and rise superior to environment. They subdue the earth, possess it, and become the rich; while the weakly, lazy, and careless drop behind more and more, and consequently lack and suffer hunger. The result is what we see: though there is a subsistence for all, the strong force their way to the table where the meal is spread and carry off the best, while the weak are thrust aside and are not fed. The able and forceful become the rich, the unfit and unresourceful remain poor.

This unequal state of things, it is to be feared, is inevitable, because its source lies deep in the natural inequality of human beings. Social inequality is at bottom only one phase of physical and mental inequality. As long as one man is stronger than another, or healthier or cleverer than another, one man must be poorer than another. Always there will be the rich man and Lazarus in this world, existing continually side by side, though they may change their relative positions even in this life. Holy Writ itself recognizes the social axiom that "the poor shall never cease out of the land" (Deut. xv. 11). Though the great mass of mankind rise but slowly, we are glad to believe that there is a general advancement and tendency to equalization in

every civilized community. The labouring man nowadays is probably in some respects better off in point of comfort than was King Alfred with his flickering rushlight and draughty hut. The poorest is certainly not so badly off as his primitive ancestor who lived in a damp cave, with a bundle of flint-headed arrows as all his worldly possessions.

This, it may be said, is but a cheerless and pessimistic philosophy after all. The rich will accept it with wonderful equanimity as a condition of affairs that cannot be helped. But, even though it be true, no Christian State will be content to acquiesce in it as if there were no remedy, though it will hesitate to accept Mr. Lloyd George's empiric and Procrustean remedy of sacrificing the rich to help the poor, and doing harm in hope that some possible good may accrue. But it is a significant fact that the same chapter of Deuteronomy (xv. 11) which lays down the general principle that "the poor shall never cease out of the land," with a daring disregard of the charge of inconsistency teaches the Israelites, as God's chosen people, to look for a time "when there shall be no poor among you" (v. 4). While waiting for that ideal we will do well to remember that the needy are "God's poor," commended to the care of their happier brethren, as the objects and palæstra for calling out some of the finest of the Christian virtues, and giving us opportunity of "doing good" (Mark xiv. 7). As Sir Thomas Browne long ago observed: "Statists that labour to contrive a commonwealth without poverty take away the object of our charity; not only not understanding the commonwealth of a Christian, but forgetting the prophecy of Christ" (*Religio Medici*, 1642, Section xiii.).

Rationalism.[1]

By the Rev. C. L. DRAWBRIDGE, M.A.,
Honorary Organizing Secretary of the Christian Evidence Society.

IT is not at all easy to decide exactly what is meant by "Rationalist" in the present day. Encyclopædias are apt to give a mere history of the rationalism of past centuries and to identify it with Deism. But Rationalism, with a capital R, is—according to its most able modern exponents both in this country and abroad—indistinguishable from Atheism. Many people, however, would dispute the interpretation put upon Rationalism by those who would monopolize the term, and apply it solely to the atheistic or agnostic positions.

The word "rationalism" is defined in Webster's "New International Dictionary" as follows:

> "The doctrine or system of those who deduce their religious opinions from (*a*) reason or the understanding, as distinct from, or opposed to, (*b*) revelation."

This supposed antithesis and incompatibility between reason and revelation is unreal and misleading. One might as well suppose that learning and teaching are incompatible. The teacher reveals ideas; the pupil exercises his own mental faculties. Often the teaching is the measure of the learning, and, similarly, the learning is the measure of the teaching—because that only can be said to be taught which the pupil has grasped. Teaching and learning are complementary; they are not exclusive. In other words, each is one side of the dual process of education. Similarly, I can get to know something of a person (whether human or divine) merely by a process of reasoning. But I can also learn something of him as the result of his self-revelation to me. These two processes of getting to

[1] A chapter from "Common Objections to Christianity" (Library of Historic Theology Series), a new volume just published by Robert Scott, 5s. net.

know a person are complementary; they are not exclusive or incompatible. The assumption that reason and revelation are antithetical implies, either that all those spiritual geniuses in the past (or in the present) who are generally supposed to have been (or to be) inspired were (or are) irrational—lacking in reasoning power—or else that their teaching has been estimated irrationally by all those who are not "Rationalists."

Sometimes a contrast is drawn, not between reason and revelation, but between reason and authority; but the distinction, in this case also, is imaginary rather than real.

A man must use his reason in order to choose to what authority he will bow—whether to the authority of his own amateur opinion, on the one hand, or, on the other hand, to the authority of those leading specialists who are very much better qualified to form opinions in their own department than is the ordinary layman. The man who sets up to be his own Pope, and the only member of his sect, and who bows only to the supposed authority of his own personal opinion in all things, is not more rational, but is less rational, than the man whose reason leads him to consult much better authorities. This principle applies, not only in the sphere of theology, but also to every other department of thought—to astronomy, to medicine, to law, to art, etc. It is *lack* of intelligence which makes a man dispense with the ripe conclusions of specialists.

Further, because authorities are not agreed, the individual layman, in order to decide which of the many conflicting authorities he will regard as the best one, must use his reason.

Therefore, the supposed antithesis between reason and authority is fallacious. It is largely by the exercise of reason that a man, or an organization, becomes an authority. It is also by the exercise of his own reasoning powers that a man concludes that the specialist, when expressing an opinion within his own department, is much more likely to be right than is the amateur, or the mere layman.

Further, it is reason that leads a man to believe that the corporate and united authority of all the greatest specialists of

the day—that is to say, of modern "orthodoxy,"[1] in whatever department of thought—is deserving of considerable respect on the part of the ordinary amateur. When a man who knows next to nothing of physics, or of medicine, or of astronomy, or of theology, holds views in these departments which are the exact opposite of the orthodox opinions in physics, in medicine, in astronomy, or in theology, and when he can put forward no better grounds for being eccentric in his views than to say, "It stands to reason that . . .," or, "I am certain that my view is correct," sensible people do not attach much importance to his opinions, nor have they a high appreciation of his intelligence. It is not superstition, but it is reason which convinces the generality of men that the corporate opinion of the best specialists of the day, in any and in every department of thought, is likely to be very much more valuable than is the individual opinion of the ordinary man in the street, who has not devoted much time to the subject under consideration, and who possesses only very ordinary intelligence—not even enough, as a rule, to know how very ignorant he is, and how valueless are his opinions.

As I have said, it is not very easy to discover what exactly modern Rationalism is. But if one is to estimate its nature by estimating organized modern Rationalism and by studying the nature of the Rationalist Press Association, one arrives at certain fairly obvious conclusions. In the first place, if one may judge by the literature which it has carefully selected for publication in the name of Modern Thought, "Modern Thought," according to the Rationalist Press Association, appears to be the negative theological opinions of past generations of atheists, agnostics, and other sceptics, such as Tom Paine. The new Copyright Act is a very serious blow to the Rationalism of the R.P.A., because, although the masses used

[1] By orthodoxy I mean the best opinions of those who are best qualified to express opinions. In theology, the orthodoxy to which I refer is not so much the official system of dogmas accepted by any particular ecclesiastical body, as the generally accepted opinions of the best theological scholars everywhere.

to accept as Modern Thought, and used to buy quite a large number of books (provided that they were sufficiently cheap), after the copyright had expired, when that meant merely that these books were only forty-two years out of date, they probably will not care to buy, as *up to date*, books which are much older than that. The Act is therefore a great blow to the "Modern Thought" of organized "Rationalism." Another serious drawback for the Rationalist Press Association is that, instead of the Huxleys and Herbert Spencers of the past, we have the Bergsons and Euckens of the present, as leaders of Modern Thought.

