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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

May, 1915.

The Month.

The Royal Lead.

THE King's lead is magnificent. While the Government have been debating how best to regulate and control the liquor traffic in relation to its bearing upon the output of munitions of war, His Majesty has come forward and set an example which, if it were generally followed, would not only solve the problem which is baffling the best statesmanship, but would also go far towards removing, for all time, the drink evil from our midst. Yet is it being followed to any appreciable extent? "By the King's command," so ran the Royal Decree, "no wines, spirits, or beer will be consumed in any of His Majesty's houses after to-day (April 6)." When this decree was first made known, we thought it would be followed immediately by a great campaign to secure as many adherents as possible to what may not inaptly be termed the King's pledge; but we have heard of no such movement. Of isolated instances there have been several, and a joint manifesto has been issued, signed by the two Archbishops, Cardinal Bourne, and the President of the Free Church Council; yet these things are not enough. The printed message is all very well in its way; but if this were to be relied on solely, it may be said at once that nothing has yet been written which is half so impressive as the simple terms of the Royal Decree. What is needed is the living word, the personal appeal, and we are simply amazed that so few, comparatively, of the clergy have bestirred themselves to press the King's example upon their people in the most effective way. What, it may be asked, is the Church of England Temperance Society doing in the

matter? It has issued some special pledge cards, and these are duly announced in a very short advertisement in the "Personal" column of *The Times!* But is this all that the Society can do at a time of great emergency such as this? The Society, like many other institutions, has no doubt been hard hit by the war, but the King's lead has given it an opportunity to propagate its principles such as it has never had before and is never likely to have again, and the utmost efforts should be put forth to use it to the fullest possible advantage. But no central body can do its work effectively unless it is adequately supported, and we greatly fear that for a long time past Churchpeople have not given their own temperance organization anything like the support it deserves. No time should be lost, therefore, in strengthening its hands at this important crisis, that the C.E.T.S. may be able to take a strong lead in rousing the country to the paramount importance, alike for our national safety, and our national wellbeing, of following the King's lead in the matter of voluntary abstinence.

Clergy and People.

But the work ought not to be left entirely to temperance organizations or professed temperance people. It is primarily the duty of the parochial clergy as such to do their utmost to promote the moral welfare of their people; and if they will make known from house to house the Royal Decree, and seek to get all their people to follow the King's example, they will have such success as will astonish them. It ought not to escape notice that the King, in doing what he has done, has been actuated by the very highest motives. Some six days before the decree was issued he wrote by Lord Stamfordham: "If it be deemed advisable, the King will be prepared to set the example by giving up all alcoholic liquor himself, and issuing orders against its consumption in the Royal Household, so that no difference shall be made so far as His Majesty is concerned between the treatment of rich and poor in this question." These are noble words, and recall instinctively the familiar exhortations of St. Paul, "That no

man put a stumblingblock or an occasion to fall in his brother's way," and "It is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor anything whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak." The thought of our King thus putting away what might possibly become an occasion of stumbling to others should be an inspiration to us all.

A Bishop in Khaki.

The Bishop of London's Mission to the Front is, in its own way, one of the most memorable incidents of the war. It is not easy to recall an instance of a Bishop, and he the premier Bishop, going out in khaki as a simple Missioner to minister to troops in action, and the precedent now created has struck the imagination of the country even as it was most highly appreciated by the army in the field. Sir John French's tribute to the Bishop's energy and fearlessness deserves to be placed on record. "Personal fatigue," writes the Commander-in-Chief, "and even danger were completely ignored by his Lordship. The Bishop held several services virtually under shell fire, and it was with difficulty that he could be prevented from carrying on his ministrations under rifle fire." The Church has reason to be proud of the Bishop of London in this matter, and to be thankful that he was given a message which appealed to the men. Sir John French records his deep sense of "the good effect produced throughout the Army" by, and his own "very deep indebtedness" for, the Bishop's ministrations.

Secret of Success.

The Bishop's own narrative, and also that of the officer who accompanied him, are most interesting, and they suggest at least one reflection. What was it that so deeply moved those vast thousands of men, and led so many of them, as we may humbly and thankfully believe, to a truer and deeper personal knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ? Was it not the simple preaching of the Gospel? It is impossible to read the Bishop's letter without realizing that it was the story of "the wondrous Cross" that touched men's

hearts. So it will ever be. And yet, at home, is that story told as faithfully and as simply or as often as it should be? It was, we believe, the late Bishop Bickersteth, of Ripon, who once said that every sermon should contain in some form or other the story of the Cross. That was, perhaps, a counsel of perfection; but are we not now in danger of going to the opposite extreme and leaving it out altogether? The matter is one of most pressing importance. We are persuaded that the future spiritual welfare of our country depends upon a revival of evangelistic zeal in the Church of England; and we should like to see a large increase of the spirit which took the Bishop of London to the Front prevailing in more ordinary ministrations of the Church at home.

"Bernhardism in England."

Not all the "Papers for War Time" which are being issued under the editorship of the Rev. William Temple are of equal merit or of equal importance, and we cannot but regard one of the latest of these, "Bernhardism in England," by Mr. A. Clutton-Brock, as distinctly unfortunate. As we read him, the writer seems to imply that there is a Bernhardism in England just as virulent and just as pagan as Bernhardism in Germany. He finds it "latent in the most unexpected places," and proceeds to show that it occurs in Mozley's memorable sermon on war. He finds it also in the press of to-day, and makes great play with an article in "one of our papers" which talks "Bernhardism as no Englishman could, unless he were possessed by the belief that the Prussian view of international morals is right, and our old English view wrong." Mr. Clutton-Brock anticipates the objection that he makes too much of the passages he quotes, and says that while "they are written by men ignorant and tired," there is more in it than that, for, "as we are all more or less ignorant and often tired, we are all apt to take the line of least resistance both in thought and in action. And Bernhardism is the line of least resistance, like all kinds of Paganism." But this is not all:

"There always has been for all men an allurement, not only in the passions themselves, but also in a glorification of them. That is the allurement of Paganism; and it appeals to us all, like soft turf when we are climbing a mountain. In war, too, we have to make great material efforts, and have therefore the less energy left for spiritual efforts. We are tired and a little afraid. Deprived of many physical luxuries, we want some mental luxury, and we get it in Bernhardism, in a sensuous reaction from all the spiritual effort and the spiritual ideas that trouble us in time of peace. Just as a soldier is most apt to pillage after a hard battle or siege, so we are apt in war-time to free ourselves from arduous hopes and responsibilities, and to enjoy the thought that war gives us that freedom as a perquisite. Then we listen to those who talk most basely and foolishly, as soldiers, when they are out of hand, will follow the worst ruffian among them. The leader of thought is the man who thinks least; the popular prophet is the one who cannot see an inch in front of his nose; the extremest patriot is the most ignorant, the most tired, the most frightened among us."

We hazard the suggestion that Mr. Clutton-Brock was just a little "tired" when he wrote this deplorable passage, for deplorable it is, if it is meant to indicate the attitude of English Christians towards this war. We have seen no evidence—and we have watched carefully—of this "glorification" of "passions" among them, and, frankly, we do not believe that it exists. The whole nation, and especially the Christian portion of it, has exercised and is exercising the utmost restraint in the presence of the attacks of an enemy who, almost daily, is defying all recognized rules of warfare and reverting to sheer barbarism. The heart of the nation is aflame with indignation at the infamies of Germany, and is determined that the power of militarism or Bernhardism shall be crushed beyond all hope of recovery. This, however, is not the "glorification" of "passions"; it is rather the manifestation of a firm resolve that, having entered upon "a spiritual conflict," the sword shall not be sheathed until its full purpose is accomplished.

Sunday Newspapers.

The publication of two fresh Sunday newspapers raises some very important questions affecting not merely the religious, but also the social and industrial life of the nation. Much as we dislike Sunday newspapers, believing, as we do, that their publication is inimical to the promotion of that spirit of quiet rest and serious meditatio

upon the things that are eternal which should characterize the Lord's Day, we fear it is too late now to object to the Sunday newspaper *per se*. But we have a right to object, and the nation has a right to object, on social and on industrial grounds to the introduction of the seven-days' newspaper. We do not say—for at present we have no means of knowing — that the two fresh newspapers which have just entered the lists come under that category, but they so closely resemble two of the illustrated dailies as at least to make it worth while to ask those under whose auspices they are being brought out for an assurance that their publication is independent, and will not involve either the editorial or the publishing staff of the corresponding dailies in seven days' labour. The principle of one day's rest in seven is the most precious heritage of working people, and it is to their interest, as much as to that of the community at large, that it should be most sacredly guarded. This particular aspect of the case is of the utmost importance, for we fear that the appearance of these two new Sunday journals will raise afresh the question of the publication of Sunday editions of some of our dailies. Many years ago such a project was mooted, and it was strangled at the birth by the strong grip of public opinion. On the outbreak of war no fewer than three daily papers published Sunday editions, and so became seven-day newspapers ; but in this case also the pressure of public opinion again proved effective. We should hope that, if the experiment is repeated on any pretext whatever, it may once more be doomed to failure ; but the phenomenal success of the first copies of these new Sunday papers makes us anxious. We trust that the Institute of Journalists will make rigid inquiry into the question whether in any case the publication of a Sunday newspaper involves a seven-day working week for journalists, and if they find that it does, will take whatever action they feel to be desirable. The newspaper distributors and newspaper agents are in a still worse position, for it is difficult to see where relief can come from for them. Their Sunday labour is already sufficiently hard, and it is a serious matter that it should be increased.

Pure Newspapers.

It may be argued that these two new Sunday journals will at least be clean, and that their competition may lessen the sale of some others which can hardly be so described. We cannot admit the force of the argument. Our view is that steps should be taken to compel any paper that is not wholly pure to adopt a higher standard. How can this be done? Simply by the force of moral pressure. Public opinion has greatly improved the tone of music-halls, and it could do much for Sunday newspapers if only it could find the means of voicing its views. We ought to be able to look for help to the societies which exist for the protection of Sunday, but they are so hopelessly divided among themselves—as the wrangles over the Weekly Rest-Day Bill showed—that not much assistance may be expected from that quarter. Yet the question is one of great importance.

Bishop Weston Again.

While we are waiting for the Archbishop of Canterbury's decision on the Kikuyu affair, the Bishop of Zanzibar has provided the Church with another topic for its consideration. The Bishop of Hereford lately promoted the Rev. H. B. Streeter to a Canonry of the Cathedral. Now, Mr. Streeter was the author of an essay which Bishop Weston strongly condemned as unsound. Those who remember his lordship's "Ecclesia Anglicana: for what does she stand?" will readily recall the nature of his criticism. The news of this promotion seems to have travelled to East Africa, and has so distressed the Bishop of Zanzibar that he has issued a formal declaration, in which, after setting out the ground of his complaint, he pronounces that so long as it remains, "there can be, and from this day forward there is, no Communion in sacred things between ourselves and the Right Reverend John, Lord Bishop of Hereford, nor between ourselves and any priest within his jurisdiction who shall make known his approval of the false doctrines now officially authorized within the Diocese of Hereford." This declaration must not be taken too seriously, but it raises some interesting questions. How far is an individual

Bishop entitled to separate himself from another Bishop of the same Communion, and under what circumstances and when? In the first Appendix to Bishop Weston's own pamphlet, "The Case against Kikuyu," there is a passage which seems to tell against his present contention: "No man is permitted to separate himself from communion with his Bishop until he has been officially deposed by his fellow-Bishops. Otherwise the Church would have no order at all." This was written, no doubt, concerning the relations between priest and Bishop; but if it is a valid argument at all, its validity is doubly as strong, one would think, as between Bishop and Bishop. But neither the Bishop of Hereford nor his nominee has been even arraigned, much less condemned, by any ecclesiastical authority; and it does seem to be an extraordinary action for a junior Bishop in a far-off diocese in Africa to take upon himself to withdraw from "communion in sacred things" with one of the oldest members of the home episcopate.

Episcopal Isolation.

The Bishop of Zanzibar's action, if followed to its logical conclusion, would lead him into a position of absolute isolation. A correspondent of the *Church Times* puts the case in this way: "Are not the grounds upon which he withdraws from communion with the Bishop of Hereford such as virtually involve withdrawal from communion with the English Episcopate? A Bishop who excommunicates a brother Bishop on the ground of tolerating heresy would seem inferentially to excommunicate all who tolerate the toleration. From the point of view of the Bishop of Zanzibar, every Bishop remaining in communion with the Bishop of Hereford becomes thereby *particeps criminis*, and the Bishop should no longer know a Catholic Church in England, but only the Catholic Church of Zanzibar." The correspondent seems to have caught the Bishop of Zanzibar on the horns of a dilemma. But perhaps his lordship is really seeking after some way of escape from the position in which the Kikuyu incident has placed him, and "the Catholic Church of Zanzibar" may provide it.

The Christ of the Gospel.

No. V.—"ASCENDED INTO HEAVEN."

I.

THE belief, hitherto so widely held, that the New Testament gives us an account of a single Ascension of Christ occurring forty days after the Resurrection has involved commentators and harmonists in insuperable difficulties. If, following Holy Scripture as we believe, we consider the Ascension narrated at the beginning of the Acts of the Apostles as the final one of a series, and the one to which the greatest importance is attached because of its finality and its marking the preparation for Pentecost, the difficulties alluded to disappear, and with them a strained exegesis which betrayed its own uneasiness.

On the Resurrection morning the Lord was seen by Mary Magdalene, who said to her: "Touch me not; for I have not yet ascended to the Father: but go to my brothers, and say to them, I ascend (*ἀναβαίνω*) to my Father and your Father, and my God and your God."[1] This passage has caused difficulties merely because of the prejudice in favour of a single Ascension. But for this prejudice it would have been taken in its simple meaning—our Lord bids Mary not to touch Him (*μή μου ἅπτου*[2]), since He has not yet ascended, but to go and tell His brothers that He was ascending, not in the future, but *now* to His Father, who was also their Father. This explains at once the use of the present tense *ἀναβαίνω*, its contrast with *ἀναβέβηκα*, and, what is so natural, the solicitude of Jesus for his brothers, the sons of Mary His mother.[3] Beyschlag, noting that our

[1] John xx. 17.

[2] The imperative may well be conative (*cf.* Moulton's "Prolegomena," p. 125). *ἅπτομαι* occurs over thirty times in the N.T., and in all these places can be rendered "touch." The R.V. margin renders here "Take not hold on me," to avoid the *seeming* inconsistency with Matt. xxviii. 9.

[3] "It ought to be hardly necessary to say that the notion of a return of Jesus to his heavenly Father immediately after his resurrection is by no means inconsistent with the Church doctrine of his ascension at the end of the forty days. This last is simply his final departure, made visible because it was final" (Milligan, "The Resurrection of our Lord," p. 236, note).

Lord forbade Mary Magdalene to touch Him, and yet later in the day allowed other women to take hold of His feet (Matt. xxviii. 9), regards the latter incident as unhistorical.[1] Interpose an invisible Ascension, and the difficulty vanishes; what was permissible after Ascension was not permissible before (*cf.*, too, Luke xxiv. 39).

This passage (John xx. 17) is, however, not the only one which indicates that our Lord ascended immediately after the Resurrection. It is implied in the last discourses that He would do so. When He speaks of His going to the Father, He tells them that this event must happen before they can see Him again:

> "A little while, and ye behold me no more; and again a little while, and ye shall see me. Some of his disciples said therefore, What is this that he saith unto us, A little while, and ye behold me not; and again a little while, and ye shall see me: and, Because I go to the Father? They said therefore, What is this that he saith, A little while? We know not what he saith. Jesus perceived that they were desirous to ask him, and he said unto them, Do ye inquire among yourselves concerning this, that I said, A little while, and ye behold me not; and again a little while, and ye shall see me? . . . ye now have sorrow: but I will see you again, and your heart shall rejoice (*καὶ χαρήσεται ὑμῶν ἡ καρδία*)."[2]

With this last clause compare xx. 20: "The disciples therefore were glad (*ἐχάρησαν*) when they saw the Lord." When speaking to the two disciples on the way to Emmaus, our Lord uses a mode of speech which possibly involves the idea that He had already ascended at the beginning of the day: "Behoved it not the Christ to have suffered these very things, and to have entered into his glory?"—*οὐχὶ ταῦτα ἔδει παθεῖν τὸν Χριστὸν, καὶ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ*;[3] On the evening of the same day our Lord appears to the disciples—"the eleven and them that were with them," as St. Luke (xxiv. 33) tells us—and "breathed

[1] "Leben Jesu," vol. i., pp. 410, 411.
[2] John xvi. 16-19, 22.
[3] Luke xxiv. 26. See, however, Plummer, "Intern. Critical Com.," p. 555.

on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost" (John xx. 19-23). This gift, increased and perfected at Pentecost, implies an Ascension of our Lord, for it was not till He had been glorified that such a gift was available for men (John vii. 39, xvi. 7); and it was owing to Ascension that He was able to say: "All power was given to me (ἐδόθη μοι) in heaven and on the earth" (Matt. xxviii. 18).[1]

The nature of our Lord's priestly office requires an immediate Ascension after the Resurrection. He is our High-Priest; and the ceremonial on the Day of Atonement was typical of the sacrificial work of Christ. As He was just about to enter into the most holy place on His meeting with Mary Magdalene, the prohibition, "Touch me not," became plain. On the Day of Atonement the high-priest, after the sacrifice for the sins of the whole people had been slain, immediately carried the blood into the most holy place and sprinkled it before the mercy-seat, making intercession for the people. So in Heb. i. 3 the sacrifice and the Ascension are connected—"when he had made purification of sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high." The objection, derived from the passage ix. 12 of the same Epistle—"He entered in once for all (ἐφάπαξ) into the holy place"—that our Lord made but one entrance into heaven rests on a misunderstanding. A careful study of the whole chapter shows that the meaning is that as Christ did not suffer in every age, but "once (ἅπαξ) at the end of the ages" (ver. 26), so He did not enter heaven at every age, but in *one age* of the world. The expression applied to the high-priest in verse 7, "once in the year," does not mean that he entered once only into the most holy place on the Day of Atonement; for, as a matter of fact, Lev. xvi. 13-15 implies more than one entrance, and the Talmudic tract, "Yōmā," tells us that he went in four times, first with the incense, then with the blood of the bullock, then with that of the goat, and finally to remove the censer and

[1] Moulton, "Proleg.," p. 140, puts the aorist amongst those of "things just happened," though allowing that some of the examples he quotes may be otherwise explained.

the coal-pan after the evening sacrifice had been offered.[1] Christ entered the most holy place once for all for a particular purpose, to present His own blood, not yearly as the high-priest, with blood not his own (ver. 25, ἐν αἵματι ἀλλοτρίῳ).

The Ascension described in the closing words of St. Luke's Gospel—

> "And he led them out until they were over against Bethany: and he lifted up his hands, and blessed them. And it came to pass, while he blessed them, he parted from them [[and was carried up into heaven]]. And they worshipped him, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy: and were continually in the temple, blessing God"[2]—

is not to be identified with the final one which took place from the Mount of Olives, but is one recorded as having taken place at the close of the day of the Resurrection.[3] Those who wish to harmonize this account with that of the Acts find it necessary to interpolate a period of forty days somewhere in the narrative of Luke xxiv. 36-50, either between verses 43 and 44, or between verses 49 and 50. But it is clear that St. Luke is in this chapter narrating a series of events which took place on the same day (*cf.* ver. 13, ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ); and there is force in Professor Whiston's contention: "I am sure that if we saw an history with the like plain circumstances of time in Herodotus or Livy, we should make no scruple to assert that it belonged to the very time at first mentioned; and why the sacred writers should not be supposed as careful at least and as accurate as the profane, I do by no means understand."[4] Professor Lake points out that from the use of εἶπεν δέ ("and he said," ver. 44), characteristic of St. Luke both in Gospel and Acts to indicate the continuation of a narrative, we have a corroboration of the general impression that no intervals of time are to be interjected into the narrative.[5] It is true that the text of verse 51 gives

[1] Yōmā, Mishna, v. 1-3. *Cf.* also Josephus, "Antiq.," iii. 10; Bedmidbar Rabbah, vii.
[2] Luke xxiv. 50-53.
[3] Wright, A., "St. Luke's Gospel in Greek," p. 219.
[4] "Essays and Sermons," p. 157.
[5] "Historical Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ," p. 108.

some difficulty, the words put between double brackets, "and was carried up into heaven," being omitted by some ancient authorities; and it is thus suggested that we have no Ascension account at all in the Gospel, this Western non-interpolation, as it is called, being no part of the true text.[1] But we think the Revisers of 1881 have retained the words rightly, and that they were omitted in ancient authorities by scribes who saw that the accounts of the Gospel and Acts could not be harmonized and who were unwilling to allow more than one Ascension. Moreover, we have some internal evidence that St. Luke's Gospel ended with an Ascension. The passage—

> "And it came to pass, when the days were being fulfilled that he should be received up (*τῆς ἀναλήμψεως αὐτοῦ*) he stedfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem"[2]—

would suggest that an *ἀναλήμψις*—*i.e.*, an Ascension—would be chronicled. And that it was is certain from St. Luke's own subsequent statements. In his preface to the Acts of the Apostles he tells us that the former treatise contained an account of "all that Jesus began to do and teach until the day" (*i.e.*, the day of the Resurrection) "in which he was taken up (*ἀνελήμφθη*)"; and again he refers to the period of our Lord's ministry as "beginning from the baptism of John unto the same day that he was taken up from us" (Acts ii. 22).[3]

The view taken of Ascension on the day of the Resurrection has some support outside the evidence of the New Testament. In the Epistle of Barnabas (xv. 9) occurs the following passage: "We keep the eighth day for rejoicing, in which also Jesus arose from the dead and having been manifested ascended into heaven" (*ἀνέβη εἰς οὐρανούς*); thus affirming that Resurrection and Ascension took place on the same day, though Raggenbach suggests that the Ascension is introduced by Barnabas after

[1] Westcott and Hort, "Notes on Selected Readings," p. 73.

[2] Luke ix. 51.

[3] The difficulty of all the events narrated in Luke xxiv. occurring on one day is well met by Lake, *op. cit.*, pp. 108, 109.

the Resurrection merely to emphasize the fact that Christ was no longer subject to death, and H. Smith[1] that the statement merely emphasizes the Apostolic view that the Ascension is regarded as the complement of the Resurrection. But there is nothing either in the immediate context or elsewhere in the Epistle of Barnabas to substantiate these opinions.

In the apocryphal Gospel of Peter, dated early second century by Harnack, the Ascension is connected with the Crucifixion:

> "And the Lord cried out, My power, my power, hast thou forsaken me? And when he had said this he was taken up"

(chap. v.; *cf.* Orig., Matt., 140); and later in the book, chap. xiii., is placed *before* any appearances:

> "And they [Mary Magdalene and her friends] . . . see a young man sitting in the midst of the tomb . . . who said to them, Wherefore are ye come? Whom seek ye? Him that was crucified? He is risen and gone."

The curious interpolation before Mark xvi. 4 in the Old Latin Codex *k* (Bobiensis) should also be noticed in this connection. It runs: "Subito autem ad horam tertiam tenebræ diei factæ sunt per totum orbem terræ et descenderunt de cælis angeli et surgent in claritate vivi dei *ascenderunt cum eo* et continuo lux facta est tunc illæ accesserunt ad monimentum et vident revolutum lapidem fuit enim magnus nimis."

We now pass on to the account of the final Ascension given by St. Luke in the opening verses of the Acts of the Apostles (i. 1-12).[2] A comparison of this passage with Luke xxiv. shows much in common, and this can the better be grasped if we arrange the parallelism thus:

[1] "The Creeds: their History, Nature, and Use," p. 101.

[2] We cannot follow those who would not refer the assembly of verses 6 *ff.* to that mentioned in verse 4. See Knowling, "Expositor's Greek Testament," vol. ii. p. 55.

St. Luke.	Acts of the Apostles.
1. "Over against (ἕως πρός) Bethany . . . He parted from them" (ver. 50; *cf.* xix. 29, 30).	1. "They returned from the mount called Olivet" (ver. 12). "He was taken up" (ver. 9).
2. "Behold, I send forth the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city, until ye be clothed with power from on high" (ver. 49).	2. "He charged them not to depart from Jerusalem, but to wait for the promise of the Father . . . ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost . . . ye shall receive power," etc. (ver. 4-8).
3. "Repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem. Ye are witnesses of these things" (ver. 47, 48).	3. "Ye shall be my witnesses both in Jerusalem, and in all Judæa and Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth" (ver. 8).

The words of our Lord in both passages are substantially the same; the place of ascension need not be different;[1] but new features in Acts are the time, the fortieth day after the Resurrection (ver. 3); and the circumstantial details, the appearance of the two men in white apparel,[2] the conversation, etc. If we consider these ascensions to be identical, we must interject, as mentioned above, a space of forty days somewhere in St. Luke's Gospel account, a device which is "a despairing clutch of harmonistics"; or we must suppose that between writing his two accounts of the same event St. Luke obtained further information as to the time of the Ascension which he has incorporated in his later treatise.[3] This is arbitrary conjecture; and so careful a writer as St. Luke (see Preface to the Gospel) would have given some explanation of his mistake and retracted it. To Theophilus the matter was clear, for he was aware that no contradiction could exist between accounts in the Lucan writings of Ascensions which took place at different periods, one on the Resurrection day, the other forty days after, the latter naturally introducing the history of the

[1] See Van Osterzee, "Com. on St. Luke," p. 444; Swete, "Appearances after the Passion," p. 97.

[2] Latham ("Risen Master," p. 402) thinks these are not angels, mainly because of the tone of their address. It is suggested they may be Essenes.

[3] Brant, "Die Evang. Ges. und der Ursprung des Christentums," pp. 370 *ff.*

Church which was to follow in the narrative of the Acts of the Apostles.

Harnack[1] draws attention to the position the Ascension takes in the fragment of the old Christian hymn preserved by the author of the Pastoral Epistles,

Ὃς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί,
ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι,
ὤφθη ἀγγέλοις,
ἐκηρύχθη ἐν ἔθνεσιν,
ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ,
ἀνελήμφθη ἐν δόξῃ,[2]

as confirming the ideas of some (*cf.* Irenæus, i. 3, 2; 30, 14; "Ascensio Isaiah," p. 43; "Pistis Sophia," p. 1), who maintained the existence of a longer period between the Resurrection and the final Ascension than the forty days of Acts.[3] But we must bear in mind that a chronological sequence need not be maintained, the last five clauses being consequences of the Resurrection, to which the first clause refers, and the last clause by a well-known brachylogy (*ἀνελήμφθη εἰς δόξαν καὶ ἐστίν ἐν δόξῃ*) connecting the assumption of Christ with the position in which He finds Himself continuing, and so forming a natural conclusion to the hymn.

St. Matthew's Gospel gives us no account of the Ascension; but it is difficult to think that it was not in the mind of the author when he wrote the concluding scene of his narrative. In the Revised Version the passage runs:

> "But the eleven disciples went into Galilee, unto the mountain where Jesus had appointed them. And when they saw him, they worshipped him: but some doubted. And Jesus came unto them and spake unto them, saying, All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and upon earth. Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them

[1] "History of Dogma," vol. i., p. 203 (English translation).

[2] 1 Tim. iii. 16: "He who was manifested in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached among the nations, believed on in the world, received up in glory" (R.V.)

[3] Swete, "The Apostles' Creed," pp. 69, 70.

> to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you: and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." [1]

The passage is closely allied to that of Acts i. 6-9,—the mention of the eleven disciples only (contrast Luke xxiv. 33); the scene on the mountain (τὸ ὄρος); the words of Jesus are similar in content (*cf.* vers. 19, 20 with Acts i. 8); whilst the promise, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world," is plainly a word of farewell.[2] That the visible Ascension should not be mentioned is agreeable with the plan of the first Gospel, which finds a natural conclusion in the majestic picture of the Messiah, Jewish and Daniel-like (*cf.* Dan. ii. 38, vii. 14, 25 *ff.*), claiming all authority in heaven and earth.[3]

The original ending of St. Mark's Gospel being lost, we cannot say whether that Gospel contained any account of the Ascension. The longer alternative ending given in the Revised Version (xvi. 9-20), possibly the composition of the Aristion mentioned by Papias, a disciple of the Lord, would lead us to think that its author, like St. Luke, contemplated an Ascension as taking place at the end of the day of the Resurrection. If Blass's theory be established, that St. Mark is the source of St. Luke's information for the history of the Jerusalem church narrated in the earlier chapters of the Acts, then in all probability the Gospel of St. Mark closed with an account of the Ascension.[4]

That St. John does not give us any account of the visible Ascension need not surprise us when we consider the purpose for which his Gospel was written (xx. 30, 31). He has no account of the birth of Christ or of the institution of the Lord's Supper, yet he was certainly not ignorant of these facts.[5] Since

[1] Matt. xxviii. 16-20.

[2] "St. Matthew, who does not record the event, is the best interpreter of its meaning, 'Lo, I am with you alway.' Ascension is rather the festival of Christ's presence in the world than of his departure from it" (*Expository Times*, 1900, p. 155).

[3] Schmidt, "Biblical Theology of the New Testament," p. 89.

[4] Blass, "Acta Apost.," § 4; "Philology of Gospels," pp. 141 *ff.* See also Briggs, "New Light on the Life of Jesus," pp. 112 *ff.*

[5] See THE CHURCHMAN, February 1915, p. 95.

throughout his Gospel he selects his facts for a particular purpose we cannot say that he was ignorant of the Ascension; and such passages as vi. 62, xiv. 12, xvi. 28, xvii. 4, 5, xx. 17, prove beyond question that he knew Christ to have ascended into heaven.

II.

The historicity of the tradition narrated in the Acts is indubitable. No writer of the apostolic age was capable of forging such a narrative. The question, "Lord, art thou at this time restoring the kingdom to Israel?" (ver. 6), is one which mirrors the expectation of the times, and which a later generation would hardly attribute to the Apostles. The Jews pictured a Messiah who should remain on earth, and the national character of the Apostles' hopes revealed in the question affords no groundwork for the construction of an Ascension myth.[1] Moreover, the quiet restraint of the narrative, its simple phraseology, its freedom from such accretions as mark legendary growths, commend it to an unprejudiced reader as derived from an eye-witness of the scene.

In the Pauline Epistles we have but three allusions to the Ascension as an event—viz., Eph. iv. 10: "He that descended (ὁ καταβάς) is the same also as he that ascended (ὁ ἀναβάς) far above all the heavens"; 1 Thess. iv. 16: "The Lord himself shall descend from heaven"—descent implying a previous ascent; and the passage, 1 Tim. iii. 16, quoted above. But throughout the fact is assumed; and we may account for the absence of biographical material by the consideration that the Ascension had not the same evidential value as the Resurrection, that St. Paul was writing to Churches which had already received instruction from himself or others, and that he wished to bring especially before his readers the living and exalted Saviour.[2] In the Epistle to the Hebrews we read of Christ as

[1] "That Christ ascended, *according to the Scriptures*, was never an article of the Creed. The Ascension of the Messiah had not been part of the Jewish expectation" (E.R.E. ii., p. 153).

[2] "Cambridge Theological Essays," pp. 426-428.

one "who hath passed through the heavens" (διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανούς, iv. 14); and, again, as "made higher than the heavens" (ὑψηλότερος τῶν οὐρανῶν γενόμενος, vii. 26). St. Peter clearly distinguishes the Ascension from the Resurrection[1]—"through the Resurrection of Jesus Christ, who is on the right hand of God, having gone into heaven." From these passages (and others might be added to them[2]) it will be seen that the indirect evidence for the historicity is strong.

Both the person and work of Christ claim Ascension. There is no incongruity in the passing from the world in a mysterious manner of Him who entered it in so unique a fashion. "The Person of God, the eternal Word, assumed human nature—not a human person, but human nature—so that God might be able, acting in and through this human nature as His instrument to teach mankind and to die for mankind. God entered on the sphere of the seen and the temporal by a miraculous door. His life and work were marked all through by miracle; His death and Resurrection were encompassed with miracle, and it was fitting that his departure from this world should be through another miraculous door. The departure of the Eternal King was, like his first approach, a part of a scheme which forms one united and harmonious whole. The Incarnation and the Ascension were necessarily related the one to the other."[3] Jesus must go to God as He came forth from God. His unity with the Father, eternally real in the spiritual sense, must be historically realized. If, indeed, He be the Christ, He must go to heaven after the resurrection from the dead—"whom the heaven must receive until the times of restoration of all things"[4]—and it was not till His Ascension that a perfectly satisfactory

[1] See Swete, "Apostles' Creed," pp. 67, 68.

[2] Collected by J. J. Griesbach, "Opera Minusc.," ii., diss. xxv.

[3] Stokes, "Acts of the Apostles," i., pp. 48, 49; see also Hort, "The Way, the Truth, and the Life," p. 151; "Camb. Theol. Essays," p. 465.

[4] Acts iii. 21: "Though the Ascension had taken place, we have δεῖ, and not ἔδει, because the necessity of the event is a permanent fact" (Hackett, "Com.," *in loc.*).

light was thrown on His Person (*cf.* John vi. 62, xvi. 28) that its dignity and glory were manifested.

The work of Christ is incomplete without Ascension. Whilst on earth He did not succeed in introducing "the happy kingdom of the future,"[1] the new dispensation of the Spirit which He had prophesied. "He anticipates," it has been said, "future acts of his work which are not simply symbolic of his utterances, but necessary to their interpretation. A future is always with Him: separate from the present in its conditions and gifts and in the nature of his agency, so separate as justly to be entitled to the name of a new 'dispensation.' The Ascension marks the transition. It has no substantial independence. It closes the public ministry; it opens the culmination of that ministry in the new age of the Spirit."[2] That the final Ascension should be a visible one was necessary for the Apostles. Had the manifestations of the Risen Lord continued indefinitely, serious difficulties would have occurred;[3] had they ceased without any indication that they would not be renewed, the Apostles would have been left in a state of uncertainty, and unfitted for carrying on the work which their Master had begun. After this Ascension we find them united for one common purpose.

III.