The nature and the extent of the bias shown by Rationalism, as displayed by the Rationalist Press Association, may be illustrated by the following fact: It published a grossly unfair attack on Christian missionaries[1] in a book entitled "Christian Missions," by Lin Shao-Yang, and the public was repeatedly informed, by the R.P.A., that the author was a Chinese official. Further, on almost every page of that book the author writes "we Chinese," and words to that effect. The fact leaked out, however, that the author is not a Chinaman at all, but a European; and that fact is now so well known that the R.P.A. can no longer assert that the author is Chinese.

What, then, does Rationalism mean? Lecky, in his "Rationalism in Europe" (Rationalist Press Association Cheap Reprint No. 44), speaking of orthodox theists as well as of Rationalists, says on p. 8:

"Nothing can be more certain to an attentive observer than that the great majority, even of those who reason much about their opinions, have arrived at their conclusions by a process quite distinct from reasoning. They may be perfectly unconscious of the fact, but the ascendency of old associations is upon them. . . ."

Although a Rationalist himself, however, he goes on to confess that "Rationalists" are indebted to many factors other than to reason for their opinions He says:

"Nor are those who have diverged from the opinions they have been taught necessarily more independent of illegitimate influences. The love of

[1] Rationalists themselves have no foreign missions.

singularity, the ambition to be thought intellectually superior to others, the bias of taste, the attraction of vice, the influence of friendship, the magnetism of genius—these, and countless other influences into which it is needless to enter, all determine conclusions. The number of persons who have a rational basis for their belief is probably infinitesimal; for illegitimate influences not only determine the convictions of those who do not examine, but usually give a dominating bias to the reasonings of those who do."

This is an interesting admission, coming as it does from a Rationalist, and from one who is dealing specifically with rationalism in one of the official publications of the Rationalist Press Association.

The Rationalist says that in the sphere of theology the tendency, for generations, has been in the direction of attaching more and more importance to reason, and less and less to faith, and by faith he means the acceptance of statements without criticism, or "the attempt to believe that which one knows to be impossible."

But faith is not credulity. It is the Christian readers of the book above-mentioned who are sceptical about its statements. Faith is not credulity, but is spiritual insight, vision, first-hand relationship with spiritual reality, personal experience of the Divine. The change in theological thought of recent years has not been the result of less first-hand spiritual insight, but has been caused by (1) the possession of so much spiritual vision that an ever-increasing number of people are learning to see for themselves. Another reason for the change in theological views is (2) the ever-increasing number of available data and of criteria which have been discovered. One of the most important, if not the most important, datum and criterion for arriving at conclusions in this particular department of thought is faith—that is to say, spiritual insight, personal experience of the Divine, first-hand acquaintance with the cause and ground of religion, insight into spiritual reality.

The man who calls himself a Rationalist intends by that designation to imply that he is more *rational* than the rest of mankind. He imagines that other men are, comparatively, irrational. This is the claim of Rationalists, but it would be

irrational indeed on our part if we were to be content merely to take them wholly at their own estimate, and without some kind of credentials. As the vulgar proverb well says: "Self-praise is no recommendation." It is unwise to judge any commodity with sole reference to the label on the box. The rationality of individuals and of societies should not be estimated with sole reference to the magnitude of their claims in that direction.

Consequently two questions arise:

(1) What *ought* to be meant by the word Rationalism?

(2) Is it the "Rationalist," or is it the theist, who can best substantiate his claim to be the more rational of the two?

The word Rationalism should denote either (*a*) an essentially rational system of thought, or else (*b*) a pre-eminently rational mode of arriving at conclusions. In neither of these respects is modern Rationalism deserving of the name, because it is clearly irrational, on the part of those who possess but finite knowledge and capacity, to arrive at a universal negative (with regard to the existence of God, *e.g.*); and, further, it is irrational to estimate spiritual matters without paying due regard to the witness of the spiritual consciousness of man. "Spiritual things are spiritually discerned," or they are not discerned at all. If they be not discerned by any particular individual, his lack of discernment is no evidence that spiritual things are not discerned by others. Blind men discern no light, and deaf men perceive no sound; but normal men retain their belief in light and sound, irrespective of the incapacity of blind and deaf people. Moreover, blind and deaf people believe in light and sound on the evidence of those who can see and hear.

Let me illustrate the theological position of so-called "Rationalism" by means of an analogy. If the fundamental principles of modern theological Rationalism were transferred to the subject of optics, such principles would repudiate all validity to the witness derived from the activity of the optic nerve and of humanity's normal visual experience, and would

rely wholly upon hostile criticism of man's belief in his faculty of vision, on the ground that, not visual sensation, but reason, is the guide, and the only guide, to truth, and that vision is merely subjective feeling, rather than objective proof of the reality of ether waves.

Or let us transfer the analogy from optics to that department of human thought which is termed acoustics, and to that sphere of human experience which is called hearing. Rationalism (of the kind we are considering) would mean, in acoustics, a biased endeavour to arrive at a disproof of the validity of man's normal experience in that department, and the advocacy of relying upon hostile criticism alone to estimate the reality or otherwise of those "supposed" vibrations in the atmosphere which "superstitious" man has always imagined to be in some sense the objective cause of his subjective perception and conception of sound.

Modern theological Rationalism is, in fact, that method of estimating the validity of religious experience by first assuming that man has not an essential spiritual side to his nature, and then assuming that there is no essentially superhuman side to man's environment, and that, consequently, there cannot possibly be any interaction between the two, and that, therefore, so-called religious experience is mere ignorant superstition.

If there be ether vibrations, or if there be atmospheric waves, or if there be an omnipresent God, we shall inevitably form somewhat negative creeds with regard to the objective reality of each of these, and of their nature, and of their importance, if we rule out of court normal human experience of relationship with them.

The whole man, including his consciousness and experience, should be brought into play in order to discover truth. If we employ our reasoning powers merely in a negative direction—namely, to disprove, if possible, the validity of consciousness—our knowledge of the actual facts with which consciousness deals is not likely to grow greater, but less. But science, not nescience, should be our aim. If it be rational to repu-

diate the witness of consciousness in the religious sphere, it is irrational to accept its witness in other spheres; and if we do not accept the witness of consciousness in any department of investigation, we are condemning ourselves to complete nescience and to intellectual suicide.

The man who best deserves to be regarded as a Rationalist is the man who makes the fullest use of his intellect, who thinks logically, carefully collecting all available data, drawing carefully thought-out inferences from those data, reaching cautious conclusions as the result of a painstaking consideration of all the available data or premises, and comparing and relating ideas, systematically, with a view to arriving at well-considered conclusions. If this be the proper employment of reason, then every open-minded and unbiased form of theology (as contrasted with mere religious sentiment) is a form of religious rationalism. But can it truthfully be said that those who attach no importance to the data—*i.e.*, to the witness of religious experience in the department of theology—are justified in calling themselves rationalists in theology, merely because they arbitrarily advocate negative dogmas with regard to the validity of spiritual experience?

All of us aim at being rational, and all of us suppose ourselves to be reasonable, but some people claim to be abnormally rational, and therefore call themselves Rationalists, with a capital R.

As I have said, the word "rationalist" is used in different senses.

For instance, the Roman Catholic Church may legitimately be called essentially rationalistic. Although that Church believes so much that most other Christian bodies emphatically disbelieve, yet the Roman Communion is distinctly rationalistic in the sense that it claims, and has claimed for many centuries, that all its tenets are founded upon reason, and that all its dogmas can be substantiated adequately by reason. Scholasticism was and is essentially rationalistic. The Roman system of beliefs is a carefully reasoned-out system.