From the time of Strauss downwards objection has been taken to the narrative of the Ascension on the ground that it savours of an exploded cosmogony and gives us a wrong idea of "heaven"; in the words of a recent writer, Professor Lovejoy, "This story (of the Resurrection) is inextricably involved with, and is unintelligible apart from, the complementary story of the Ascension, with its crude scene of levitation; and this, in turn, is meaningless without the scheme of cosmic topography that

[1] Schmiedel, "Protest. Monats.," 1906, pp. 257 *ff.*

[2] A. S. Martin, in Hastings' "Dict. of Christ and the Gospels," vol. i., p. 125[a].

[3] This point is dealt with fully by Stokes, "Acts of the Apostles," vol. i., pp. 49 *ff.*; Latham, "Risen Master," pp. 378 *ff.*

places a heaven somewhere in space in a direct perpendicular to the earth's surface at the latitude and longitude of Bethany."[1] Apart from the consideration that the story itself does not bear out this interpretation, we must bear in mind that some great change occurred in our Lord's body at the Resurrection ; though the same body that hanged upon the Cross (Luke xxiv. 39, 41-43 ; John xx. 27) it was endowed with properties which made it independent of ordinary physical laws (Luke xxiv. 31, 36; John xx. 19). Physical sciences and psychology converge in repudiating the notion of the impossibility of the objective reality of the post-resurrection life of Jesus even though the phenomena it presents be beyond our comprehension; and the opinion that the "spiritual body" (*σῶμα πνευματικόν*) is but a duplicate of the earthly body creates more difficulties than it solves.[2] There is no need to adopt the view, for which there is no Scriptural warrant, that during the forty days there was a gradual change going on in our Lord's body as a preparation for His Ascension, a view which is ultimately the result of prejudice against the teaching that He ascended more than once, and which contradicts the teaching of Scripture that resurrection is itself the completion of the new body (*cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 42-44). From the moment of resurrection the Saviour was clothed with the same body in which He ascended and now sitteth at the right hand of God.[3]

The Ascension has nothing to do with astronomy; and as Mr. Griffith Jones has pointed out a right understanding of the account depends on that principle of accommodation which is the solvent of so many Scriptural difficulties. We venture to transcribe his weighty words: "A visible Ascension into the clouds unquestionably savours of the notion of a materialistic

[1] *Hibbert Journal*, 1908, p. 503; "Strauss, "Life of Jesus," § 142; J. M. Robertson, "Christianity and Mythology," pp. 384, 385; Streeter, "Foundations," p. 131.

[2] G. B. Stevens, "Theol. of the New Test.," c. xii.; Ballard, "Miracles of Unbelief," p. 170; Schwartzkopff, "The Prophecies of Jesus Christ," pp. 92-95.

[3] Steinmeyer, "History of the Passion and Resurrection of our Lord," p. 296.

heaven beyond the blue, and, so far, is entirely out of keeping with our present conception of the spirit-world. It is difficult, however, if not impossible, to imagine how the disciples could have been convinced of His final and irrevocable disappearance from the scenes of His earthly labours in any other way. Such an act of accommodation to the limited ideas of the time would at least be entirely in keeping with His gentle and sympathetic dealings with the mental limitations of His followers, and disposes of most of the objections raised against the story of the Ascension."[1]

The new school of mythology, represented by Winckler, Cheyne, and others, would throw discredit on the Ascension story[2] by adducing parallels from the stories of Enoch and Elijah, from Babylonian stories like that of Etana,[3] from Græco-Roman legends like those of Romulus and Herakles, and by endeavouring to show that from these pre-Christian myths the Christian representation of the Ascension grew. A detailed examination of these lies beyond the limits of this short article. All we can now say is that the Old Testament instances are not really parallels. In the case of Enoch, the Hebrew text of Gen. v. 24 simply says "he was not, for God took him," leaving the mode of his departure from the world uncertain; whilst in that of Elijah there is scarcely any analogy between the taking up of one by an external power and the going home of One by his own power; nor was his assumption an experience after that of death. As to the Babylonian and Græco-Roman myths, a study of these shows that the resemblances between them and the Ascension story of the Acts are outweighed by the profound differences,[4] and that they cannot have

[1] "The Ascent through Christ," p. 270. See also Latham, "Risen Master," pp. 386, 387; Thorburn, "Jesus the Christ," p. 277.

[2] "As a student of religion, I distinguish between the form of the truth that is believed and the very truth itself" (Cheyne, "Bible Problems," p. 121).

[3] See Jastrow, "Religion of Babylonia and Assyria," pp. 519 *ff.*

[4] See Fogtmann's essay, "De Christi Jesu adscensu in cœlum," pp. 93 *ff.*

been interpolated into the Christian tradition.[1] As Bishop Bernard says, "Christ's Ascension, as described in the Christian tradition, has no exact parallel in history or literature. This it is essential to keep in mind" (E.R.E. ii., p. 153). The upholders of the myth theory have not yet explained how and when these myths became part of the Ascension story. To Judaism they cannot be credited, for the Jews for a decade of centuries before the appearance of Christianity resisted the incorporation of such myths, and their resistance would be part and parcel of the tradition inherited by the Judæo-Christian community, whilst the sources of the early narratives in the Acts of the Apostles forbids us even to consider the infiltration of stories from purely Gentile sources.[2]

It may be well to mention here that any appeal to Rabbinical literature of the seers who entered Paradise and were granted revelations, to confirm a notion that ascension of the body to heaven was no strange thing to the Jews, is based on a misunderstanding of the Talmudical passage, Chagigah 14*b*, which runs: "Our Rabbis have taught that four men went up into Paradise (פרדס, 'the Garden')—namely, Ben Azzai, Ben Zoma, Acher (*i.e.*, Elisha b. Abuyah), and R. Akiba."[3] The Tosaphoth do not take the passage literally, saying "it only appeared to them tnat they went up"; and it is certain, from the context in Chagigah, that the expression "entered Paradise" merely means that they engaged in the study of speculative philosophy, with disastrous results, as we learn, in the case of all but Akiba, who "went into Paradise in peace and came down in peace." There are some now who have done so!

[1] "A page of history, or a minute description of some present-day custom, could be proved mythical by setting against it several items of skilfully selected parallels from ancient history, from fable or folk-lore. The process is facilitated by the writer's liberty to describe his parallels in terms suggested by the comparison he has in mind" (Moulton, "Religions and Religion," p. 26; the Fernley Lecture for 1913).

[2] See Zenos in "Dict. of Christ and the Gospels," article "Myth."

[3] Bishop Bernard (E.R.E., ii. 151) is wrong in calling all four "Rabbis." Ben Azzai and Ben Zoma were not ordained. On Acher see Hershon's "Genesis," pp. 35 *ff.*

IV.

The theological implications of the Ascension cannot be distinguished from those of the Resurrection, or from those of the sequel of both, the Session at the right hand of the Father;[1] and it is not without significance in this respect that the same historian should mark the Ascension at the close of the Day of Resurrection as the completion, so far as his history was concerned, of the earthly life of Jesus, and the Ascension forty days afterwards as inaugurating the preparation for the Day of Pentecost.

The Ascension was a true "exaltation" of Christ as Representative Man, and is conceived of as a reward of His humiliation in the elaborated rhetorical passage:

> "Who, being in the form of God, counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross. Wherefore also God highly exalted him, and gave unto him the name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things on earth and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."[2]

In this passage probably "the pre-temporal glory is thought of as the counterpart of His exaltation to sovereignty over the world" (*cf.* John xvii. 4, 5); and it thus serves to teach that the Ascension brought out what was inherent in the pre-existent Christ.[3] The "name" given to the glorified redeemer is that of "Lord," the name of Jehovah-God of the Old Testament. "Through the resurrection and exaltation, Jesus in a sense,

[1] On the connection of the Ascension with the Resurrection, see Milligan, "The Ascension of our Lord," pp. 12, 13. On the nature of the offices exercised by the exalted Saviour see the recent work of Principal Tait, "The Heavenly Session of our Lord." A discussion of the subject lies beyond the scope of this paper.

[2] Phil. ii. 6-11 (R.V.). [3] See THE CHURCHMAN, January, 1915, p. 7.

according to Paul, *became* divine. He was thereby . . . constituted the Son of God in power.[1] But divinity in the proper sense, as distinct from *apotheosis*, cannot begin to be. The divine is eternal. Therefore He who was man, and thereafter was exalted to God's right hand, must have been with God before He came into the world."[2]

By ascension Jesus is set free from all human limitations, and can exercise a universal sway over His people in the undivided unity of His Person. So it was expedient that He should go away,[3] that the Living One might live in the hearts of His people, and not be a memory only. "The same Jesus," says Dr. Mackintosh, "inhabiting now a sphere in which His influence is universalized, continues to reveal the Father and to bestow a regenerating life through the instrumentality of His own personal impression. We can still be united to Him through faith. On this view, the divine working has been marked by continuity at each stage. Throughout, the living Person of Jesus is the ultimate force in Christianity. Its real content and power are dissipated if it be cut loose from an immediate relationship with Him, mere teaching, preserved in books or traditions, being substituted for the life-giving influence of a present Lord."[4]

A. W. GREENUP.

[The sixth and last article in this series, "Shall come again with glory," will appear in the June issue of THE CHURCHMAN, and will be contributed by the Rev. F. S. Guy Warman, D.D.]

---

[1] Rom. i. 4.
[2] Bruce, "Apologetics," p. 407.
[3] John xvi. 7.
[4] "The Person of Christ," p. 369.

Benjamin Laney:

THE LAUDIAN SCHOOL AND THE NONCONFORMIST.

BENJAMIN LANEY, Bishop of Lincoln, enjoyed the privilege of preaching before the King at Whitehall on March 12, 1665, and he took the opportunity thus afforded of expressing his thoughts on the ecclesiastical situation of the moment.

Laney was a scholar of repute, a High Churchman of the Laudian school, and a devoted Royalist. It goes therefore without saying that he found no favour when Parliament, in its struggle with King and Church, gained the ascendancy. He was driven from his rectory at Buriton, from his residentiary canonry at Westminster, and from the mastership of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge. Deprived of all preferment, he attached himself to the person of Charles I., whose chaplain he was; serving Charles II. in the same capacity after his father's execution.

As one of the victims of the reign of nonconformity he had suffered much, and it was only reasonable that at the Restoration he should receive a measure of compensation. Accordingly, he was at once made Dean of Rochester, and later in the same year (1660) he was consecrated to the See of Peterborough. On the death of Bishop Sanderson in 1662 he was translated to Lincoln, and on the death of Bishop Wren in 1667 to Ely, where he remained until his death in 1675 at the age of eighty-four. He never married, and he enjoyed the reputation of great generosity in the use of his substance for works of piety and philanthropy.

No biographer has told the story of Laney's life, and for this reason little has come down to us of his personal history; but (independently of his rapid promotion after the return of the King) that his reputation for scholarship and influence stood high among his contemporaries is vouched for by the fact that on two important occasions he was put forward to

represent the interests of the Church of England. When Parliamentarians and Royalists met for conference at Uxbridge in 1644 Laney was one of five divines chosen to represent the King. When the Savoy Conference was summoned in 1661 he was again a chosen representative of the Anglican Church. On the former occasion the result, or rather lack of result, was a foregone conclusion. As Thomas Fuller quaintly remarks, the Conference "was born with a dying countenance." Laney's experience was characteristic of the whole procedure. "Dr. Laney proffered to prove the great benefits which had accrued to God's Church in all ages by the government by Bishops, but the Scotch Commissioners would in no wise hear him; whereupon the Doctor was contentedly silent."[1] Laney had sense enough to see that any attempt to unfold his views would be waste of breath. The end of the Assembly was that it dwindled to nothing without ever being formally dissolved. On the second occasion on which Laney was called upon to represent his Church—namely, at the Savoy Conference—Richard Baxter was there to report him. He does so in the following words: "Bishop Laney of Peterborough was sometimes present, but did not speak much. Once, however, he spake too much. For Mr. Baxter, charging the episcopal Impositions as sinful, was accused of uncharitableness and boldness in that he thereby charged all the Churches of Christ with sin. Mr. Baxter asserted that there were many Reformed Churches free from such Impositions;[2] but, if there were not, he thought it no arrogance or uncharitableness to charge all the Church and the world with sin; for that in many things we offend all: and freedom from sin is the privilege of the Church triumphant. Bishop Laney here cried out that *justified persons have no sin, and are no sinners, because justification taketh it away.* The arguing of which left him in no small confusion."[3]

[1] "Church History," book xi., pp. 214, 215, First Edition, folio.

[2] Impositions—*e.g.*, kneeling to receive the elements, use of the sign of the Cross in baptism, wearing the surplice, consent to the doctrine of baptismal regeneration.

[3] "Abridgment of Mr. Baxter's History of his Life and Times," vol. i., p. 173.

We are not altogether surprised at the Bishop's confusion. But this extract from Baxter's account of the Savoy Conference gives a good idea of the captious spirit in which the discussions were carried on, and affords a good specimen of the "little personal brangles" which Baxter notes as frequently taking place.

If we had no monument or record of Bishop Laney's life but the sermon he preached before the King in 1665, we should infer that Nonconformists had little to expect but repression and persecution at his hands. The discourse, even if it does not breathe threatening and slaughter, savours of dislike, scorn, antagonism. His text on the occasion was 1 Thess. iv. 11, "And that ye study to be quiet," a text that might have prompted the hope that an olive-leaf would be held forth from the pulpit. Any such hope would have been disappointed. Not peace, but a sword, would seem to be the gist of the sermon. With all the greater satisfaction, therefore, we learn that the bark of this learned prelate was worse than his bite. High Churchman though he was, he was distinguished above many of his brother Bishops for his courtesy and forbearance towards dissenters in the dioceses which he successively ruled. To quote his own words, he "looked through his fingers" at them. Instead of finding satisfaction in the vigorous execution of the Act of Uniformity and the penal laws passed with the view of putting down dissent, he carried out the policy of suppression with much reluctance; and his treatment of the Nonconforming community corroborates the verdict of history that, however great the suffering in very many individual cases, yet, speaking generally, "the leniency in carrying out the laws against the Nonconformists forms a pleasing contrast to the harshness of the laws themselves."[1]

The sermon itself is interesting as the work of a man who, like so many of his colleagues on the Bench and of the clergy generally, was fully convinced not only that nonconformity was indefensible, but that it was a duty owing to Church and State

[1] Overton, "English Church, 1660–1714," p. 342.

alike to suppress it, if possible by persuasion, but, persuasion failing, by the strong arm of the "powers that be." Deeply we regret that the spirit of charity is so grievously violated by the Bishop's utterance. At the same time we must make allowance for human nature, and remember that the speaker looked back upon many years of personal loss from the temporary triumph of nonconformity. We must also bear in mind that the spirit of toleration was yet in its infancy, and that the Anglican Church of the Restoration was but using the selfsame weapons which had been employed with such severity against itself. It may be perfectly true, as historians assure us, that the House of Commons at this period was more intolerant than the House of Lords or even the Bench of Bishops, but there is no doubt that a large proportion of the clergy came back to their own with no mind to let bygones be bygones or return good for evil. It is not without significance that six months after this sermon was preached the tyrannous and oppressive "Five Mile Act" became a part of the law of the land.

After a very brief exposition and application of his text, the Bishop gets to his main point, which is to prove that dissent must be put down with a high hand. He begins by endorsing that part of the Act of Uniformity which asserts the principle of non-resistance,[1] urging that, however justifiable war may be when waged with a foreign foe, civil and domestic war can under no circumstances be lawful: "for the composing of all quarrels that may arise between subjects, God hath by His ordinance provided a remedy in princes and magistrates, from whom alone we are to seek for refuge or defence." Civil wars may not actually take their rise from questions of religion, but religion becomes inevitably mixed up with revolt; "therefore you shall scarce hear of a rebellion of late times in which religion did not carry the colours at least, if not command in

[1] The Act of Uniformity required that all incumbents, dignitaries, officers in universities, public schoolmasters, and private tutors, should subscribe a renunciation of the covenant, and a declaration of the unlawfulness of taking up arms against the Sovereign under any pretence. See Lingard, "History of England," vol. ix., p. 16.

chief." Schism is the great disturber of peace, and England will study to be quiet in vain, unless schism, which is only another word for dissent, can be effectually dealt with. Schism is the same to the Church that rebellion or treason is to the State. He appeals to the action of the ancient Church, with its *altare contra altare*, "which, in our modern dialect, is a conventicle against the Church."

He proceeds to deal with false principles which lie at the root of dissent, then with the true principles which should insure loyalty to the Church. And first of the false. Religion, says dissent, must be free, and all compulsion be avoided. The Bishop's reply to this rests on the fallacy of instituting an exact parallel between crime punishable by the law of the land and the adoption of religious views not authorized by the Church. As the one, so the other, must be corrected by punishment, for "*spes impunitatis est illecebra peccandi.*" And in support of his argument he borrows a weapon from the armoury of Rome, and quotes the words of our Lord: "Compel them to come in."