But the man who calls himself a Rationalist, with a capital R, intends by that designation to imply that he is *not a theist* at all. Therefore, in his mind, the term Rationalist is practically synonymous with the term atheist or agnostic. The Rationalist, however, prefers to employ the first of these three designations, because it has a more dignified and cultured sound than either atheist or agnostic, and because those who employ the term Rationalist consider that the designation suggests abnormal intelligence. They also prefer the term because it sounds less aggressive than the term atheist or agnostic, and, further, because it draws the attention of opponents to a supposed *method* of arriving at conclusions, rather than indicating the actual negative conclusions on the subject of theology which have actually been adopted by Rationalists. The supposed method by which the negative conclusions are said to have been arrived at is less vulnerable than are the conclusions.

The leading spirit of the Rationalist Press Association, Mr. Joseph McCabe, in his handbook for inquirers, which is entitled "Modern Rationalism" (revised edition), says, in the introduction:

> "Modern Rationalism is a system which rejects both natural and supernatural theology, and is antagonistic to the orthodox churches on *every* point. . . . Modern Rationalism declines all theistic belief."

This is pretty definite and sweeping; in fact, a definition of modern atheism could not possibly be more so. Those who call themselves atheists agree that the term means merely one who is definitely not a theist; the modern atheist does not profess to be able to demonstrate the non-existence of God, and, therefore, does not actually deny His existence. Rationalism is regarded, by its leading exponents, as a system of negation, and it is a system which is just as dogmatic as is modern atheism.

By rational is meant in accordance with reason. What, then, is reason? The word "reason" is used in different senses. For instance, Shakespeare writes:

> "I have no other than a woman's reason.
> I think him so, because I think him so."

This "woman's reason" is the only kind of "reason" which some Rationalists (and also some Christians) display for their stereotyped opinions. But to say: "I think as I do because I think as I do," certainly cannot be called a rational reason for entertaining any specific opinions, whether positive or negative.

The word "reason" is sometimes used to denote the *cause* for an opinion, as when a man says: "The reason that man has always been religious is threefold: (1) Man has a spiritual nature; (2) there is a spiritual universe; and (3) man has always been conscious of relationship with the Divine and superhuman." Religion is active and vital correspondence between the human spirit and the Divine. Here the word reason is used as synonymous with cause.

Or, again, a man may say: "The reason that I am a Rationalist is that my parents were Rationalists; I naturally adopted their views. My views were born of heredity and environment."

The Rationalist historian, Lecky, tells us in his "History of Rationalism," published by the Rationalist Press Association, that Rationalism is caused, primarily, by *bias*. But bias is a "reason" only in the sense of being a cause; bias is not rational; it is often very much the reverse of rational.

Sometimes the word "reason" is used to denote the belated attempt at logical justification which is made on behalf of any particular opinion only after it has been adversely criticized. Such efforts at justification of a theory by ratiocination are, as a matter of fact, nearly always postponed, as I have said, until *after* the opinion has been formed, and formed on other than intellectual grounds. The attempt at justification is made in order to defend that particular view when it is challenged.

Or, once more, reason may be regarded as *the sum of all mental powers*, as when one says that a man has lost his "reason." If so regarded, reason must, of course, include those psychic powers which are denominated religious and moral.

It used to be supposed that reason, intuition, instinct, desire, insight, etc., were distinct and separable from each other, so

much so, in fact, that any one of them could display itself without any admixture whatever with any of the others. But the world of culture no longer entertains this extraordinary view. The self, with all its activities, is one. The Rationalist, however, makes imaginary watertight series of partitions in his mind, and, in theory, isolates from the others that activity of the mind which we call ratiocination, and he calls that reason, in contradistinction to the other and inseparable, and no less valid and important, mental activities, such as God-consciousness. What primarily constitutes the difference between the self-styled "Rationalist" and the rest of the world appears to me, as I have said, to be this: the former deliberately and carefully abstracts the critical faculty from the sum of normal human mental powers, and enthrones the destructive faculty at the expense of such constructive faculties as, *e.g.*, God-consciousness. He rules out of court some of the most important mental powers, and he arrives at his negative conclusions by the exercise of a good deal less than the total sum of his faculties. He endeavours to discredit and to eliminate the evidence of some very essential mental powers and their witness, and he arrives at his negative conclusions with sole reference to the remainder of his faculties, which he has artificially and arbitrarily abstracted from the normal sum of man's powers. The self-styled Rationalist arbitrarily rules out of court the witness of all those normal human faculties which, in all ages and everywhere, have been the cause of religion. All knowledge is born of consciousness. The Rationalist's process of ratiocination, his method of sorting and of analyzing the contents of man's consciousness, rigidly excludes from respectful consideration the witness of man's religious consciousness.

It has frequently been said that man differs from the beasts in that the genus *homo* alone is a rational being—although there is, and has always been, a percentage of exceptions, such as very small infants and idiots, who are undoubtedly human beings, but who are not rational. But even a dog acts rationally to some extent—more so than does a small infant, which is more

human than a dog. Even a dog is capable of some measure of thought, and it can reason to a limited extent.

The primary distinction between man and the beasts is rather that man alone, apparently, has the *religious faculty.* Unlike the lower animals, man, as such, possesses what is usually termed God-consciousness; man has the tendency to worship, and he possesses both the desire and also the capacity to control his life in accordance with transcendental ideals. Man alone believes that he has the capacity, actively and vitally, to correspond with the Author of his being. This religious faculty is higher than those faculties which are possessed, in some measure, by the beasts, such, *e.g.*, as the capacity to reason.

Rationalism is that system of negative theology which, if it does not wholly discard, at least discredits, the primary data of all theology—viz., religious experience. Rationalism is the system of thought which forms a theory with regard to the validity of religious experience on the *a priori* assumption, either that the essentially spiritual or divine sphere is non-existent, or else that man preserves no sane and useful relationship with it.

The "Rationalist" attaches far more importance to ratiocination than he does to intuition and instinct. Bergson, however, attributes to *intuition* far greater authority than to ratiocination for the purpose of arriving at the higher realms of truth; and Kant places first in importance what he calls the "practical" reason which, in his opinion, provides irresistible evidence of the existence of the Divine and of the Providence of God.

We sometimes speak of a person "losing his reason"—*i.e.*, becoming mad. Reason may, therefore, be regarded as that which distinguishes the sane man from the man who is insane. Which, then, is the more obviously sane, the theist or the Rationalist? One of the primary characteristics of sanity is that it tends to draw men together socially, whereas insanity, on the other hand, is always accompanied by a love of solitude. Judged by this estimate, which is the more obviously sane, Rationalism (atheism) or theism? Religion is, certainly, always

more social than is hostility to religion. In the practice of his religious exercises, the religious man is far more social and gregarious than is the Rationalist in the exercise of his anti-religious mental exercises. Take, for instance, Sunday, the general weekly holiday. Religion draws innumerable crowds of people together all over the kingdom in a way that nothing else does. Conversely, irreligion most certainly does not draw people together on Sundays, nor on any other day of the week, to anything like the same extent that religion does. On Sundays, religion collects together in this country many millions of people.[1] *Rationalism cannot assemble a single big crowd, even once a year, in any building in the kingdom.* In fact, Rationalists do not even *possess* a large building, nor do they even regularly hire one. In the open air, it is not the negative conclusions of Rationalism, but it is the aggressiveness of atheism which collects crowds. Fierce vituperation collects a crowd, because outrageous attacks upon any individual, or upon any society or cause, attracts attention now that the classical gladiatorial shows no longer provide for the passions of the populace. Nowadays the crowds of holiday makers have to make the most of whatever excitement of a somewhat gladiatorial kind is provided for them.