But, urges the schismatic, error in judgment is not of the nature of sin, "because no man be abler and wiser than God made him." Laney meets this by stating what he could not have proved—namely, that the *will* participates in the error, and this makes it sin. Proceeding, he deliberately repudiates the right of private judgment. Dissenters have no right to say that, not understanding certain tenets, they cannot hold them; "whereas, in truth, it is not required; they are not bound to know them, but believe them; for it is the mercy of God that the defect of our knowledge may be supplied by the knowledge of others; for to believe is to see with other men's eyes, as knowledge is with our own."

The Nonconformist raises the objection that the omission of religious forms and ceremonies is more severely punished than some foul and scandalous crimes. Are these schismatics, asks the Bishop with scorn, to be trusted with the balance of sins? "for we know how the market went for them, when they held the scale: obedience to the King and the laws and serving God

according to them were the great scandalous crimes." But is not the dissenter completely mistaken on this point? Earthly tribunals must make punishment commensurate with the mischievous results of conduct. "Treason and rebellion are more severely punished in the State than many other heinous crimes, because they destroy the very foundations of government and society." The same principle must be applied to schismatical disobedience, which undermines the very foundations of the Church.

But, pursues the dissenter, "if fewer articles and points of religion were defined, it would make more room in the Church for those that dissent." The Bishop agrees that "the Church-door should always stand open, *but for such as shall be fit to enter*; for it would be a dangerous thing to set any door so wide open to let in an enemy upon us. But to what purpose would we have the Church-door so wide open, when the gate of heaven is strait? Why should they be taken in here if they shall be turned back there? The Church is a city that is at unity in itself; so it is a city too that hath gates and walls to shut out others." Why was there no Richard Baxter or John Howe present to convict the preacher of shamelessly begging the question, while at the same time, in imitation of Rome, defining a Church outside which there is no salvation?

Surely, however, urges the dissenter, it would make for peace "if men only of moderate opinions were taken into employment in the Church." A strange request, replies the Bishop, for, according to the objector, "the man of moderate opinions is he that is part Churchman and part schismatic. . . . The truth is moderate opinions are a chimæra, a fancy; either nothing at all, or somewhat worse than nothing."

"The last, and most importunate, pretender to peace is *liberty of conscience.*" This the preacher describes as "the most popular, and therefore the most dangerous, principle in the study of quiet." Is there not rather "a great deal of reason to restrain the conscience"? Think of "the mischief it doth to quiet when it is at liberty; for all the discord both in Church

and State arises from this false principle of the liberty of conscience. . . . Ask the schismatic why he joins not with the congregation of God's people?—he will tell you his conscience will not suffer him. Ask the rebel in the State why he takes up arms to the ruin of his King and country? and his conscience will answer for him, that it is God's cause, and it is to do Him service. Ask him again why he doth not repent of the mischief done by it? (for that they seldom do) and the conscience will serve that turn too. . . . Thus we see, the conscience, as it is used, doth not only open a door to sin, but shuts the very door to mercy—that is, repentance." Talk of the Church domineering over conscience! It is rather conscience that domineers over the Church. "If any list to see the conscience acting all this, we need go no further than our late times, when conscience was loose for a while: one would think Hell had broke loose, so filled, on a sudden, was the Church with sects and the commonwealth with confusion."

Having to his own satisfaction disposed of the false principles pleaded by the dissenter, Dr. Laney expatiates on the more excellent way, and shows the student of quiet how he may attain his object. But before argument he insists on fact. He reminds his hearers that the way to peace is the King's highway. "With the King's way I shall not meddle, as being fitter matter for our thankfulness than instruction, who hath already paved the way for us by wholesome laws for that purpose." And we think of the King sitting in the royal pew—the most irreligious monarch, perhaps, that ever sat on the throne of England—and who, always at heart a Papist, in his last hours was received into the Roman Church. If listening, he could scarcely have concealed the smile of the cynic.

Having thus summoned his most religious and gracious Sovereign to the defence of the truth, he proceeds to deal with some of the principles which will save men from the snares and perils of schism. Let a man study himself; let him cultivate a spirit of humility, and find out how little reason he has to trust himself and his own conclusions. Does not Scripture teach us

to obey our governors ? (Heb. xiii. 17). To dissent from "the whole eldership, all our governors jointly," is presumption indeed.

Further, let a man take heed lest he be deceived. "Truth is many times so like error, and error comes so near to truth, that he had need be careful and circumspect that shall distinguish them in some cases. Truth lies hid under many folds, especially the ambiguity of words—the common cheat of all students—who are more often *deceived* into opinions than *convinced.* It is not strange to see so many go astray from the Church, to whom the things of it are represented under the covert of false names, when they hear the government called tyranny ; obedience, slavery ; contempt, courage ; licence, liberty ; frenzy, zeal ; order, superstition."

Think, again, continues the Bishop, how often men are misled by prejudice, passion, or favour. "The sum and upshot of the faith of most that dissent is the credit given to some weak, private, ignorant instructor, whose person they have in admiration, without any great cause, God knows."

Once more he turns to Rome for an argument when he urges that for our own safety we shall be well advised to conform to Church doctrine and order, for if we err in following the Church, the chief part of the responsibility, and therefore guilt, lies at the door of the Church ; if, on the other hand, we err through following our own judgment, "the blame and guilt must of necessity, and inexcusably, fall upon ourselves."

In his concluding remarks the preacher appeals to history and experience. If anyone wants to know how precious a thing is quiet, let him think of England's near past during those disastrous years when England was in rebellion against her lawful King. "In troubles and dissensions every good thing goes backward, only mischief thrives. It fares with troubled times as with troubled waters ; all the filth, dirt, and mire, in the bottom then gets up to the top. What a deal of filth, dirt, and mire, what sordid stuff, was then got up to the top, and highest place of rule and command! So much more are we obliged to study that peace and quiet which hath sunk them to

their proper place again—the bottom; and there let them lie if you would be quiet."

The sermon closes with solemn words of warning to those who persist in standing outside the Anglican fold. Their punishment will be appropriate to their sin. When Christ left the world He bequeathed to it the legacy of peace—*My peace I leave with you.* "And when He comes again to judge the world, we have reason to look that He will call us to a reckoning how we use His legacy. And so He will too; for He is that Lord that, when He came and found some smiting their fellow-servants, commanded them to be cut asunder and have their portion with hypocrites, a punishment well fitted to their offence. There was a schism in the fault, and there shall be another schism in the punishment: they who sundered and divided from their brethren should themselves be cut asunder, and have their portion with the hypocrites."

We think of such men as Philip and Matthew Henry, Richard Baxter and John Howe, and wonder whether Benjamin Laney, Bishop of Lincoln, with an honest and clear conscience, pronounced on these men and their like the doom of the hypocrite. The Nonconformist might well have asked who, in the sight of the God of truth, at that particular period of history were smiting their fellow-servants.

The sermon extends to forty-two pages, and the briefest outline has here been given. Its interest chiefly lies in the typical example it affords of the arguments which an acute and conscientious Churchman summoned to his support in penalizing fellow-Christians who differed from him in the interpretation of Scripture and ecclesiastical history. The general impression it leaves upon the mind is the same that is made by the clever advocate in a law court—it is a conspicuous instance of special pleading—specious, ingenious, altogether one-sided, only waiting for an equally clever exponent on the other side to show how illogical as well as unfair is the statement of the case. "He that is first in his own cause seemeth just, but his neighbour cometh and searcheth him."

G. S. STREATFEILD.

Facing the Future in the Faith of the Past.

(AN EXPOSITORY STUDY FOR THE PRESENT CRISIS.)

"*Who will bring me into the strong city? Who hath led me into Edom?*" (Ps. lx. 9; and see also cviii. 10).

THERE is in the nations of the West something of a hush of expectancy. The fierce, rapid movements of the autumn have dropped into the doggedness of siege warfare. In spite of constant explosion and frequent rushes upon trenches, the campaign is understood to be marking time. We are waiting for the "general advance." Unless an economic famine forces a scarcely hoped-for collapse, we have, as the soldiers sing, "a long way to go." The words of the text, then, are singularly appropriate, and the circumstances under which the Psalm was written are peculiarly helpful for meditation and stimulus. Israel and Edom were at war. The invading foe had been checked and thrown back by the former, and now there came the more serious task of driving him into his capital and forcing him to terms. Battles already won lead the poet-king to trust for complete victory. David argues from the past to the future. If we may paraphrase his words into modern terms, "the God who gave the triumph of the Marne may be trusted to open the road to Berlin." The poem is a war-hymn composed half-way through a keen campaign. The history, as the title of the Psalm suggests, may be read in 2 Sam. viii. and 2 Chron. xviii., and these chapters throw considerable light upon the setting. Its first five verses express national grief at very serious losses. The next three breathe quiet confidence during the recruiting of a new army. And the last four speak of hope and cheerfulness as to the ultimate issue of the fight. Let us consider these in order. But first a word as to

The Title.

David says he wrote these verses when the Edomites attacked him during his campaign "with Aram-Naharaim (*i.e.*)

Mesopotamia) and Aram-Zobah." He had gained a remarkable series of successes. The Philistines on the south-west had been reduced to harmlessness (2 Sam. viii. 1). On the south-east Moab had been beaten to the ground (2 Sam. viii. 2). The king's forces had then proceeded to a larger task in the frontier quarrel with Aram—often rendered "Syria" in our Authorized Version, but really including, as Sayce tells us, Mesopotamian Syria as far south as the borders of Palestine, and the larger part of Arabia Petræa, possibly even Edom ("Hast. Dict." i. 139). Confederate States, like Zobah, Damascus, and Rehob, were all part of Aram (2 Sam. viii. 5, x. 8), and were doubtless included in the conquest. In the midst of this sweep of unbroken successes came a check. Edom, filled with delight at the thought of gratifying a very ancient cousinly hatred for men who, being of the same blood originally, were much more prosperous, swooped upon the unguarded south. Amalek had done the same at an earlier date when the forces were away (1 Sam. xxx. 1). It is possible that Moab, recently smitten and consequently smarting, joined with Edom in this raid (Ps. lx. 9). I understand from the same verse that Philistia had prudently kept quiet. This, then, introduces our first section—

I.—The National Losses and Sorrow (Vers. 1-4).

The onslaught of the raiders found the people unprepared for these "*hard things*" (ver. 3); the savage ferocity of the foe acted like heady *wine* (ver. 3), and they were at first too dazed to know what to do. The home garrisons were beaten back (ver. 1), the lines were pierced (ver. 2). The villages looked as though an earthquake had wrecked them (ver. 2). Worst of all, it seemed as though God's favour, of which the previous victories had made them confident, had been withdrawn. He had suddenly dropped them (ver. 1); the nerve of the people was shaken at the eclipsing of the light of His countenance. The dread tidings flew forth by the lips of swift messengers,

and David promptly detached Joab and Abishai with their commands to punish the invaders (2 Chron. xviii. 12; Ps. lx., title). Marching south, the sight of their banners rallied the scattered forces of the home divisions (Ps. lx. 4), which had been panic-stricken by the rain of arrows from the Edomite archers (see R.V.M., ver. 4, and LXX). David appears to have followed them up (2 Sam. viii. 13), and a pitched battle was fought in Edomite territory, in which heavy losses were inflicted on the foe. Nevertheless, a larger work remained to be done: the capital of the enemy had yet to be invested (Ps. lx. 9), the country had to be garrisoned, and a new army had to be raised. So David prays that God will change His front (ver. 1) and remember His beloved (ver. 5). Only God's hand can really do what is needed, and David becomes the nation's intercessor (ver. 5). If this Psalm was written for use at the Temple service of national humiliation and prayer before the expedition started, then we have here the leader's call to prayer.

In time of war, then, this is the first note for the heads of a nation to strike and the people to echo—a note of profound sorrow for widespread loss and destruction; of thankfulness that in the banner of God we have always a rallying-point, and by it a King who reigns in righteousness; of earnest pleading to Him for final victory; of recognition that His right hand counts and His love decides issues. Nor will the situation be substantially altered even where some success has already been attained. For in these days every victory is costly, and in the light of Christianity all war is not only a calamity, but a reflection on the previous conditions of international relationship. Each side needs to confess sin, though one side may be more blameworthy. Each side has to mourn disaster, though one may be less harmed. Amid much dissimilarity we recognize many parallels between King David's people and King George's—sudden and unexpected assault after much prosperity, initial giving way before the foe through lack of time for preparation and shortage of troops, recovery of ground through brave generals and valorous men, but nevertheless much work yet

remaining to be done before peace comes. We turn, then, to the central section of the Psalm.

II.—The Response of the Nation (Vers. 6-8).

The atmosphere of these verses is that of calm confidence in the general situation, of certainty that the people are on the side of the Holy God (ver. 6), and of belief that the loyalty of the nation will rise to deal with the need that has arisen (vers. 6, 7), with the general result that the foe will be ultimately subdued (ver. 8). One striking feature is the way in which the King and the King of Kings are identified in plan and action. It is not certain who says, "I." We ask, "Is it David or God?" and the answer, surely, is, "Both." This is not arrogance; it is faith. It is the reliance of God's man upon God's word. "*The children of wickedness shall not humiliate them*" (2 Sam. vii. 10) is David's charter of victory. "*God hath spoken*" by the holy prophet and with the weight of an oracle. So he reviews his people and his plans. "*I will exult*"—he is cheery with a spirit of sacred defiance of adversity (see same word in Hab. iii. 18). Therefore his methods must be thorough. There must be an organized levy for military service over the divisional districts of Shechem, with all the land on this side Jordan, and Succoth, with all the wilder districts on the eastern banks (ver. 6). This is the territory north of Judah, which therefore had not been overrun by the invader. He counts confidently on the loyalty and response of both areas: "Gilead and Manasseh, the colonies on the east of Jordan, and Judah and Ephraim on the west, the men across the water and the men this side the water, I can count on them as king's men through and through" (ver. 7; contrast Judges v. 17). The western forces are the cream of the army. The mountaineers and woodsmen of Ephraim are the line regiments which shall repel and pierce the enemy's lines like the horns of the bull which was perhaps depicted on Ephraim's standard (see Deut. xxxiii. 17, R.V.M.; Num. ii. 2, 18). "*The strength of his head*" are the large families of sturdy sons among Joseph's "doubly fruitful" tribesmen (Gen. xli. 52), masses of

men ready for flank movements, like curving horns. And the brain behind the horns, the staff behind the army, is the royal clan of Judah, lawgiver and sceptre-bearer (see Gen. xlix. 10), kinsmen on whose counsel David can rely, whose interests are his interests, as perhaps Ephraim's could not be, in view of old-time rivalry and coming separation (Ps. lxxviii. 67; 2 Sam. ii. 9, 10; 1 Kings xi. 26); yet in this time of national stress old rivalries are put away, horns and brain are acting together in victorious combination.

Then the King turns to review the possible strength of the foe; Moab hostile but enfeebled, Edom the heart of the danger, Philistia terrorized into neutrality. The contempt of an Eastern for his foe rings in the lines that follow. The most menial office is that of washing the feet that have been exposed on the open sandals to the defilement of undrained streets. Moab shall be his foot-washer, and Edom shall pick up and carry the dirty sandals (in passing, notice what a light this throws on the humility of Christ in the Upper Room and John the Baptist at the Jordan—St. John xiii. 5, 6; St. Matt. iii. 11). Philistia shall cry "God save the King," even though she may not feel it. Ewald thinks the difficult phrase is a warning to Philistia against seizing the occasion for a rising. At any rate, as David reviews both friend and foe, he sees nothing to discourage his hopefulness.

Here, then, is a second parallel with our own present position. We too look with the gladness of a trustful confidence to God Who judgeth righteously. We make our plans, and raise our willing millions from home and across the seas, while rivalries are hushed and paltry strife almost (not quite, alas!) forgotten, and Cabinet and Staff take harmonious counsel together. Our foes, too, we reckon as three, one fierce and dominating, one subdued and accommodating, one thrust out of neutrality, probably into nothingness. Our Philistia doubtless wishes she had held her hand; while our Moab and Edom shall, if God prosper us, be compelled to yield, though it shall

not be our purpose to humiliate them. Great David's greater Son has taught us better things.

So we turn to the third section of the Psalm.

III.—The Task Before the Nation (Vers. 9-12).

Here the dominant note is clear-sighted hopefulness. He recognizes the difficulty of the task, but has every confidence in the Lord of Hosts and the hosts of the Lord. "*Who will bring me into the strong city?*" The Edomite city of Petra or Sela (2 Kings xiv. 7) was probably the most difficult of all the surrounding capital cities to assault. It is approached by a narrow defile two miles in length, capable of admitting only two horsemen abreast, beside the stream which flows down it. This gorge opens out finally into an amphitheatre about a thousand yards wide surrounded by very steep cliffs. In these was a very remarkable series of rock-hewn dwellings and adapted caves, dating from Horite times, and much strengthened since. Small wonder that David calls it the strong city, and asks whether the great fight in the Valley of Salt will be followed by a crowning triumph in the reduction of the Edomite stronghold.