[1] Since writing the above I have addressed a Sunday afternoon congregation of men which amounts normally to over 2,000. There were about 2,200 present on the Sunday afternoon when I spoke to them.

For the Table.

(*Tune*: "*Unde et Memores*," *Church Hymns*, 245.)
SIX 10's.

ALMIGHTY Father, who didst give Thy Son,
A willing sacrifice, on Calvary's Tree:
For that great boon which our redemption won
Unending thanks and praise be made to Thee:
While He, who did as Priest before Thee stand,
Now sits a King enthroned at Thy right hand.

And while we praise Thee, and our Saviour's grace,
We keep in constant mind His wondrous love;
And, till that day when we shall see His face
Rapt in His advent, to Thy Courts above,
By those blest signs, on which He laid His hands,
We show and preach the tidings to all lands.

O Lord of Mercy, hear our humble quest,
As these Thy hallowed gifts of bread and wine,
According to Thy blessed Son's behest,
We eat and drink at this Thy board Divine,
And grant that we, who claim the children's food,
May share His broken Body and His Blood.

Ah, how unworthy we of all Thy care,
Who feast alone, while those for whom He died
Still grope in darkness, far from hope and prayer,
Nor lay their sins on Him, the Crucified!
Lord, break our hearts, Whose heart for us did bleed,
And make Thy people One, in Truth and deed!

ALBERT MITCHELL

The Spiritual Aspect of the Great War.[1]

By the Rev. W. EDWARD CHADWICK, D.D.,
Vicar of St. Peter's, St. Albans.

"Prove the spirits; . . . every spirit which confesseth not Jesus is not of God."—1 John iv. 1, 3 (R.V.).

THERE is a real danger lest, while our minds are concentrated on the great events which are passing before us, the deep, abiding spiritual forces, not only of life generally, but which lie behind this present war, be forgotten. There probably never was a time when the physical and the material was so apt to absorb our attention. We are thinking of the material weapons of warfare, of its material and physical results, of wounds and death, of material destruction of priceless monuments of the past, of want of work, and of poverty in many shapes and forms. It almost seems as if we had neither time nor energy to think of anything beyond these.

If you or I were physically attacked, say by a highwayman or a burglar, we should surely concentrate all our thought and all our energy upon how we could best defend ourselves. This is the present condition of our nation, and explains the state of mind of every true Englishman to-day.

Yet there never was a time when it was more necessary to remember that man is a *spiritual* being, ruled by spiritual forces and having spiritual needs. And—I record it with thankfulness—never have I seen a more widespread expression of the consciousness of the need of spiritual help.

If the spiritual includes thought and feeling—and if "spiritual" is opposed to "material" it must include these—then the ultimate causes of this war are spiritual, however material may be its weapons.

The match which set the explosive material alight was the murder of the Austrian heir-apparent, the cause of which was a misguided and fanatical patriotism—a spiritual feeling. This

[1] A sermon preached in St. Albans Cathedral on Sunday, September 6, 1914.

murder was the excuse for the revenge, or rather for the ambition, of Austria, which in turn provoked the race-championship of Russia, which, again, became the occasion for the pouring forth of the long-pent-up hatred, covetousness, and boundless ambition, of Germany, which last was answered by the heroic defence of her independence by Belgium, and by the determination on the part of England to prevent injustice and oppression. Every one of these various steps or movements was due to some deep-rooted feeling, to some thought within the minds of these various nations, hence ultimately to some spiritual force or power. Thus we can see that, however grossly material the *objects* of Germany and Austria may have been, the ultimate cause of each movement on the part of each nation was really spiritual, each was the outcome of some "spirit." And as we examine these various spirits, we can see how some of them lead inevitably to misery, destruction, and death, while others lead as surely to the protection, the development, the purification, and the ennobling, of life.

Christianity is essentially a spiritual religion, one dealing with spirits, seeking to foster and strengthen some spirits, while endeavouring to root out and destroy others. Spirits are forces; they are the motive powers of action and conduct. Christ's wisdom is seen in His constant reference to these, in His method of always piercing, beneath the outward and visible phenomena of life, to the inward, the "spiritual" causes which lie beneath, and which are constantly producing, these.

The text bids us to "prove the spirits"—in other words, to examine and test the nature of those motive powers of conduct by which we and others are guided and ruled. It further supplies us with one all-sufficient, absolute test of the rightness or the wrongness of every spirit. Does this spirit practically confess the infinite supremacy—in other words, the Divinity—of Jesus? Does it own Him as Lord and Master? Is it in perfect unison with His Spirit? Does it tend to promote conduct and actions such as His? This is the one and only standard by which the nature and quality of all spirits must be proved.

Undoubtedly for many years a great wave of irreligion has been passing over Europe. It has been terribly pronounced in Germany; it has been more than sufficiently apparent in England. If we have maintained something of the outward form of religion, have we not been far too careless of its inner essence? Treitschke's verdict, that "with the English people love of money has killed every sentiment of honour and every distinction between right and wrong, though they hid their materialism under the unctuous phrases of religion," is doubtless far too sweeping; but none of us can assert that it is absolutely untrue.

But some may be saying of me, "When you speak of irreligion, should you not rather address yourself to the multitudes who hardly ever enter a place of worship?" Did Amos, or Isaiah, did our Lord Himself address His rebukes either exclusively or chiefly to these? What did Amos say about coming to Bethel and transgressing, and at Gilgal multiplying transgression? What did Isaiah say to those who "trampled" God's courts, and to those who bowed down their heads as the bulrushes? To whom were Christ's most scathing invectives addressed, but to the Scribes and the Pharisees, the professedly religious among the people?

Spirit is the motive power of conduct, and conduct reveals spirit. What, I ask, has been the real, the actual motive lying behind many of our religious observances? Has there been a really earnest, an enthusiastic, desire to study God's Word, as the revelation not only of the highest, but of the all-important, Truth? What self-sacrifice have we evinced in order to obtain or to impart this priceless knowledge, this absolutely essential guide to conduct? Where have been the prayers so really earnest, that they produced sweat upon our brows as upon the brow of the Master? Where have been the Communions which felt the actual spiritual presence of Christ: not "under the forms of bread and wine," but as feeling His entire spiritual nature passing into our nature, the assimilation of His whole personality—human and Divine?

Conduct reveals spirit. What earnest, persistent, self-sacrificing effort has there been to redress social wrong? Have we not been far too careless about this? And even to-day, in the midst of a spiritual awakening, while we give to relief funds with one hand, do we raise the other to prevent the simply appalling waste of both money and character which is taking place every night in the public-houses of our great cities, and not least in the wicked and idiotic "treating" of various kinds of troops, who are either quartered among us or are leaving for the war?

Try the spirits, prove the spirits, the motive powers by which conduct is actually governed. Probably never in the world's history were the actual results, the inevitable issues, of evil spirits, of wrong motives, of base and sordid passions, more clearly revealed than they are revealed to-day. They are only too plainly revealed in the desolated homes of Belgium, in the corpse-piled battle-fields of Servia, of Austria, and of France.

We cannot condemn too strongly the arrogance, the covetousness, the ambition, the desire to increase material possession, of which Germany has been guilty; and, remember, these spirits have not been fanned merely in the councils of her military leaders, but in the lecture-rooms of professors, by some of the keenest intellects among her teachers. But while we condemn them, let us ask whether in our own individual hearts and minds we have been entirely guiltless of harbouring the same spirits? Have we been as ready to give as we have been to get? Have we been as ready to serve as to see how we might exact service?