And the answer is that the future is to be inferred from God's treatment in the past. "Who will?" finds its response in "Who hath?" The God of the Past is the Lord of the Future. David infers that Petra will fall, because in the Valley of Salt God has already showed His right hand. "*Who hath led me into Edom?*" God. "*Who will lead me into the strong city,*" with its difficult approaches and its frowning fortifications? The same Lord. Yes, but there is a deeper answer still. It is not only the God of the victories but the God of the reverses of whom he is so sure. Even there God had His purposes, which have now ripened. Self-confidence has been moved into dependence. "*Wilt not thou, O God, which hadst cast us off? And thou, O God, which didst not go forth with our armies?*" This is no vainglorious boast, like the Edomite's "*who shall bring me down to the ground*" (Obad. 3). Still less is it a

blind appeal to a tribal fetish. "*Give us help from trouble, for vain is the help of man.*" Nations often learn more from trouble than from victories. "*Through God we shall do valiantly, for He it is that shall tread down our enemies.*"

And the hope of King and people was evidently justified. "*He put garrisons throughout all Edom, and all the Edomites became servants to David, and the Lord gave David victory whithersoever he went*" (2 Sam. viii. 14). It took six months to accomplish, and the Crown Prince was compelled to flee the country (1 Kings xi. 16, 17).

So we to-day in like case take both national and personal comfort. God is prepared to exceed His own records in dealing with us, if we with humility and faith seek Him. The difficult tasks of clearing Belgium, of entering Germany, of compelling terms—Who shall say how these things can come about? Yet very sure we are that somehow God shall bring it to pass. A short time since I received a letter from a man who was brought to God after a remarkable experience two years ago. He is now with the colours, and sent to me, as he said, "a verse from last Sunday's Psalms in Canterbury Cathedral: '*Through God we shall do great acts, for it is He who shall tread down our enemies.*' And there is not a happier man in His Majesty's forces than your grateful friend." So did David's hymn hearten one of England's men. It is not only the nation, but the individual, who needs a stimulating message of this kind.

And in the personal matter of the inmost life of the soul we may also argue from the past to the future. A vision of Christ has, it may be, dawned before us, and we fear we cannot attain unto it. Let us follow the gleam and remember the days of old. The Lord Who led us out of our old surroundings can bring us up to a mount not only of Transfiguration, but of Pentecostal power, and making even the strongholds of imagination fall, shall occupy them with the garrisons of His peace (2 Cor. x. 4-5; Phil. iv. 7). What God has done for others He can do for us. What strengthened men in olden days is good medicine for their souls now. Even as I write I

hear a strange story, directly from an officer at Mons, of a sudden checking of Prussian cavalry, for no apparent reason, in the midst of a deadly charge, and of a vision of angels seen by a Highlander dowered with the Celtic gift of second-sight. I cannot say. Who knows? The Lord still reigns. The most encouraging study for faith is history, and the future draws its heartiest inspiration from the past. Shall we ever understand the action of the German right wing before Paris by merely military reasoning? Who dies if England live? And who fears if the living God be seen and followed?

HARRINGTON C. LEES.

NOTES.

1. There are several difficult passages in the Psalm, notably in verses 4, 8, 9, 10. A conclusion must be adopted in exposition, even when the opposite view is known to be reasonable. What seemed most intelligible has not been adopted without consultation of authorities such as Perowne, Cheyne, Lange, Kirkpatrick, Sanders and Kent, Hengstenberg, Ewald, Delitzsch, and Cook.

2. At a later day Amaziah again undertook the reduction of Petra and succeeded (2 Kings xiv. 7), calling it Joktheel, "subdued by God," as Gesenius renders it. I suggest that Psalm cviii. was used as a war-hymn on this occasion; and since the expedition had not been preceded by the reverses which had led up to David's punitive expedition, the first four verses were omitted as pessimistic, and part of Psalm lvii., a hymn of David's cave and wilderness warfare, was added as a suitable prelude to the "expeditionary" passage. By that time the "remnant of the Philistines," as Amos calls them (i. 8) were a negligible factor. Hence the change of reading in verse 9. Amaziah originally contemplated an attack by the united forces of the two kingdoms; hence Ps. cviii. 8, and see 2 Chron. xxv. 5-12.

The Credibility of Christian Miracles.

I AM proposing in this paper to deal solely with the miracles of the New Testament, and mainly with that of the Resurrection of Christ. If we wish to prove that miracles are credible, it is enough if we are able to show that the miracle of the Resurrection is a fact. On it stood the Church as founded by the Apostles; with its truth to-day stands or falls the credibility and possibility of miracles generally. If it once be accepted that the miracle of the Resurrection was possible and is a fact, the acceptance of the fact of any miracle rests solely on the sufficiency of the evidence adduced in favour of it.

What is a miracle? Of many definitions, the following taken from Hastings' "Dictionary of the Bible" seems to give the clearest answer: "A miracle may be described as an event manifesting purpose, occurring in the physical world, which cannot be accounted for by any of its known forces, and which therefore we ascribe to a spiritual cause." It will be seen from this definition that a miracle is not merely something wonderful. Matthew Arnold in his "Literature and Dogma" lost sight of this when, in arguing against miracles, he said: "Suppose that I could change this pen with which I write into a pen-wiper, I should not thus make what I write the truer or the more convincing." What we are arguing for is not the power of doing conjuring tricks.

Nor is it merely for the existence of supernatural power that we are arguing. It is true that the acceptance of the miraculous demands the acceptance of the supernatural; but the fact of something being the result of supernatural power will not necessarily make it convincing as a miracle. As the author of "Ecce Homo" says: "That a man possesses a strange power that I cannot understand is no reason why I should receive his words as Divine oracles of truth. . . . His power may terrify, but it will not convince." No, while the miracles of Christ, *qua* miracles, could not possibly be accounted for by any known

forces of human power, the main point about them was the purpose they displayed. They were, as I hope to point out later on, not separate nor separable from the other facts of His life; as Origen said long ago, "the miracles of Christ all bear the impress of His own holiness, and He ever used them as means of winning to the cause of goodness those who witnessed them."

There are, I take it, two main objections that people raise against miracles: the fact that they seem to break through the law of continuity in Nature, and the fact that they are contrary to experience. But before proceeding to answer these objections in detail, there are one or two preliminary observations to make. At the root of all objections there lies the denial of the possibility of the supernatural. To a certain class of professed scientists the world of Nature is merely a machine, which being self-constituted and self-started at some remote period of the past, must pursue its movements uninterrupted, till the course of time brings its defective parts into collision, to result in reducing the whole to chaos or annihilation. This reduces man also to a machine, or rather to a fractional part of the great machine. He has no power of independent action or of individual thought; he is merely impelled by the vast treadmill of the universe to perform a certain number of revolutions, after which he drops into the dust-heap of eternity.

Now, man will not accept this position for himself; he is conscious that he is not the mechanical material form that he appears on the surface. He is conscious that he is a spirit; he has, or rather is, an underlying consciousness, an ego, which directs all his outward actions. But though he demands this for himself, he often refuses to acknowledge the spiritual—*i.e.*, what we call the supernatural in Nature. Thus when critics like Renan or Strauss deny the miraculous Christ, their arguments, though often most captivating to the superficial thinker, are fraught with difficulty. Let us take their two positions. Both start with the postulate that the supernatural is impossible. Renan feels forced to grant that the historical gospels are true.

Christ lived here on earth about nineteen hundred years ago; He was killed by the Romans; and then His followers, in order to support their establishment of the new Church, invented the tale that He had risen from the dead, and moreover adorned His life with many picturesque colourings of miracle. The miracle part must be an addition, since all miracle is impossible. This position, beside begging the question, is really untenable. Apart from the miraculous Christ there is no historical Christ. To quote some words of the Bishop of London: "Go back to the earliest accounts of Him, analyze if you can the Gospels into the one central account that underlies them, and the one most certain fact about Him is that He worked miracles. He worked miracles if He did anything. Do you want to take His teaching by itself? It is embedded in miracles. Do you want the discourse on the Bread of Life? It is founded on the miracle of the feeding of the five thousand. The liberal teaching about the Sabbath? It is occasioned by a miracle on that day. Will you keep Him as the great Philanthropist or the Inspirer of Hospitals? They were inspired by His miracles and works of healing. The non-miraculous Christ is the fiction of the brain of the nineteenth century." If we take the position of treating the Gospels as nothing more than historical documents—and from the point of view of criticism this is a justifiable position to take—we must yet be careful to treat them as no less, and the historical evidence for the miraculous in the Gospels is overwhelming. Suppose we take the greatest of all the New Testament miracles. If a man will once give up the dogmatic assertion that all miracles are *a priori* impossible, the evidence for it is as great, if not greater, than that for any fact in history.

It was a canon of miracles laid down by Hume that "no testimony is sufficient to establish a miracle unless that testimony be of such a kind that its falsehood is more miraculous than the fact it endeavours to establish." It is just this that is claimed for the miracle of the Resurrection.

If it is not a fact, it is impossible to imagine how a body of

timid and ignorant fishermen from Galilee, who at the approach of danger to their Master all forsook Him and fled, could, in the course of a few weeks after His death, have begun a process of turning the world upside down, which has continued with increasing vigour to this day.

If it was not a fact that there was an empty tomb, the surest way of putting a stop to this new and hated religious movement was for the chief priests and scribes to have produced the body. This was never attempted.

If it was not a fact, how are we to account for the fact that over five hundred men and women believed that they had seen the Lord together? The sceptic says that they were mentally inclined to believe—that the wish was father to the thought; nothing could be further from the truth. Whatever the Apostles were, it is admitted that they were men of honesty; they all, at least, believed the truth of what they described. They would not have gone to prison and to death unless they had done so. Moreover, men of their intellectual capacity could not have invented the story of the Resurrection—at least, Renan says that they were "men without invention and without genius." Their account is that the disciples were so struck down with terror by their calamity that they refused to believe in the Resurrection. They certainly did not expect to see their Risen Master. And, more than this, a subjective vision has never been known to have come to several people at one time, nor several times to the same collected people. They were the last people to expect the Resurrection, they were the last people to have been able to invent the story; and had they invented the story, we are left with the assumption that the greatest event in the world's history—the event with most lasting results for the benefit of mankind—was founded on ignorance and perpetuated by a lie. That the Christian Church was founded in this way is a fact that is more difficult of belief than the miracle which this explanation seeks to disprove.

To turn now to the position formulated by Strauss, a position held very widely till recent times, but now rendered

impossible owing to modern scholarship. He, like Renan, demands the impossibility of the supernatural; but, unlike Renan, sees that the historical and the supernatural are impossible to separate in the narrative handed down to us. The historical, then, must go. Jesus is a myth—*i.e.*, Jesus, as we know Him in the Gospels, represents the accumulated growth of fable that appeared in the second century of our era, purporting to be the life of a good man who lived in the first century. Even if, as Strauss averred, the Gospels were the product of the second century, this theory allows very little time for the myth to have grown up. The miraculous myth only grows up round men who are only seen through the mists of antiquity, not round one who lived but a hundred years ago. But to-day no competent scholar dates the Synoptic Gospels later than the third quarter of the first century. The myth hypothesis is eliminated. Unless the writers were badly informed or were dishonest, their writings may reasonably be considered as historical. To demand that they were ill-informed is unscientific, considering the fact that the events described took place under the eyes of the writers or of their near companions. That they were dishonest, as we have seen from the character of the men and the example of their lives, as well as from the ingenuousness of their record, is in the highest degree improbable. The historical part of the narrative cannot be separated from the miraculous. We have, therefore, very good grounds for accepting the miraculous in the life and death of Jesus Christ.

After all, the main miracle is not the power possessed by Christ of healing the sick or of raising the dead, nor even the final display of power in His own triumph over death, but in the miracle of the spotless life—the life of perfect communion with the Father. That Christ had power to lead such a life, as cannot be denied—no man has ever been able to pick a hole in His character—proves that He lived in a higher spiritual plane than ordinary man. It is therefore only to be expected that He would have possessed higher powers in the spiritual

sphere than ordinary man—in other words, that He wrought miracles.

To the Christian there is no difficulty in believing that Christ worked miracles, because to him Christ is what He represented Himself to be—the Son of God, "equal to the Father, as touching His Godhead." That God should work miracles is a claim in which we see nothing impossible nor incredible. J. S. Mill admitted that if there be a God, there is no difficulty in believing in miracles. We believe in a God Who has appeared on earth, and to us the statement that He worked miracles on earth is neither irrational nor absurd.

But to revert to the objection that a miracle, even worked by God, is impossible because it necessitates an interruption in the law of Nature or because it is contrary to experience. These two will be found to merge into one. The mere expression "laws of Nature" presupposes the existence of a lawgiver who can at will change His law, if need be, to work out His design. The law of continuity, for example, is nothing more than a convenient principle for the direction of scientific investigation. That the expression is inadequate to express the rule of Nature is evident from the fact of creation. Even if we do not demand the literal interpretation of the early chapters of Genesis, it is evident that we cannot conceive of the absence of a beginning of creation, whether it be of the earth as such or of the germ of protoplasm which was to develop into the universe as we see it now. That beginning necessitates an interruption in continuity, so that this very postulate of science is untenable, except as a working hypothesis for the investigation of natural phenomena.

Again, it is very easy to talk of the uniformity of Nature as an objection to miracles, especially for people who know little of science and less of God; but it must be remembered that Nature, as Huxley said, "is the sum of the phenomena presented to our experience, the totality of events past, present, and to come, of which the so-called miracle forms a part." In other words, an *a priori* objection to a miracle is unsound. It

must be accepted or rejected on evidence." "If a dead man did come to life, the fact would be evident, not that a law of Nature had been violated, but that the laws of Nature, even when they express the result of a very long and uniform experience, are to be held only as grounds of a more or less justifiable expectation." Every day our experience is being widened, so that an event which twenty years ago would certainly have been considered contrary to Nature and contrary to experience is now accepted as a fact. As our knowledge increases, much that would until lately have been thought miraculous is seen to conform to laws higher than our previous experience dreamed of.

But if we admit that a law of Nature is a law until some law higher than itself has been made known to experience, we must yet allow that God, if we ascribe a miracle to Him in the past, has at least seemed to break natural laws, because the higher laws were not known to mankind at the time the miracle was performed. Might it not seem, then, that this action of God was due to mere caprice? Were it so, our idea of a just God would indeed receive a sad shock. The fact is that man, as we thought above, has a will of his own, whether he likes it or no; and by bringing that will into conflict with the Divine will he has necessitated a constant readjustment of the existing state of things by the Creator. Had man not sinned, and by his sin upset the fair order of God's earth, there would have been no need for Divine interference in a perfect state of things. The fact that God has interfered from time to time on earth only points to the fact that God is not merely an engineer who has constructed a locomotive, opened the throttle, and let her go where she will, whether the signals be green or red, but one who is constantly on the footplate to regulate the machinery and to safeguard the lives of the passengers. When things go on as usual, it seems as if the steam were working by a natural law; but when the master eye sees danger ahead, and sees fit to interfere, who is the individual crank, shut up in the complex machinery of the whole, that it should object to the engineer's interference?

The true miracle, as we thought, is always performed with a purpose—the purpose of revealing God to man. Now, since a supernatural God can only be revealed by supernatural means, and since it is only reasonable to suppose that if God has created beings for communion with Himself, He should reveal Himself to them, we must suppose a supernatural revelation; in other words, a miracle. I venture to think that the revelation which may come to a man to-day in time of suffering or crisis is as supernatural and miraculous as came in Christ's healing of the sick and suffering; each method is suited to its time. In His days that which we commonly call a miracle was demanded as a proof of the Divine; to-day such an occurrence would produce far less conviction than the Divine voice of conscience in the heart.

When all is said and done, we still need to remember that the day is coming when we shall see that miracles *do not exist.* "Miracle" is only a term to express certain Divine phenomena in human language. With God there is no miracle; or, if you like, everything is miracle. To revert to our former definition, we must, in the case of God, omit the words, "which cannot be ascribed to any known causes"; and we are left with the definition, "A miracle is an event manifesting purpose, occurring in the physical world, which we ascribe to a spiritual cause." If we admit the existence of God, we must allow that He knows the forces at His command. Once the forces are known, their action is easy to comprehend. If a child is told that a bar of iron can be cut as easily as a pat of butter, he may believe, but he cannot understand; it may be a miracle to him. When once he is old enough to understand the uses of the forge and the hydraulic chisel, all is easy to accept; the known forces are changed. So one day when we have left school, and are able to pursue our studies at the University, we possibly shall be able to understand that much that seemed to us miraculous has, after all, been done according to higher laws, which include, and perhaps repeal, those laws with which we have been familiar.

H. Colin Walker.

Liberal Evangelicalism: What it is and What it stands for.[1]

III.—THE BIBLE.

EVANGELICALISM is naturally conservative, but from what we have said it will be seen that it is not necessarily intransigeant. The right of private judgment prevents it from becoming stereotyped, gives it a perennial vitality and elasticity, and maintains an avenue of communication with contemporary thought.

The critical spirit of to-day has centred upon the Bible. It would be idle to deny that this severe examination to which the Scriptures have been, and are being, subjected has not caused a great deal of apprehension. But though we admit this, and admit also that this apprehension has much reason on its side, yet we are not prepared to deny the right of the critic, or to condemn his criticism as useless or mischievous. Indeed, much of the anxiety and questioning for which the more extravagant critics are responsible has served one good purpose—it has thrown the believer back upon Christ and the witness of the Holy Spirit in his heart. Chillingworth's dictum, "The Bible is the religion of Protestants," is not only wrong, but a grave error. Christ is the religion of Protestants, and the Bible is of value only as an instrument through which Christ mediates Himself to us.

We are prepared to listen to the voice of the critic, to weigh his arguments, to test his conclusions, to hold fast the good and reject the unprofitable. Our mind is open to receive new light, if there is any forthcoming, upon this as upon any other question.

The inspiration of the Bible is as real to us as to our fathers, but we find the proof of it not in any magical property it

[1 It may be convenient to state that the CHURCHMAN is not necessarily identified with all the views set forth in this series of papers. They are contributed by one of the ablest writers amongst the younger Evangelicals who is entitled to be heard.—ED.]

possesses, not in any miraculous method by which its contents were transmitted to men, but in its influence, its spiritual force in our hearts. Its inspiration consists in the peculiar power it has of seizing upon the Divine and spiritual part of our nature, and meeting every striving after better things. As the needle flies to the magnet, so half-awakened impulses after heavenly things, half-crushed yearnings after God, are stirred into new life and full activity when that Bible force, which we call inspiration, operates upon us.

There is no hall-mark of inspiration which the merely critical, the spiritually dead, can see: so far as such people are concerned, the Bible is as other books. Jesus of Nazareth was to unreceptive minds simply "the carpenter," but to those who were spiritually alive He was the Christ of God. So also is it with the Bible. It is, so to speak, the Divine in human form. It is its internal property which is revealed only to the spiritually receptive, wherein it is unique. There is no cause, then, for alarm if some of the popular assumptions regarding it have to be discarded, and any attempt to protect it from the free and honest application of new methods of inquiry is neither practicable nor advisable.

It would be a matter for considerable surprise, in view of all the new light thrown upon the Bible by new discoveries, if there were no such new methods. A more perfect knowledge of Hebrew, the discovery of many ancient manuscripts, the sciences of archæology, textual criticism, and comparative religion, are but a few of the fresh avenues to knowledge which have enriched our age. It would indeed be an odd thing if they had nothing to contribute to Biblical knowledge. We want to learn all that can be learnt; we mean to keep our minds open; and if readjustment of our views concerning the Bible is necessary in some details, we have no apprehension whatever that this will shake our belief in its inspiration.

It is true that in some subsidiary respects we do not now regard the Bible as our fathers and grandfathers did. They thought of it as one Book, homogeneous in character, verbally

exact, infallible in every detail upon which it touched, its writers controlled by the Holy Spirit in such a way that their individuality was lost, a Book Divine in the sense that the human was excluded.

We now know that the Book is a library of books, very diverse in character and in value. St. John's Gospel is on another plane from Esther, and Romans is of vastly higher value than Judges.

We know that these books were not placed side by side by any Divine command, but as the outcome of a very lengthy process in which spiritual intuition and inspired common sense played a very large part. The Canon of the Old Testament was not finally determined until after our Lord's Ascension. The Canon of the New Testament was not agreed upon till the end of the fourth century of the Christian era, and even in our own day a little uncertainty exists in some quarters. The Russian Church has some suspicion of Revelation, and the Syrian Church practically ignores some of the smaller Epistles and Revelation. Indeed, the process of forming a canon goes on unconsciously in the minds of most people, many of whom would firmly repudiate any sympathy with Biblical criticism; for several of the books of the Bible are very seldom read in private devotions, and two or three are practically, if not entirely, neglected.

The science of Textual Criticism was none too popular, but it has almost lived down its unpopularity, and its masterpiece, the Revised Version, is now received everywhere in a kindly way, if not with open arms.

But it is the so-called Higher Criticism which has met with the bitterest and most implacable hostility. This is not the place to discuss an exceedingly difficult and involved subject in detail, but some general consideration must be given to it, because the claim of the Liberals of every degree of liberality is so seriously challenged at this point.

First of all, let us say at once that we hold no brief whatever for the Higher Critic. We sit in the court in the capacity of

interested listeners, prepared to give a sympathetic hearing to both sides. If the critics have a real case, we are open-minded enough to listen; but large assumptions and confident assertions will carry no weight with us, whichever side makes them.

Speaking generally, we feel that *sane and reverent* criticism, in both its branches, has added greatly to the value and interest of the Bible, and in no sense, so far as can be seen, has it really injured it. Quite true, the mechanical view of inspiration has suffered, but this is a gain and no loss. The human element has been disclosed to us. There was no room for this in the old view of verbal inspiration. The writer was a mere insentient tool in the Divine Author's hand. But now we can feel the beat of the human heart throughout the whole Book, we can feel the striving of the human for union and concord with the Divine, and our Bible is coming back to us more precious and dear than ever before. It is the humanity in our Divine Lord which draws us to Him. Before He could reveal the Father to us He had to assume human nature, and then, flesh of our flesh, bone of our bone, He was able "to shew us the Father." The Bible is thus emblematic of the Incarnation, and it is its human side which finds us, gathers us up, and sweeps us into the Divine aura.

Isaiah was not a mere pen in the hand of God. He was a man like us, yearning and agonizing for God, and in his self-abasement and humility God came to his soul and revealed Himself to him. What, then, does it matter whether or no the latter part of his prophecy was his work or another's? Whoever was the hero who reached that level, he was a man like us.

The history of the ancient patriarchs was not a dictation from the mouth of God mechanically committed to writing, but a living story of how men of old time strove to find God, how they succeeded, and how they sometimes failed.

The Psalms are not mere ecstatic outbursts by men in a kind of spiritual coma. We can put our finger upon the human pulse in every verse, and we can feel the beating of a human

heart, sometimes sobbing in penitence, sometimes shouting with joy, sometimes cast down, sometimes lifted up, but human, human, always human, just as we are ourselves.

Full well we know the mischief that rash and baseless assertions made by the more extravagant critics have done to many souls. But though we lament this, we cannot see that it gives any ground for wholesale condemnation of criticism. It is from Germany that this dogmatic and hectoring critical method has mainly come, and it is all of a piece with the blustering and over-confident self-assertion which we look for from that quarter.

Wellhausen has gone through the Old Testament with a blue pencil, and his disciples have followed him with a box of crayons. The result has been a polychrome Bible, which sane English criticism has laid aside with a smile of amusement. Upon the facts which they have discovered, valuable as all facts must be, they have erected a superstructure perfectly ridiculous. We have no scruples in accepting the facts and ridiculing the top-hamper.

These theological Huns have not spared the New Testament. The bombardment of Rheims Cathedral is but the military counterpart to the bullying and swaggering onslaught on the most delicate truths of our faith. To "hack a way through" their opponents is the approved method of the leading caste in Germany, and it is only to be expected that a similar attitude would be adopted in matters far less important in German eyes. Their theological professors have taken their cue from Potsdam, and the wildest and most dogmatic assertions have been made, repeated, and reiterated again and again. It is the voice of the Jub-jub; when they have said a thing three times it is truth, and must be accepted as such on pain of ridicule and the charge of ignorance. We are bidden to do a goose-step in response to their whistle!

It is hard to refrain from bitterness, for we have suffered much from the positiveness and bullying of Germany. We quite anticipate that not the least far-reaching consequence of

the present war will be a reaction against German criticism, and a calm and reverent re-examination of much which has passed for "assured results" of criticism, and Wellhausen, Pfleiderer, Lobstein, *et hoc genus omne*, will be condemned as possessing a zeal not according to knowledge. We are bitter against these extremists because we feel that criticism of the Bible, which ought to be all gain and no loss, has been prejudiced and dishonoured. We strive to keep an open mind, but when mere *ipse dixit* is advanced as argument, it is a severe temptation to turn away in disgust.

The essential qualification for criticism of the Bible is often overlooked. We hear a great deal of the necessity for rigorous application of the historical and scientific method. With this we are in hearty agreement, and venture to repeat that we are certain that nothing but pure gain can result from such a process. But another thing needs to be borne in mind. A satisfactory and efficient critic must possess a sympathetic mind, open to the most delicate and subtle impressions. This applies to every form of criticism.

How many biographies have been rendered useless by this very want in their writers? As literary productions they are admirable, but as a portrait of their subject they are useless. Conversely, the possession of this one gift will compensate for nearly every other loss. Boswell was a shallow gossip who was frequently snubbed for his ineptitudes by the great mind he almost worshipped, but he has written a life of his hero which will live as long as English literature. Boswell's "Life of Johnson" is immortal because it is a biography written by one who, whatever his faults might be, spared no pains to study his subject. His love and his sympathy covered every defect; they enabled him to surmount every obstacle, and Dr. Johnson lives again in the work he wrote.

How much more so is this the case with the Bible? It is essentially a Book for the soul, and soulless men can no more estimate it and criticize it than a blind man could criticize art.

"We may easily idolize or under-estimate a man," says

Illingworth, "but to know him as he is—his true motives, the secret springs of his conduct, the measure of his abilities, the explanation of his inconsistencies, the nature of his esoteric feelings, the dominant principle of his inner life—this is often a work of years, and one in which our own character and conduct play quite as important a part as our undertaking: for not only must the necessary insight be the result of our own acquired capacities—which will have to be great in proportion to the greatness of the personality with which we have to deal—but there must further exist the kind and degree of affinity between us which can alone make self-revelation on his part possible."

Now it is just because we feel and know that there is a living Something in the Bible that we protest that sympathetic appreciation is indispensable to genuine and effective criticism. To apply naked historical and scientific method to the Bible is like criticizing a Beethoven symphony by testing the volume of sound it produces or counting the number of parts in the orchestration. The essential and distinctive thing in the Bible is the Living Spirit within, and the would-be critic who overlooks this is *ipso facto* disqualified for his task before he begins.

This is what we mean when we plead for *reverent* criticism. Not only have we no desire to hold back our Bible from examination even if we could. Rather do we thrust it forth for criticism of the most rigorous kind; but we maintain that the critic must have his spiritual sense highly developed. This is, when we reflect, no more unreasonable than the demand that a musical critic should understand music, otherwise the possession of the literary gift and the power to write racy critiques will result only in injustice to the work displayed for criticism. So it is not unreasonable to ask that the would-be critic should combine with the historical and scientific method a spiritual mind.

When, for instance, Professor Schmiedel tells us that, of all the many statements attributed to our Lord, in his opinion there are only nine which we can be certain He uttered, he

is laying claim to possessing a perfectly unique power of sensing the Spirit of Christ, a sympathy with His Mind so subtle that he can catch at once the false note in all else which Christ was reported to have uttered. Such an illustration of so-called critical methods is a *reductio ad absurdum;* for Professor Schmiedel, great scholar though he be, has not yet given any real evidence of possessing great prophetic and spiritual insight.

But the combination of the spiritual sense with historical and scientific method will give us scholars equal in some measure to their task, and they will supply us with results wholly helpful in the long run. We say in the long run, because to those bred and brought up in the old view of the Scripture, some mental adjustment will be necessary. Alarm may be occasioned in some cases, and the cry may go up that the anchor is dragging. Serious though this feeling of anxiety is, yet it is necessary and welcome if it recalls us to this obvious fact that it is to Christ we are anchored, and not to the Bible. Christ exists for us quite apart from the Bible. He mediates Himself to us through its reading, it is the record of His dealings with men, and therefore priceless to us, and the better understanding of that record can only enrich our spiritual life. But any revision of our estimate of the Bible surely cannot rob us of our experience of its value? We shall at the worst have to revise our definition of inspiration, but nothing can prove that the Book is not inspired, because we know perfectly well that it inspires us. We come to it as to a friend, we take up and read it, and we are conscious that God meets us in its pages. No learned talk about J, E, P, D, or Q can obscure, much less negative, that fact. We know it and rejoice in it. So far from sober inquiry into its sources and origins hindering us, once we have discarded the view that infallibility is a necessary constituent to inspiration, it aids us and stimulates us and adds to the interest and value of our reading.

But if we start with the idea that the Bible is a kind of inerrant encyclopædia of all branches of subjects—historical,

scientific, and ethnological—upon which it happens to touch, then deep anxiety and much disquietude of soul is before us.

We do not mean to suggest that all (or for that matter any) of the conclusions of sober and reverent inquirers are necessarily right. They may all be wrong, as in our judgment *some* at any rate are more than questionable. But we plead rather for this, that the mind should be kept open and unprejudiced to any new light which may be forthcoming, that we should entrench ourselves behind the position that the Bible is given us to foster the Divine Life within, that its purpose is to mediate God to our souls, and that our assurance that it fulfils this object is not dependent upon the authorship of the books of the Bible, nor upon the accuracy of its historical or scientific statements, but upon our own certain knowledge of its value to our souls, our own assurance that the Holy Spirit uses it as the most powerful instrument in dealing with our souls.

Let a man know this and he has got the Bible embedded in his soul. Intellectual processes will then move easily on their own proper plane. But let the spiritual value of the Bible become entangled with intellectual conceptions of what it *must* be if it is to be regarded as inspired, and then growing confusion or obstinate obscurantism are the only alternatives before us.

X.

The Danger of Modern Controversy.

WITHIN recent years a considerable amount of attention has been given to the actual condition of affairs within the Church of Christ. The wave of unrest which has disturbed the social and political world has invaded the Christian community, and has introduced a period of unsettlement, not only in the practical activities of the Church, but also in the traditional beliefs which have been handed down from days of old. The controversies which have been raised have been fraught with unhappy consequences. In the minds of many educated laymen, controversy suggests uncertainty, and they have preferred to withhold their active support pending the settlement of the questions which are under discussion. When the theologians disagree, the wisdom of suspending judgment commends itself to the lay mind. Moreover, the differences of opinion have often resulted in the display of an unchristian spirit, which has widened the gulf between those who ought to be united in the closest bonds of brotherhood and love.

I.

The appeal to antiquity exercises a strange fascination over a type of mind which loves to idealize a past age; yet the value of such an appeal can be very differently appreciated; and the resistance to any attempt to set up the beliefs and practices of a past generation either as a standard of judgment or as the model for our imitation would be uncompromising and severe. Some acquaintance with the Liberal movement is needful if we are to rightly appreciate the forces at work in the present controversies. "There is remarkable unity," writes Professor E. C. Moore, "in the history of Protestant thought from the Reformation to the end of the eighteenth century. There is a still more surprising unity of thought in this period with the thought of the mediæval and ancient Church. The basis and methods are the same. Upon many points the conclusions are

identical. There was nothing in which the Protestant scholastics were more proud than of their agreement with the Fathers of the Early Church."[1] The prevailing spirit of the last century was impatient of such limitations. The altered views of history, of Nature, and of man, were "characteristics of the nineteenth century. They would naturally issue in an interpretation of Christianity in the general context of the life and thought of that century."[2] Consequently the appeal to antiquity as the final authority in the settlement of modern controversies would be questioned by those whose outlook upon life tallied with this description, and any attempt to enforce the result of such an appeal would be provocative of greater disorders than those which already exist. The disciples of Liberal Theology would rally to resist what would be in their eyes an encroachment upon freedom of thought.

It is often assumed that the primitive Church was a perfect Church, but the description in the New Testament does not bear out this assumption. The members lived nearer to the fountain-head of Christianity, and were fired with the enthusiasm which a new religious movement was certain to arouse. The conflict between the Church and the world was more keenly felt than it is to-day, and the fires of persecution served to keep outside the Church all who were not sincere. The severity of the sufferings which Christians were called upon to endure purified the Church and strengthened the bond of union between the members. "Persecution," writes Canon Hobhouse in his Bampton Lectures, "always acted as a winnowing fan and separated the wheat from the chaff. In a time of persecution no one became a Christian who was not in earnest, and the nominal or half-hearted Christians who had crept in already were weeded out and denied their faith."[3] Those early days were the purest days of Christianity, but it does not necessarily follow that the Church of those days was either perfect or infallible. The writer already referred to goes on to say:

[1] Caldwell, "Christian Thought since Kant," p. 2.
[2] Hobhouse, "Church and World," p. 67.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 5.

"We may well keep ever before us the warning not to idealize Ante-Nicene Christianity overmuch. The imperfections which we traced in the Apostolic Church were always there, and, with the spread of the Church, love, as we have seen, was more apt to grow cold, and faction to become schism and weakness apostasy." In a footnote he adds that the canons of the Synod of Elvira in Spain (A.D. 305-306) supply one of the most striking evidences of the degeneration of Christianity before the time of Constantine. "These canons show a very low state of sexual morality, and a prevalent tendency to relapse into idolatry."[1]

The Apostles themselves would have been the last to prefer any claim to infallibility for the New Testament Church, and their writings suggest that matters did not always run smoothly in these primitive communities. In fact, for them the Golden Age lay neither in the past nor in the present, but in the future. They looked forward to the time when Christ should come again and establish His Kingdom, and the eschatological hope occupied a prominent place in their presentation of Christianity.