Oh, what a call to cultivate a *new* spirit! To get for us a new heart and a new mind! To seek for the spirit of love issuing in a life of self-sacrifice for others! To cultivate the spirit of Jesus, who ever went about releasing from sin and diffusing happiness, setting men and women free from the worst of all slaveries—the slavery to the Devil, the source of all the evil spirits in the world!

"Renew a right spirit within me" must be the constant prayer of every true follower of Christ to-day. And with prayer

must go Christlike effort, Christlike personal self-sacrifice. There must be a real self-sacrifice for our country, for our country's cause, which, thank God, in this great war is the cause of truth and righteousness, of justice and of mercy.

Studies in Texts:

SUGGESTIONS FOR SERMONS FROM CURRENT LITERATURE.

By the Rev. HARRINGTON C. LEES, M.A.

IX.—THE PERMANENT VALUE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Text:—"Every scribe who hath been made a disciple is like unto a householder which bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old."—St. Matt. xiii. 52.

[Book of the Month: "The Anatomy of Truth"[1] = AT. Other references: Kellogg's "Leviticus" (Expos. Bible) = KL. Bonar's "Leviticus" = BL. Plummer's "St. Matthew" = PM. Bruce's "St. Matthew" (Expos. G.T.) = B.M. Smith's "Days of His Flesh" = DF. Mackinlay's "Magi" = M. Ramsay's "Luke the Physician" = R.]

This small parable is the fixing of a principle arising from the disciples' assertion that they understood the previous seven, which contain the family secrets ("mysteries") of the Kingdom. Capron thinks allusion to Lev. xxvi. 9, 10; and parable illustrating the link between Old and New Covenants. We have then—

I. A New Testament Parable.—The scribe (*i.e.*, teacher of old Law) has become a disciple (learner of new Law). What is he to do with the old? Like a man with ever-replenished storehouse, he is to use both old stock and new, not throw away the old (AT. 212, 213). "Produce things new and old in new form" (PM. 198).

1. "Anatomy of Truth," by F. Hugh Capron. Published by Hodder and Stoughton. A companion to the author's "Conflict of Truth," of which the late George Matheson said he was "enthralled, enchained, spellbound, by the magnificence of the reasoning and the striking freshness of treatment."

II. An Old Testament Illustration. — Christ thinking of promise in Lev. xxvi. 9, 10, R.V.M.: "Ye shall eat old store and bring forth the old from before the new." "One year's harvest not be consumed before it would have to be removed from barn to make room for new" (KL. 522; so BL. 451; Speaker's Comm., *in loc.*, and see LXX.). Capron thinks xxvi. 10 explained by xxv. 22 (AT. 212), which latter is a reassurance for Sabbath-year. If so, this doubly interesting because M. shows (118) and R. endorses (232) that Matt. xiii. spoken at beginning of *year after Sabbatic year*, when old and new store specially in view. But Christ's words draw important distinction. The farmer in Leviticus removed old to make room for new. Christ's scribe will add new to the old, and bring forth both together. Christ came not to destroy, but to fill up the treasure-store hitherto only half full (Matt. v. 17, 18; see AT. 212-216).

III. A Permanent Principle.—"We must not maintain in thought or in thoughtlessness the heresy that the Old Testament has been displaced by the New" (AT. 217, and see DF. 95, 96). "The word 'scribe' naturally points to acquaintance with the Old Testament, and teaches that that knowledge may be usefully united with discipleship in the love of the Kingdom. In Wendt's words: 'One remains in possession of the Old, recognized as of permanent value. Yet it is not restricted to it, but only with it possesses a precious new element'" (B.M. 204). "Judaism religion of Time, Christianity of Eternity" (AT. 209). "The mysterious link which for 2,000 years has bound New Testament to Old Testament no mere caprice. A link forged in Nature's workshop" (AT. 216). "Amalgamation of new 'trust in Christ' with old 'trust in in God' of Judaism" (AT. 220, and *cf.* John xiv. 1, xvii. 3; Eph. iii. 17-19). Thus the treasure-house is kept full "unto all fulness of God" for householder to draw from. The suggestion of severing the New Testament from Old, "infidelity to Religion, heresy to Science, and treason to Philosophy" (AT. 225).

The Missionary World.

IF words brave and grave are an indication of the real attitude of the missionary societies under the first shock of the war, it may thankfully be allowed that they, like the nation as a whole, are acquitting themselves worthily. It can even be said that the immense circulation of the missionary magazines makes them a national asset just now. It is in their power to represent the Church at its best. They can bring into our homes, not merely a plea for the particular interests or views which they represent, but a steady presentation of the faithfulness of God to His people which shall aid them to stand humbled and undaunted in the stress. They can remind us unswervingly that God is the Father of all, and apply to the European situation that brotherhood of love in Christ Jesus upon which the missionary position to the non-Christian world is based. They can save us finally from that pitiful cry which they themselves have so ardently resisted when applied to home interests: "We must think of ourselves first." They can be the exponents of that resistless faith, hope, and love, which interprets the message of Calvary to the world, and which never speaks so calmly and clearly as in the clash and clamour of a bitter strife. If the missionary ranks falter, the Church will be driven back to its first line of defence. This is unthinkable. If the onward spirit of faith be maintained, God will take care of the plans, making them possible or exchanging them for something far better in His time.

* * * * *

On August 8 the Society of Friends issued their address "To Men and Women of Good-will in the British Empire." Thus early in the war they spoke words of inspiration and guidance to the Church, and in particular to all missionary bodies, through whose action good-will must spread and social foundations be consciously or unconsciously laid. We commend a study of this paper to all missionary workers, both those who

do and do not look beyond the horizon of their own work. It will guide the one class, it will enlarge the other. The missionary ranks of the Church also owe a debt to the *Times Literary Supplement* of August 27 for its "Thoughts in Adversity." The writer, having pointed out that there is "the lower faith that we must win because we are right," urges that "this is the time for us to recover the higher faith that we must disregard defeat because we are right." He goes on to say:

"It is for us now to make the answer of faith to this silence of a Heaven that faith alone tells us is not indifferent. And the answer now is one of deeds, not words, but of deeds made constant by the faith that is behind them. It is not for us to expect failure or success, not to be cast down or puffed up by winds of fortune, but to remember always that the cause is greater than the fortunes of those who fight for it. . . . We must fight as if all the odds were against us, and there were nothing but the cause to make us fight, if we are to keep our souls worthy of the cause to the end."

We are further strengthened by the "Call to Prayer in this Time of Trouble," issued by the Collegium, of which the Rev. W. Temple is chairman, with its confession and comprehension, and its plea for "quiet centres of peace and love, through which the Spirit of God can work." The war will show the Church as well as the nation something of the magnitude of its resources.

* * * * *

Since we last wrote the area of the war has been greatly extended, and in each instance with a strong bearing on missions. Japan entered the war area on August 15, and finally declared war on August 23; a German steamer has been seized by British forces at Lake Nyasa, and there has been active fighting at Karonga, one of the stations of the Livingstone Mission; raids have been made in British East Africa by German forces operating in the neighbourhood of Voi; fighting is reported on the Belgian Congo; Togoland has surrendered, and the celebrated wireless station has been destroyed; German Samoa has surrendered to the expeditionary forces of New Zealand. The fact that England and France have stated their thankfulness at the prospect of fighting shoulder to shoulder with the brave Indian troops shows the extent to which the

world upheaval has grown. It has been freely said that the map of Europe will be changed by this war: so also will be the map of the world. Prayer should be earnestly offered that the area of strife may be limited, in the mercy of God.