On the other hand, no adequate conception of Christianity is possible without an appeal to antiquity, yet such an appeal must be made upon the right grounds. Throughout the history of Christianity there have been certain fundamental principles and leading ideas which remained persistent in the midst of change. Their expression or interpretation has varied according to the conditions of each succeeding age or the environment in which they were placed, or the personality of the individual through whom they operated. The discovery of these fundamentals requires a careful investigation of primitive Christianity, and especially of the New Testament literature. Only it must be borne in mind that the object of search is not precedents,

[1] Hobhouse, "Church and World," p. 79: "In the first generation of Christianity every man became a Christian at his peril. The converts were adults, and each conversion represented an act of individual deliberation and resolve. . . ." "There were as yet no hereditary and conventional Christians; even at the end of the second century Tertullian could say, 'Fiunt non nascuntur Christiani' (p. 66)."

but principles; not so much a model for our exact imitation, as the source of a religious experience which has always accompanied the sincere acceptance of the Christian Faith. The practical counsels of the New Testament are valid for all time, but the administrative policy was developed to meet existing needs. The existence of any special form or custom at a given period, even in the earliest days, cannot be taken as sufficient justification for the assertion that it is essential to the preservation of the Christian Faith.

The bearing of these considerations upon modern controversies may not be at first apparent. The growth of the Christian Church brought in its train a series of practical difficulties which very largely grew out of existing social conditions, and which had to be settled by those in authority. These difficulties may have differed widely from those which distress the Church to-day, yet if we can ascertain the spirit in which the Apostles approached the settlement of the various disputes as they arose, if we can ascertain the ruling principles which regulated their methods and guided their activity, we shall have at our disposal information of the highest value when we are brought face to face with the unhappy controversies of the present day.

II.

The Epistles of St. Paul contain many references to the presence of disturbing elements in the various Churches with which he was brought in contact. In the Church at Corinth there were practical disorders which threatened to break up the unity of the Church. The development of a strong party spirit had gone on side by side with extraordinary laxity in the administration of discipline. Heinous sin was openly tolerated, and there appears to have been no clear conception of the gravity of the issues which such a compromise with evil must involve. It needed a stern reproof from the Apostle to stay that Church in her downward path. The toleration of sin was

an open scandal to the Christian name.[1] The petty jealousies and mutual recriminations were breeding a schism which would impair the life of the Church.[2]

The Epistle to the Colossians was addressed to a Church where the danger was of a different kind. Influences had been at work to corrupt the purity of the Christian Faith, and the prevailing spirit had fostered an undue interest in curious and vain speculations. The three neighbouring cities of Laodicea, Hierapolis, and Colosse were important commercial centres in Asia Minor. Laodicea was the capital of the province, while Hierapolis was not only the centre of a busy trade, but was also a favourite health-resort on account of the medicinal qualities of the waters in that locality.[3] The population included a large number of foreigners who had been attracted from other parts of the empire, and had made their home in one or other of these cities. Then, as now, the people flocked to the large towns, seeking wealth and prosperity in the busy centres of industry. Now, these people would bring with them their special religious beliefs which they were accustomed to practise, in addition to the national and civic religious rites. Consequently, within the borders of these towns there would be representatives of the various types of religious belief, and the conditions were favourable to the formation of religious communities. Hierapolis has been described as "the chief centre of the passionate mystical devotion of ancient Phrygia."[4]

The Christian Church grew and flourished in this circle of ideas, and it would be surprising had it escaped altogether the syncretistic influences of these pagan cults. Many members of the Christian communities had at one time belonged to one or other of these religious brotherhoods, and certain resemblances might lead them to suppose that the likeness between the new and old faith extended much farther than was actually the case. The introduction of familiar ideas, and the attempt to combine them with the Gospel which they had received, becomes intel-

[1] 1 Cor. v., vi. 19, 20. [2] 1 Cor. iii. 1-9, xii., xiii.
[3] See Lightfoot, "Colossians," pp. 7-11. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 12.

ligible in the light of these considerations. Moreover, the desire to extend the Christian Faith would itself prove to be a strong temptation to accommodate that Faith and bring it more into line with contemporary ideas. Many more would be won if Christianity could be shown to possess a close affinity with accustomed beliefs and practices. The tendency at work here was *to add* to the Faith. To some the additions would have seemed harmless and relatively unimportant. The significance of the changes could be easily overlooked.

Such, in brief, is a description of two of the situations which St. Paul was called upon to face—the practical disorders at Corinth, and the speculative tendencies in the neighbourhood of Colosse. Both had their own special dangers, and the position required very careful handling. In both cases St. Paul finds the key to the situation in the Gospel of Christ. He reminds the Corinthian Christians of their baptism into Christ. He takes the fact of their union with Christ as the reason for their union with one another. "Is Christ divided? Was Paul crucified for you? or were ye baptized in the name of Paul?"[1] With penetrating insight he diagnosed the state of affairs in Colosse. These extra beliefs could not be sheltered under the cloak of Christianity without destroying the essential truth. Jesus Christ was the one and only Mediator between God and man. He does not attempt to discuss the value of the speculations, but rather lays his finger upon the root-cause of all the mischief—they are not "holding fast the Head,"[2] even Christ. Their indulgence in speculations had weakened their grasp upon essentials. The exalted conception of the Person of Christ, which is one of the characteristic features of this Epistle, was framed to serve as a corrective to the type of teaching which, by peopling the supernatural world with a host of intermediary beings, was raising an unnecessary barrier to the fulness of the communion between God and man.

The Apostle was fully alive to the pressing danger which the controversy had created, and he sought to avert the danger

[1] See 1 Cor. i. 12, 13. [2] Col. ii. 19.

by a return to the first principles of discipleship. Whether he was called upon to meet the opposition of the Jews, who sought to combine the legal system of the Old Testament with the Gospel, or whether he was dealing with an attempt to incorporate pagan ideas into the Faith of the Church, he insisted with all the force at his command upon the completeness and perfection of the work of Christ. When he was called upon to find a remedy for practical disorders within a local Church, he sought to apply the same truth to the immediate needs. The relation of the individual to Christ would determine his relations with his fellow-Christians. The great facts of the Incarnation and Atonement were central; from them radiated forth the solution of every difficulty, whether practical or speculative, which the Church was called upon to face.

III.

The troubles which distressed the Church at Corinth are in many respects similar to those with which we are familiar to-day, but the speculative spirit which manifested itself in the neighbourhood of Colosse belongs to an age and temperament very different from our own. The Western mind is more practical than the Eastern, and our own tastes do not lie in the direction of speculation. We have our own problems to solve, and we approach them along the lines of experience, making ascertained facts the basis for further progress. The idea of the Divine Immanence appeals to such a habit of mind, and we have learned to trace the hand of God in the course of history and in the natural phenomena of the physical world.

The marked change in our outlook upon life apparently justifies the assumption that the ancient and modern world have little in common; yet the far-reaching changes have not altered the sad fact that controversies still rage with increasing force around the faith and practice of the Church. The most sacred things are dragged into the arena of conflict, and the display of an unchristian spirit over details in worship and ceremonial, or

the nature and extent of revelation or Biblical inspiration, and other subjects of a kindred nature, has been in many cases a stumbling-block to the acceptance of the Christian Faith. Doubtless there must be protests against false teaching. Unlimited tolerance is incompatible with genuine Christianity, and St. Paul himself never hesitated to condemn perversions of the Gospel he was commissioned to proclaim. Controversies are inevitable; and the interchange of opinions can easily become fruitful of good results, and one of these is the creation of a better understanding between those who approach the same subject from different points of view. At the same time the existing conditions within the Church, and the lamentable loss of spiritual power directly caused by the ill-feeling and mutual suspicion which those engaged in the controversy so often exhibit, should serve to remind us of the danger, which is as real to-day as it was in the days of St. Paul. It is fatally easy to be so obsessed with accidentals that we weaken our hold upon essentials. The Person of Christ, His Incarnation, His Cross, are the central fundamental facts, and only in the light of this revelation can we hope to arrive at a satisfactory solution of the manifold problems which distress the Church.

IV.

A brief reference to one of the most urgent problems of the day will help to illustrate the main contention of the foregoing argument.

In the *Realm of Faith*, controversy centres around the Person of Christ. If at one time the tendency was to believe too much, at the present day the tendency is to believe too little. Beneath the surface of a great deal of conventional Christianity there lurks a latent scepticism, and it is now fashionable to take exception to the traditional doctrines contained in the Creed. The hesitation to make the venture of faith, and to cross the line of actual human experience, is one of the most serious factors with which the Church of to-day has

to reckon. In some respects the movement represents the reaction from the excessive dogmatism of a past generation, and is not wholly attributable to an irreligious spirit; the reluctance to accept the traditional formula may spring from intellectual honesty which will not profess to accept any statement which is not sincerely believed. Such a state of mind is preferable to the easy and formal repetition of the Creed by one who seldom troubles to think out the significance of the doctrines he professes to believe and constantly denies his creed by his life.

We cannot, it is true, alter and accommodate the Creed to the sceptical mind unless we are prepared to allow Christianity to degenerate into a nebulous theism, but we can and ought to express our creed in terms of life and experience, and indicate the bearing of those truths upon the practical problems of the day.

It is through the deepening of personal religion that we shall prove the reality of our faith. The revival of spiritual life and power which will accompany the renewal of our fellowship with Christ will do more to dispel our doubts and solve our difficulties than the study of apologetics—important as such a study is. "Nothing, I suppose," writes the present Bishop of Oxford in his Bampton Lectures, "can keep the Christianity of a theoretical student from deterioration save the constant exercise of prayer."[1] Through communion with God in Christ, man receives the assurance that the Divinity of Christ is not a fiction, but a reality. Then, while the supernatural elements must remain a mystery, they will no longer be a stumbling-block to faith. It was an experience of this kind which led the inhabitants of the Samaritan village to say: "Now we believe, not because of thy speaking; for we have heard for ourselves and know that this is indeed the Saviour of the world."[2]

W. Escott Bloss.

[1] Gore, "Incarnation," p. 5.

[2] John iv. 42 (R.V.).

The Missionary World.

EVERY reader of these notes has a "favourite society," whose annual gathering is to him the central feature of the May Meetings. But this year the meeting of the China Inland Mission on Tuesday, May 11, is central for us all. It is the jubilee year of this mission, which, standing on distinctive ground and holding to the principles of its founder, has yet drawn into continually closer fellowship with all Christian Churches and all other missionary agencies. Those who, like the present writer, knew Hudson Taylor in his prime nearly thirty years ago, have watched the growth and development of the mission with deep thanksgiving. The record of its large income, sent without any direct solicitation from headquarters, of its steady advance into one unopened province of China after another, of its international and interdenominational methods, and of its more than fifty thousand baptisms of Chinese during the fifty years since its foundation, is one of the best modern evidences of Christianity. The spiritual force of the mission has told far outside its own borders, both in the mission-field and at the home base. It is to be desired that the message of the mission, embodied in an attractive volume (3s. 6d. or 2s. net, according to binding) entitled "The Jubilee Story of the China Inland Mission," by Mr. Marshall Broomhall, to be published on May 11, may be circulated widely. It will stir consciences and warm hearts.

* * * * *

After the period of special "May Meetings," with its inspiration and interchange of thought, comes the return of each man to his local work, the sphere in which problems have to be faced in the actual, and theory translated into practice. Of all men, the minister in his parish has the most evident opportunity for serving the missionary cause. In recent issues of the *International Review of Missions*, twelve men who have, in the opinion of their respective denominations, been successful in America, Great Britain, and the Continent of Europe in moving

their congregations to active support of missions, have been recording their personal experiences. A study of the twelve papers brings out certain interesting points. The writers realize that "the pastor is the key to the situation," and that it is by the reality of his own spiritual zeal and the self-sacrifice of his own giving that he can move men. Stress is laid again and again upon the value of preaching, and the content of missionary sermons is discussed. Various assumptions, erroneous in themselves, are noted as having hindered—disbelief in the universality of Christianity; belief that home work has prior claims; that missions are "not a business proposition," and that they communicate dogma, not life; that responsibility is restricted by empire, and that interference with conviction is dishonourable. Other difficulties recorded are—the obscuring of missionary ideals by intellectual and moral obstacles, the conflict between old and new schools of thought, ignorance and apathy, counterclaims, lack of "a mind for missions," inadequate ideals for the Church, the temptation to popularize the missionary appeal, "ophthalmia among church officials," and the waning of enthusiasm. These points are gathered from ministers representing many denominations in many lands, yet we Anglicans in Great Britain know them all.

* * * * *

Still more suggestive is it to gather out the principles which these twelve ministers have found effective in their work. More than one urges the need for expanding from a spiritual nucleus, beginning first with those whose faith is vital; several from different lands find world-wide interests and a share in world-wide movements essential to the maintenance of local missionary life; a minister who has seen great things among his people urges the importance of presupposing their missionary interest, taking for granted that they care; others have found it vital to inculcate right ideas of stewardship, and to fire the imagination of their people by appeals framed on an adequate scale. If the central place assigned to missions in parochial work is to be maintained, active co-operation in work will have to be claimed

from all supporters, the young people will have to be secured, and the principle of "scrapping worn-out machinery" will have to be faithfully applied. The range of method which has been found useful is very wide, varying with nation, denomination, and type of congregation; organized intercession has a large place; specialization upon particular objects (wisely balanced by the cultivation of world-wide interests) is frequently recorded; the utilization of Church seasons, especially confirmation classes, is urged; and the permeation of all parochial agencies with a missionary spirit is strongly recommended. None of this is mere theory; the writers have "done the thing," and each man records the means which he himself has tested. Therefore the papers are encouraging as well as informing. What has been, by the grace of God, may be.

* * * * *

At a time when the material forces of Islam are in part being engaged in earthly warfare, and when the future is big with problems as to the political centre of the Moslem world, a book on "The Vital Forces of Christianity and Islam," just published by the Oxford University Press (3s. 6d.), is sure of a welcome. It contains an introductory chapter by Dr. S. M. Zwemer, a concluding chapter by the leading American student of Islam, Professor D. B. Macdonald, and six studies by missionaries to Moslems, men of various nationalities, working in various fields. The main topics of the book are—the vital elements in Islam; the specific points in Islam with which Moslems are dissatisfied; the elements in the Christian gospel and Christian life which appeal to Moslems; those which awaken opposition and create difficulty among Moslems; points of contact between Christianity and Islam; and light shed on the vital elements of Christianity and on the New Testament by contact with Islam. Each writer deals with these points in turn. In order to facilitate the use of the book an index has been provided classifying the contents under these main topics, which makes the volume singularly well suited for use by those who speak or preach on missions to Moslems.

* * * * *

The *C.M. Review*, wisely relating its contents to current interests, has three articles on Palestine: a survey of the C.M.S. Mission covering a hundred years; a sketch of Northern Palestine as it was thirty years ago; and a record of the experiences of a missionary doctor in Southern Palestine in the closing weeks of 1914. *Mercy and Truth* also contains an interesting account of the C.M.S. Dispensary at El Areesh, a town which has come into prominence through the Turkish attack upon Egypt. The Bishop in Jerusalem, in a "greeting" which is published in the *Moslem World*, regards the future of his extensive diocese as hopeful, and urges the need of preparation of heart and mind during the waiting-time, that workers may be ready to advance when the "countless opportunities" of the near future open to the Christian Church.

* * * * *

Two articles in the April number of the *Moslem World* are uniquely interesting. One is by the well-known Dutch Islamist, Dr. Snouck Hurgronje, in which he records the amazement created in the island of Java by the introduction of a phonograph. A Sayyid in Batavia used one to reproduce verses of the Koran, whereon a discussion arose as to whether this was profane or lawful. Dr. Hurgronje summarizes the curious arguments used by the learned Moslems on both sides of the question. Meantime the phonograph has attained great popularity in Java. In the other article referred to, M. Louis Massignon defines the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church towards Islam. He first analyzes, upon the authority of official documents and Papal Bulls, the general directions given by the Popes to the Roman Church in its relation to Islam at various times from the Crusades onwards, and then studies the present application of these directions in the missionary work of the White Fathers, founded by Cardinal Lavigerie, the religious Order to whom is allotted the Moslem world. This large missionary organization has a threefold field of work—the African lakes (including the mission to Uganda), Jerusalem, and Algeria and the Sudan. The three stages enjoined for evangelization in purely Moslem regions such as

the latter, are—a period of contemplation given to prayer, penance, and works of mercy, with no religious teaching; a period of seeking to win selected individuals by personal effort; and a period of open evangelization by means of discussion, the creation of literature, and the use of native agents. The first stage is often protracted—we read of one missionary in a specially difficult post in the Sahara who has been in this first stage for twenty years; the second stage has been reached in Kabylia; the third stage has been attempted successfully in only one or two stations. The whole article will repay study, though the standpoint of the writer as to the political and religious relations between Christianity and Islam differs widely from our own.

* * * * *

The April number of the *International Review of Missions* represents an extraordinary amount of research and careful grouping of selected facts. Mr. Maurice Evans's well-proportioned study of "Black and White in South Africa"; the Rev. J. H. Ritson's masterly summary of "Christian Literature in the Mission Field"; and Dr. H. T. Hodgkin's survey of evidence gathered in an inquiry as to "Self-support in the Mission Field," are all papers to be read first and then to be noted for future reference. Those concerned with the higher finance of missions—for whose special interests little is provided in missionary periodicals—will welcome the sane and suggestive paper by an American on "Some Aspects of the Work of a Treasurer of a Foreign Mission Board." Professor Hogg's paper on "Missionary Intercession and the Crisis" will not disappoint those who have found rich pasture in his book, "Christ's Message of the Kingdom." But perhaps the article of most immediate interest is that which summarizes briefly the work of the Continental missionary societies.