* * * * *

With the breaking out of war, naturally the British Consul was withdrawn from Dar-es-Salaam, and the C.M.S. missionaries in German East Africa are isolated from us. We are not afraid for them. Not only are they in the keeping of God, but we believe the German administration will continue to extend to them that courtesy which has hitherto always marked their mutual relations. The large L.M.S. work in Samoa has experienced great kindness from the German officials since 1899; now they and some Germans on their staff will suddenly find their work in touch with British rule again. We are indebted to the *L.M.S. Chronicle* for the statement that there are altogether some 800 German missionaries in British possessions and colonies, about 400 being in Asia and in Africa respectively. Their welfare is a matter of deep concern to us. The statement made in the House of Commons on August 27 is reassuring and worthy, being to the effect that the Government were confident that sympathetic consideration would be extended to German missionaries in the Colonies and Dominions, as well as in India, who were engaged in purely religious work.

* * * * *

The China Inland Mission has more than 100 German workers associated with it. *China's Millions* says: "Circumstances beyond their and our control have brought our nations into conflict, but we pray that nothing may disturb the love existing between us." The L.M.S. is in close touch with the work of German missionaries in South India, South China, and South Africa. Instructions have been sent to their missionaries in these fields to give all the help in their power to the German missionaries who are in need. This will be the natural attitude of missionary bodies all the world over.

* * * * *

But over and above such particular effort we note with thankfulness the statement in the *Record* of August 28, opening a channel for the gifts of those—and they are many—who have on their hearts the needs of the members of Continental missions, whether they come from the lands of our allies or of our present enemies. It is pointed out that these Continental missionaries are finding themselves in difficult conditions, cut off from all supplies from their home base. "Brotherly aid to Continental missions in their present distress would be practical proof that Christian love transcends differences of nation and race." Therefore a temporary emergency fund has been opened, and it is earnestly to be hoped that the signatories to this statement will receive many gifts. Every week brings fresh evidence of the urgency of the need. If any of our conceptions of giving deserve the term of Christian giving, this does. Even though the modern work of the C.M.S. is not so closely allied to German missions, who can ever forget what German missionaries did for it in earlier days? and who is there who does not with unfading love and reverence think of Rebman and Krapf, of Christlieb, Zenker, Weitbrecht, and a host of others, our brethren and theirs?

* * * * *

The actual difficulties in which British missionary societies are placed are really serious and require to be looked at steadily. Several announce the postponement of autumn meetings in London, and of the departure of missionaries, and the difficulty of remitting supplies to the field. As an illustration of pressure in the field, the *L.M.S. Chronicle* says that in Madagascar it has been found impossible to secure cash, the French banks in Tananarive refusing to honour drafts in the period of war. Some reductions in the issue of missionary literature are recorded; there might well be other economies in this direction, and it may be that after the war this reduction could be permanent, loss being avoided, perhaps, by an extension of the principle of co-operation in publications. The C.M.S. announces that, while exercising all possible economies and releasing some

of their missionaries and staff to serve their country if they so desire, every effort will be made to carry on the work in a normal way. Whatever be found possible or impossible in the unknown circumstances, the fact remains that the chief problem centres in money. On this the *S.P.G. Mission Field* has some fine words from the pen of Bishop Montgomery. He refers to the thrill of reading in a time like the present of deserters returning to the ranks, and points the application to missionary malingerers, adding: "Times of peril and deep responsibility in any direction help us in every direction. The whole character is purged. We are brought up standing." He says, in answer to the question, "The times are bad, something must be given up: what is it to be?" "Our answer is clear: Anything but the promises we have made to our men and women in the fighting line."

* * * * *

Great sympathy will be felt concerning the statements in the British and Foreign Bible Society *Gleanings*. Last year the Society was employing about 200 colporteurs in Russia, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Servia, France, and Belgium. The majority of these men will now be serving with the colours. Let us not forget that French Protestant pastors and Roman Catholic priests will also be at the front; among the former are to be found names distinguished in the missionary world, leaders of the Paris Evangelical Missionary Society.

* * * * *

The C.M.S., B. and F.B.S., L.M.S. and B.M.S. publications remind us of the "cordial" of history, though we thankfully observe that there is no indication of "drooping spirits" to which it might be applied. Thus, the C.M.S. recalls that it commenced its career in a war which lasted for twenty-two years, when Ireland was in rebellion, and when bank payments in specie were restricted. The B. and F.B.S., at a slightly later date, had its birth when "the price of bread rose to 1s. 4¼d. the quartern loaf. Our trade was half ruined, our poor were half starving." The L.M.S. gives the names of eight seamen of

H.M.S. *Bellerophon* who sent to that society their share of the first division of prize-money (£18 16s.) arising from Nelson's victory in the Battle of the Nile. The B.M.S. most helpfully records the experiences of their Society in the stress of previous wars. During the Crimean War in 1855 the receipts were only £250 short; in 1856, as the war dragged on, the report continues, even though legacies fell off, "taking this difference into account, the Society's income is in excess of the previous year by £1,307 0s. 4d." In the following year and during the Indian Mutiny the total receipts were again greater. We echo their wish that our Lord may, in the "very greatness of the time, find an eager and sacrificial response in the hearts of God's people." G.

Notices of Books.

SOME QUESTIONS OF THE DAY. By Henry Wace, D.D., Dean of Canterbury. Second Series. London: *C. J. Thynne.* Price 3s. 6d. net.

The volume is a reprint of papers by Dean Wace which have appeared in the *Record.* We may safely say that no man living has a wider range of thought, a firmer hold on fundamental principles, and a more pointed way of expressing himself, than the Dean of Canterbury, and anyone who takes the trouble to master the present volume will find himself well equipped for approaching the theological and ecclesiastical questions of the day.

We proceed to enumerate some of the more important conclusions to which the Dean seeks to lead his readers, and we trust that the result will be a desire to study the arguments by which those conclusions are reached. It should be explained that the subjects discussed fall under four heads—namely, questions "National and Ecclesiastical" in general, questions concerning "Convocation and the Church," "Scriptural and Doctrinal" matters, and matters which deal with "Practical Religion."

The first question which is brought before us is the Ulster question. An explanation is given how far it is a religious question and how far it is not. There are strange misconceptions abroad on this point. It is an entire mistake to imagine that there is any desire to dictate to people what religious opinions they should hold. Ulster has all along been strongly Liberal on this point. What Ulster protests against is the usual practice of the Roman Church to dictate to people what religious opinions they should hold, and also the fact that the Papacy has always claimed the further right to dictate to the State what policy it should pursue. The Dean appeals to the recent *Ne Temere* and *Motu Proprio* decrees on these points, and shows that these

utterances involve even claims to decide on the validity of marriage among persons who are not Roman Catholics, and to the right of ecclesiastics to be exempted from subjection to the decisions of civil courts. As everyone knows, this last question was a burning one in this country in the days of Henry II. and Thomas à Becket, and that since the reign of Henry VIII. it has been decided that no such exemption shall be pleaded.

On "Faithfulness to the Church" we are seasonably reminded that the party represented by the E.C.U. is not, and has not for more than fifty years been faithful to the Prayer-Book as it stands, but only to what it is pleased to call "Catholic faith and practice." The word "Catholic," it is important to remember, means, in the mouth of a member of the E.C.U., members of the Roman and the "Orthodox" Eastern Churches, and those members of our own Church who accept the position of the E.C.U. This must be confessed to be in itself a singular "derangement of epitaphs," as Mrs. Malaprop would put it. And when it comes to be added that the "Catholic belief and practice" of the so-called "Catholic party" in our Church is not identical with that of either their Roman or their "Orthodox" brethren, the situation becomes a little confusing to straightforward folk. And as this party deliberately contradicts the formularies of the Church of England as they stand, and has over and over again denied that it is bound by the decisions either of the authorities of the Church to which they belong, or the decisions of its lawfully established Court of Appeal, it is very difficult to see how its claim to membership of the National Church can be sustained. On this point Bishop Beveridge is quoted as saying that the "harmony between the Primitive Church" and our own "is so great that the two can scarcely be distinguished from one another by anything but time."

On the question lately raised by the Bishop of Zanzibar, "For what does the *Ecclesia Anglicana* stand?" the Dean has much to say which deserves close attention. He concludes with the remark that the raising of this discussion "will have done good if it compels the authorities of the Church at home to realize the danger of letting the Church drift helplessly between the currents of Rationalism and Romanism." This is what they are now doing. And he once more reminds the members of our Church of the fact, which for nearly half a century they have been allowing themselves to forget, that the true answer to the Bishop of Zanzibar's question is that, and only that, which was given by "Jewel, Hooker, Cosin, and Beveridge," and by hundreds more sound, learned, and devout members of our Reformed Church.

On the question of the rights of the Church of England laity, we are thankful to find the Dean speaking of the "utterly unsatisfactory nature of their present participation in Church affairs." We wish that his protest had been even more vigorous. Not only is it the fact that of 14,000 inquiries "sent out to incumbents and rural deans," only about half have been returned; but it is matter of experience that the majority of the clergy at this moment are anxious to put obstacles in the way of the free expression of lay opinion. If lay opinion is to be properly ascertained, "inquiries" should be sent, not to "incumbents," but to the people's churchwardens. And the laity should be strongly urged to attend the Easter Vestries and elect churchwardens who represent their views.

We have not space to enter upon the Dean's much-needed criticisms of the extraordinarily reckless action of the Southern Convocation of late, especially with regard to the revision of the Prayer-Book and Church Finance. But we must not pass over the question of Divinity Degrees. Here we are not altogether in agreement with the policy recommended. The Dean tells us that "the friends of Christian teaching in the University are bound to hold fast to any security which remains to us for the authoritative maintenance of Christian belief by the University." "Any security which remains!" But does any security remain? Would it not be better far to let the University go its own "undenominational" way, and establish, as denominations are doing on the Continent, denominational faculties of theology under the control of the Churches themselves? With just a word of thanks to the Dean for reminding us that by the abolition of Church rates the last shred of the old-fashioned lay control of the funds raised for Church expenses passed away, we proceed to say a word or two on his treatment of matters "Scriptural and Doctrinal."

The very serious condition of religious thought among those who arrogate to themselves the sole right to the title of "scholars," and control the teaching of young men at the Universities, is very fittingly dealt with by the Dean. That in the literary and scholastic world the tendency to treat religious questions from a purely intellectual point of view, and that at the present moment a reaction from the over-dogmatism of the Tractarian movement is in full swing, cannot for a moment be denied. But those who look below the surface know full well that the great majority of lay folk have no sympathy whatever with the habit of giving intellectual "stones" to those who are "asking for bread." Among the numerous causes of the abstention from religious worship, which is universally admitted to be characteristic of the present age, one undoubtedly is the extent to which the pulpit is now denying to souls the spiritual nourishment for which they crave. On one side a hard-and-fast dogmatism repels them; on the other, when they ask for information concerning Him Who told men that He was the Truth, they are met rather in the spirit of Pontius Pilate than of Simon Peter's "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of Eternal Life." Certainty on all points we cannot, of course, expect from our teachers. Only the Church of Rome professes to give that, and her profession is a false one. But what the purely intellectual school now in the ascendant offers us is certainty on no point whatever—nothing but the opinion of the professor of the hour, which holds the ground for a short time, and is then succeeded by another, equally barren and equally unsatisfying. We cannot go into the details of the Dean's sketch of the situation. We must refer the reader to his book. There we shall be led to the only ground on which religious teaching can be permanently founded. There we shall learn how hollow are the assumptions on which the case of the intellectualist is based. There we shall see how the bold assertion that "scholars are unanimous" in accepting the theories of the critics is only their way of concealing from themselves and other people the fact that the ground on which they stand is steadily, if slowly, giving way beneath their feet.

RELIGION IN AN AGE OF DOUBT. By the Rev. C. J. Shebbeare, M.A. London: *Robert Scott*. Price 5s. net.

That this is an age of doubt no thoughtful person will deny. But whether it is more an age of doubt than any other is open to question. The crowd is intensely interested in religious questions, the religious novel is eagerly read, children are seldom withdrawn from religious instruction in our schools, and there are many other indications of the fact that, despite the carelessness of the multitude, there is more latent faith than some suppose. We are therefore, to start with, inclined to quarrel with the title of this deeply interesting but unconvincing book.

We look in vain for any recognition of the fact that "religion," in the case of the Christian, is a miracle of Divine grace. Can a sinner become his own saviour—his salvation being reduced to duty, goodwill, and so forth? According to Mr. Shebbeare, systematic theology must be abandoned, or at least recast. The old teleological argument, dished up with Keswick and garnished with discursive treatment of harmonies of music and art, merges in the future life and the doctrine of the Trinity. Mr. Shebbeare's motto might, indeed, be his own words: "Those whose task it is to commend Christ and His Gospel to the modern world must lack neither intellectual industry nor intellectual courage." But we need to remember that there is still "that which is revealed to babes" and is "hidden from the wise and prudent." Mr. Shebbeare, however, reveres the German philosopher who propounds the theory that Christ is God because we worship Him, not that we worship Him because He is God—His Godhead being purely an *a priori* assumption. There is some really brilliant writing in the book. Perhaps the best specimen of this is the delineation of the personal Saviour, but even this does not redeem it from what are, in our judgment, serious defects.

THE MEANING OF CHRISTIANITY. By Frederick A. M. Spencer, M.A. Second edition, revised. London: *T. Fisher Unwin*. Price 2s. 6d. net.

This is indeed a storehouse of surprises for the orthodox. On the second page we read that "the account in Genesis of the Creation, however inspiring and religiously valuable, has been demonstrated by natural science to be not in accordance with the facts." This is a statement that it would go hard with Mr. Spencer to prove. Even the most uncompromising Evolutionist sees in the Genesis narrative the confirmation of his theory, for things are on a moving scale, ascending from lower forms of life to higher. How strange to find the Old Book written down and written up in the same sentence!—for how can that which is false be "inspiring and religiously valuable"? We come across the same kind of thing elsewhere, as, for instance, where the author speaks of "the personality which the Bible, with various degrees of truth, makes known to us." The chapter on God is startling: even so far as He is concerned, evolution is still in progress—He has not yet perfected His omnipotence, or evil would cease to be! So, too, as the accuracy of the Hebrew Scripture and so forth may be challenged, we find Christ must be reconstructed, and we are told that "the received conception of the personality of the members of the Holy Trinity cannot be maintained exactly." In suffering Himself to be addressed as "Good

Master" He "incidentally classes His own goodness as among the imperfect kind," and we are told that "such vast scientific and industrial and political progress of man as has since taken place was probably not imagined by Him." Mr. Spencer does not grow less courageous as he proceeds, for he regards the doctrine of the heredity of sinful bias as a monstrosity. Of this alleged "meaning" of the Faith we can only say, "The OLD is better"; and we remember the late Mr. Spurgeon's witty but pungent epigram: "There is nothing new in theology save that which is false."

THE PEOPLE OF GOD: AN INQUIRY INTO CHRISTIAN ORIGINS. By H. F. Hamilton, D.D. Vol. I.: Israel. Vol. II.: The Church. London: *The Oxford Press.* Price 18s. net.

We took up this book with real interest; we put it down with feelings of disappointment mingled, it must be confessed, with admiration for the author's patient erudition, powerful pleading, and altogether excellent temper. We cannot follow him. So far as the first volume and its argument is concerned, has it struck him, one wonders, that if his theory be true, the Bible really possesses but little authority, and no inspiration worthy of the name? The reader is on the horns of a dilemma—he must decide between Dr. Hamilton and the Hebrew Scriptures. The Old Testament gives us an account of the way in which God revealed Himself. Instead of this, we are asked to accept an imaginary account of the way a change took place in human worship from many gods to one God, and the constant reference to Yahvism and Mono-Yahvism and Yahveh is wearying and bewildering.

The second volume, despite the promise of an attractive preface, is as disappointing as the first. Over the desert Dr. Hamilton follows the mirage of Apostolic succession. He wears, metaphorically, coloured spectacles, and seems unable to understand the position of those who differ from him; indeed, his views are clearly held to be *sine qua non.* "Back to the Fathers" is the cry we often hear, and our author does not hesitate to echo it. "Back to the Grandfathers" we heard a well-known preacher once cry—back to the Apostles. Here we are on safer ground. The pity is that Dr. Hamilton relies on those among whom there are diverse opinions, all parties being able to use them to advantage.

THE PENTATEUCHAL TEXT: A REPLY TO DR. SKINNER. By Harold M. Wiener, M.A., LL.B., of Lincoln's Inn. London: *Elliot Stock.* Price 6d. net.

The point at issue between Mr. Wiener and Dr. Skinner involves the very alphabet of textual criticism. And, as Mr. Wiener very fairly contends, before addressing one's self to the literary problem whether the use of the respective names Jehovah and Elohim is characteristic of different writers, one ought to find out first whether the respective names are really to be found in the passages quoted or not. This is a question of textual criticism; and to textual criticism the modern Old Testament critic has never as yet resorted. There are three main sources from which the true text of the Old Testament may be discovered. One of these is the so-called Massoretic text, which was made, not before, but after, the Christian Church was founded; the text in the hands of the translators of the Septuagint in the

second or third century B.C. (the question of the date of the LXX., in spite of the bold assertions of some recent critics, is still *sub judice*); and the text of the Samaritan Pentateuch, which may have been originally made any time between the reign of Hezekiah, when the King of Assyria settled a heathen race in Samaria, to a period subsequent to the Return from the Captivity. This is the question Mr. Wiener discusses, and he comes to the conclusion that the LXX. text was derived from Hebrew manuscripts which were in existence before the Samaritan schism. We must refer the reader to his pages for the arguments with which he defends his position. But he points out that Hassenkamp and the great Hebrew scholar Gesenius, at a certain stage of their investigation, assumed one of the very points which it was their duty to prove. As this has been all along a characteristic of the Old Testament critic, readers will not be surprised to learn that Mr. Wiener complains that Dr. Skinner makes "no direct answer at all" to this assertion. He further "makes concessions," Mr. Wiener declares, "which appear to destroy Gesenius' view altogether." Next, Mr. Wiener goes on to show that the Massoretic text is not "confirmed," as Dr. Skinner further contends, "by the Vulgate." He goes on to argue that Origen and Jerome seem to have had before them "various other texts"; that the Massorites not only had "a single imperfect archetype" before them, but that this archetype was "deliberately altered on non-critical principles" (of which we have one out of many examples in the well-known correction made in Ps. xxii. 17); and that "the Egyptian tradition"—that on which the LXX. was based—was "separated from the Palestinian before the Samaritan." It is clear from all this that Old Testament textual criticism is at present in its infancy, and that, as Mr. Wiener puts it, "the issues now involved touch not merely the Divine appellations but the whole problem of the text, and it is already certain that the old views which have done duty for so long will be challenged all along the line." So that instead of "the assured results of modern scientific criticism," of which we have heard so much, we find ourselves face to face with the fact that the axioms and postulates on which scientific criticism depends for its results are just being laid down. J. J. LIAS.

THE SOVEREIGNTY OF CHARACTER. By Albert D. Watson. London: *Macmillan and Co., Ltd.* Price 4s. 6d. net.

"Lessons in the Life of Jesus" is the sub-title of this delightful volume of short chapters or readings on *the* Life of lives. The list of contents, carefully analyzed, shows that the whole range of the Redeemer's life is covered. There is no attempt to draw upon the imagination or to explain away what is written. On the Resurrection, for instance, there is clear and definite teaching, and, although the matter is not discussed critically, Mr. Watson says: "To my mind, no fact of history is based on a surer testimony than that Jesus was seen alive after His death on the Cross." The conclusion, summed up in four pages, is worth the whole book. The chapters are short, and would be most useful for reading at family prayers.

THE SANCTITY OF CHURCH MUSIC. By the Rev. T. Francis Forth, B.A. London: *J. and J. Bennett, Ltd.* Price 2s. 6d. net.

This book is really much more than it pretends to be. It is not merely a dissertation on the sanctity of Church music; it is a brief but careful

history of the subject. However much we may differ from some of the author's opinions, there are some points upon which he will find many to agree with him. Is it not too true that, as he says, "music in the Church has developed beyond all bounds, so that the people's part is not only reduced to a minimum, but in some churches seems to be extinct"? He rightly objects to the introduction of *Kyries*, "which it is practically impossible to sing congregationally" in obedience to the rubric, which directs that "*the people* . . . shall ask God mercy for their transgression." "Is it not possible," the writer asks, "that Church music, reading, and rendering should be taught as necessary subjects of the general curriculum at those colleges which profess to train men for the ministry?" This is indeed a pertinent question, and if Mr. Forth's book directs attention to it many will be grateful.

CHALLENGE AND CHEER. By the Rev. J. Warschauer, M.A., D.Phil. London: *Robert Scott.* Price 3s. 6d. net.

These Sunday studies in week-day religion are of a high order. They are characterized by deep spiritual insight combined with a wide outlook and a knowledge of human nature. In some of them the preacher boldly leaves the beaten track—without, however, forsaking the old Evangel, which is ever to the fore. For example, he illustrates a sermon on "The Value of Effort," based on St. Paul's words, "This one thing I do," from Browning's "Grammarian"; while another on "Man in Search of his Soul," with our Lord's question, "What shall it profit a man?" as the text, is skilfully and effectively built up on Ibsen's "Peer Gynt." They are indeed sermons that were worth listening to, and were well worth printing.

Publications of the Month.

[*The brevity of the following list is a striking indication of the havoc the war is working with the publishing season.*]

PARABOLIC GOSPEL, THE: or Christ's Parables, a Sequence and a Synthesis. By the Rev. R. M. Lithgow. (*T. and T. Clark.* 4s. net.)

WHEN WILL OUR LORD RETURN? Prophetic Times and Warning Events. By Harold Norris. (*C. J. Thynne.* 1s. net.)

SEEDS SCATTERED BROADCAST, or Incidents in a Camp Hospital. By S. McBeth. Third Edition. (*C. J. Thynne.* 1s. 6d. net.)

REGENERATION OF NEW CHINA. By Nelson Bitton. With Introduction by the Rev. Lord William Gascoyne-Cecil. (*C.M.S.*, 2s. net.)

ROAD-MAKING FOR THE KING. The Story of South Street Mission, Hammersmith. By Sister Lizzie. Second Edition. (*Morgan and Scott, Ltd.* 2s. net.)

SUPPLEMENT, THE. A collection of Hymns and Tunes specially designed as a supplement to any Hymn-Book. (*Morgan and Scott, Ltd.* 2s. 6d. net.)

SOPHIA. By Stanley Weyman. THE POTTER'S THUMB. By Flora Annie Steel. (*T. Nelson and Sons.* 7d. net each.)