* * * * *

The article in question simply states the actual facts as they were in July, 1914, before the world-war broke upon us. The work undertaken by continental Protestant missions is reported

field by field. At the close a summary shows the total extent of German, French, Swiss, Dutch, Swedish, Norwegian, Danish, and Finnish missions. But the burning interest of the paper, as we read it, lies in the questions concerning all this work which the war has raised. To take our own empire only, the work of continental nations among our subject peoples is long established and widespread. The great French mission in Basutoland and Barotsiland, costing the little French Protestant Church some £10,000 a year, has been a factor for righteousness and peace in British South Africa. How is it, in the sore impoverishment of France, to be maintained? About half of the missionary work of German Christians is in British territory, and some of it dates back eighty years. German missionaries have received honours from our Government, and their school have been subsidized like our own. One German mission alone in India has been carrying on over 300 schools. There are besides large and prospering missions in German colonies, on which much prayer and labour have been spent. Altogether a Christian community of well over 700,000 has been gathered round German mission centres in Asia and in Africa, and over 1,600 German missionaries were at work last autumn. The present arrest of all their work is terrible. But the future is even graver than the present. Here lies a great problem which no Christian, especially no British Christian, can afford to leave out of account. No readjustment of boundaries between nations at the close of the war can be lightly accepted in which missionary interests are left out of sight. The facts which the article in the *International Review of Missions* sets before us are a powerful plea for such a settlement, when the war is over, as will make continued and expanded missionary co-operation between European nations possible. G.

Notices of Books.

THE BOOKS OF THE APOCRYPHA: THEIR ORIGIN, TEACHING, AND CONTENTS. By the Rev. W. O. E. Oesterley, D.D. London: *Robert Scott.* Price 16s. net.

Some books find it needful to apologize for their appearance because they merely traverse already well-covered ground. Others are happy enough to fill a really vacant place. In the opinion of the present writer, Dr. Oesterley's book belongs to the latter class. Up to recent times the book most accessible on the Apocrypha was the work written by various authors and published as two volumes of the Speaker's Commentary, under the editorship of Dr. Wace, in 1888. This contained Introduction and Commentary on the several books. Since its publication a flood of new light has been thrown upon the period in which the Apocrypha was written. New documents illustrating its contents have been discovered, and whole movements of thought have been investigated and made clear. A new commentary on the Apocrypha which should take account of recent research was much to be desired. Now, in 1913 there was published "The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English." This was a joint production of many of our leading scholars, edited by Dr. R. H. Charles. It took its place at once as the standard work upon the subject. But it suffered from its very magnificence. It was a technical work demanding scholarship for its understanding, and its price was rather prohibitive. There was still a place for what may be called a popular edition of Dr. Charles's book at a less price. This place Dr. Oesterley's book has filled, and his name is a sufficient guarantee that the work has been ably done out of the fulness of knowledge. There is no detailed commentary on the several books. The second part of the volume deals with them individually, and gives for each a discussion of those points which usually come under the head of Introduction, *e.g.*, title, original language, sources, authorship and date, summary of contents, theology, historicity, and purpose. This is all excellently done. The only criticism possible is that sometimes compression has been carried so far that it is difficult to grasp the meaning. We have noticed this particularly in the sections on Theology. It may be permissible also to express the wish that the analysis of the books had in some cases been fuller, so that it would have been easy for a reader to take his Apocrypha in hand and, with the analysis by his side, to have read his text with intelligent appreciation. Such extra fulness was the more to be desired since notes on the text are excluded.

The first and larger half of the book gives an elaborate introduction to the whole apocryphal period, and the author feels constrained to apologize for the number of *prima facie* irrelevant subjects which he has introduced. He deals, in over 300 pages, with the following main questions: (1) What was the Hellenistic movement, and what were its effects upon the Jews in Palestine, and in the Dispersion, and upon their Scriptures? The four chapters which give the answer are freshly and interestingly written. Sometimes Dr. Oesterley sees Greek influence in Old Testament books—*e.g.*, Job and Psalms—where we fail to see it, and where the late Dr. Driver did

not see it. But the Old Testament is not very material to the matter in hand. (2) What was the Apocalyptic movement? Here every writer must be indebted to Dr. Charles's pioneer labours. (3) What was the position and teaching of Jewish sects, like Scribes, Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes? (4) How was the Old Testament canon formed? Here again we disagree with Dr. Oesterley in detail, and are inclined to put the practical fixing of the canon earlier than he does. He assigns its formation to a date later than Dr. Ryle does, to say nothing of more conservative canonists like Green. (5) What are the uncanonical books, and why are they so called? In this section a short account is given (unfortunately, too often very short) of the main apocalyptic books, eleven in number. (6) What is the meaning and object of Jewish "Wisdom Literature"? (7) What is the teaching of the apocryphal books on outstanding points of doctrine?

To each chapter is appended a good summary, and there are copious indexes at the end of the book, and references to further literature at the head of each chapter. The Apocrypha has been declared by our time-honoured formulary to be useful for instruction in life and manners, and we thank Dr. Oesterley for a book which will greatly help the English reader to appreciate and derive benefit from its varied contents.

C. H. K. Boughton.

Democracy and Christian Doctrine. An essay in re-interpretation. By W. H. Carnegie, M.A. London: *Macmillan and Co.* Price 4s. 6d. net.

"Personal experience gained in the heart of a great democratic community" has enabled Canon Carnegie to discover the virtue of the working classes, the vice of the Church, and the need of theology. The curriculum of this otherwise excellent school does not inculcate the avoidance of hasty generalization or inconsequential reasoning.

"The fact that only a small proportion of working men are regular attendants at any place of worship, and that a still smaller proportion are attached members of any religious body is itself significant." This is not, however, the special peculiarity of the working men; the wealthier classes are equally at fault. It is not class interest, but human nature, that is opposed to the Gospel. The fact is wider than any one person's observation of it.

Canon Carnegie describes the Church, with its repelling force upon the working men, as one which is "represented by living agents, who too often seem to ignore injustices and inequalities . . . who are disposed to extenuate them, and to ally themselves politically and socially with those who profit by them." Such a conscious acquiescence in wrong is not fairly attributable to the clergy of to-day, who as a whole evince the warmest endeavours to rebuke the sins and the selfishness of all people, and who warmly espouse the cause of the weak. "The Church, which in well-appointed and comfortable buildings provides sweet music, and attractive ceremonial, and soothing discourse for well-off worshippers, while imposing small strain upon their professed adherence for personal service and sacrifice." What a travesty of truth! Advocates of music and ceremony believe that these adjuncts of service are helpful to the poor. Where is the preacher who specially panders to the laxities of the rich, or is not frequently appealing for

their personal assistance in the work? "The Church, which in a city like Dublin, where it still retains the affection of the poor and hardly used, could allow them to welter in noisome dens without raising a word of protest, or making any organized effort to improve their lot." A partisan caricature! With methods which may not suit Canon Carnegie's ideas, the Church of Ireland (the nearest akin to our own) is diligently at work, hampered in every direction by the unfortunate bigotry which prevails, in the effort to help the poor to mend their environment by the conquest of their own sins. There is much failure, but the intention is pure.

A perfunctory Church is to renew her life and the allegiance of democracy to be reclaimed by the re-interpretation of the Christian faith. *Parturiunt montes.* "This seems to me to be the master conception of the Christian life as it is unfolded to us in the Gospel story; the only conception which holds the facts together and makes them intelligible. It is not a life apart from that of duty or superimposed upon it; it is the life of duty itself expressed in the highest terms. No department of it lies outside the range of this principle, for the law of duty is of Divine origin; it is the human expression of the fundamental law of God's own life. For the Christian morality and religion are intimately intertwined with each other, and cannot be considered apart from each other." More simply, an ancient writer said that "faith without works is dead." The benefits of the re-interpretation are not obvious. The old wine is not improved by the new bottles.

The reinterpretation of the doctrine of the Trinity declares that the activities of God, as of man, display purpose, method, and power. How the illustration of the boy, whose parent shows purpose in sending him to school, whose teachers supply method in the education, and who himself provides the intellectual power for learning, can demonstrate the equality and unity of the Three Persons is not discoverable.

Discussing the "sacramental principle," Canon Carnegie "will enter as little as possible into the controversial religion," and at once proceeds to build his theories upon the much-debated sixth chapter of St. John. He closes his exposition by the unanswerable, but not convincing, argument in reference to the words of consecration: "If words mean anything, these words must mean——" (*scilicet*, "what I say, not what you think"). Here we take leave of a very disappointing book.

THE EMOTIONS OF JESUS. By Professor Robert Law, D.D. Edinburgh: *T. and T. Clark.* Price 2s. net.

Another volume in "The Short Course Series," in which the emotions of Jesus are discussed helpfully and suggestively. We naturally turn to the chapter on the Anger of Jesus as the most difficult of treatment, and are not disappointed. "In every case," says Dr. Law, "the anger of Jesus is the anger of love." "Love is not wholly sympathy and sweetness; love is full of indignation and wrath. When you see someone maltreating a child, what happens? Your sympathy with the child instantly becomes wrath against his persecutor and rises up in arms against him." This quotation is sufficient to show the method of treatment. Dr. Law's little book is entitled to rank with others in this excellent series of handbooks.

ROMANISM IN THE LIGHT OF HISTORY. By the Rev. Randolph H. McKim, D.D., LL.D., D.C.L., Rector of the Church of the Epiphany, Washington. New York and London: *G. P. Putnam's Sons.* Price 5s. net.

Dr. McKim has prepared this volume in the hope of arousing his countrymen to see and resist the efforts so assiduously being put forth "to make America Catholic." He has given us a valuable contribution to the literature on the Romish Controversy, bringing the claims of the Papal Church to the bar of history and showing how untenable they are. He shows how fallacious is the notion that Rome has become more enlightened in these modern days, and demonstrates the fact that she remains *semper eadem*, and antagonistic to modern progress and modern science. Since the emissaries of Rome are not less aggressive in this country than in America, Dr. McKim's book deserves a wide circulation.

THE QUEST. A Mystery Play. By Helen Beatrice Allan. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 1s.

Our notions may perhaps be regarded as antiquated, but we must confess we have no liking for plays of this kind; nor are we favourably impressed by this one when we read in the "directions" that the pageant is to include Thurifer, Acolytes, Crucifer, Monks, Nuns, etc., while we are told that, "if a thurible is not carried, the hall must be 'censed' before the doors open." But is it not a bold and unjustifiable assumption that this kind of thing accurately represents the early days of the British Church? What can be the object of such representation? Is it to familiarize our people with an elaborate ritual which has been foreign to our Church since the Reformation, and which belongs to the Middle Ages rather than to primitive Christianity?

Publications of the Month.

[Insertion under this heading neither precludes nor guarantees a further notice.]

BIBLICAL.

THE TEACHING OF CHRIST. By the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, M.A. (*Longmans, Green and Co.* 2s. 6d. net.) An addition to "The Layman's Library" series. Mr. Selwyn describes his book as "an attempt to appreciate the main lineaments of the teaching of Christ in their historical proportion." The first five chapters, dealing respectively with the vision, the preaching, the faith, and the spirit and form of the Kingdom, and with the Person and Office of Christ, are based upon the Synoptic Gospels; not that the writer regards the Fourth Gospel as an unreliable source, but because there are obvious advantages in using it to illustrate rather than to prove. The later chapters are somewhat different. The sixth shows how the teaching of Christ was translated into the language of the Apostolic age, and the seventh shows "what principles our Lord left to His Church for its further progress."

THE REVELATION OF DISCOVERY. By Bishop Brent. (*Longmans, Green and Co.* 2s. 6d. net.) A collection of papers contributed by the Bishop of the Philippine Islands to *St. Andrew's Cross* and the *New York Churchman*.

THE INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY: 2 CORINTHIANS. By the Rev. Alfred Plummer, D.D. (*T. and T. Clark.* 12s. net.) Dr. Plummer is now the sole survivor of the three original editors of this great Commentary, Dr. Briggs and Dr. Driver having died within a year of each other. His volume on 1 Corinthians was undertaken in conjunction with the Bishop of Exeter, but the increase of diocesan work and the Bishop's illness made it expedient that Dr. Robertson should be released

from his promise to co-operate in a volume on the Second Epistle. Dr. Plummer has, therefore, brought out the present book single-handed. It is a notable contribution to Pauline literature, and exhibits great thoroughness. "No difficulty of importance has been passed over in silence."

STUDIES IN THE SECOND EPISTLE OF ST. PETER. By E. Iliff Robson, B.D. (*Cambridge University Press.* 2s. 6d. net.) The question of authorship is carefully examined, but, says the author, "we leave it with an air of puzzle and dissatisfaction."

THE GOSPEL MIRACLES. By J. R. Illingworth, D.D. (*Macmillan and Co., Ltd.* 4s. 6d. net.) As essay in which the writer proceeds "to vindicate the occurrence of the Gospel miracles as being intrinsically congruous with the Incarnation, considered as the great enfranchisement of human life by its deliverance from the slavery to sin."

THE MESSIAH. By R. A. Cumine, M.A. (*J. and J. Bennett, Ltd.* 3s. 6d. net.) A Life of our Lord told in poetical form.

THE FOURFOLD GOSPEL. Section III.: The Proclamation of the New Kingdom. By Edwin A. Abbott. (*Cambridge University Press.* 12s. 6d. net.) Another monumental work from Dr. Abbott's learned mind and fertile pen.

DEVOTIONAL.

THE CREED IN HUMAN LIFE. By Maurice Clare. New cheap edition. (*Hodder and Stoughton.* 3s. 6d. net.) A volume full of good things. It is not a doctrinal exposition, but a devotional commentary, intended "as a help and comfort to contemplative folk." It is a compilation rather than an original work, and the author's selections cover an immense range of writers of the most varied character. The thoughtful reader will find it a veritable treasure-house, upon which he can draw again and again, and always find something fresh, stimulating, and helpful. In its handsome binding, this volume is one that every Churchman will be glad to possess.

THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS: THOUGHTS FOR EVERY DAY THROUGHOUT THE CHRISTIAN YEAR. Selected from authors old and new by May Byron. New cheap edition. (*Hodder and Stoughton.* 2s. 6d. net.) A precious volume for the early morning hour. The range of subjects is far wider than in most books of this kind, and the variety of authors drawn upon is striking. The compiler is singularly happy in her idea. The book is meant as "a small exponent of the Communion of Saints, past, present, and to come, blent in that eternal now which this holy fellowship assumes in the sight of God."

FRIENDSHIP and COMFORT. Two volumes of the "Friendship" Books. By Hugh Black. (*Hodder and Stoughton.* 1s. net each.) We give a cordial welcome to these reprints. Each has much wise and heartening counsel to give, such as is specially needed just now. Mr. Hugh Black's style is singularly lucid, fresh, and illuminating.

RELIGIOUS LIFE: PERSONAL AND NATIONAL. The Addresses given at the London Meeting of Lay Churchmen, January 16. (*C. J. Thynne.* 6d.) These addresses deserve the closest attention for their strong and direct bearing upon the attitude of the Christian layman towards the war. They were contributed by Professor Beresford Pite, Mr. Albert Mitchell, Dr. C. F. Harford, Dr. Eugene Stock, Mr. G. A. King; and Mr. Martin F. H. Sutton.

THE NIGHT OFFICE. For Christmas Day, the Epiphany, Holy Week, and Easter Day. (*Harrison and Sons.* 2s.)

GENERAL.

THE OFFICIAL YEAR-BOOK OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND FOR 1915. (*S.P.C.K.* 3s.) An indispensable work of reference, packed from cover to cover with facts and figures concerning the progress of the Church at home and abroad.

THE HOUND OF THE BASKERVILLES, by A. Conan Doyle; THE MONEY MARKET, by E. F. Benson; and THE OPEN QUESTION, by Elizabeth Robins—three new volumes in T. Nelson and Sons' Sevenpenny Library Series. THE STORY OF MY STRUGGLES: The Memoirs of Arminius Vambéry; and THE CITY OF THE WORLD, by Edwin Page—two new volumes in T. Nelson and Sons' Shilling Series.

THE CHILD AND THE NATION. By Grace M. Paton. (*Student Christian Movement.* 1s. net.)

VILLAGE INDUSTRIES: A NATIONAL OBLIGATION. By J. L. Green. With Introduction by the Right Hon. Jesse Collings, M.P. (*Rural World Publishing Co., Ltd.* 1s. 6d.)

BIOGRAPHICAL.

THE LIFE AND TEACHING OF WILLIAM HONYMAN GILLESPIE. By James Urquhart, F.S.A. (Scot.). (*T. and T. Clark.* 1s. net.) An interesting memoir, introducing a popular exposition of Mr. Gillespie's great work, "The Argument *a priori*," which, in Dr. Tulloch's view, claims to be ranked along with anything in British philosophical literature.

RECOLLECTIONS: The Reminiscences of the Busy Life of One who has Played the Varied Parts of Sailor, Author, and Lecturer. By Frank T. Bullen. (*Seeley, Service and Co., Ltd.* 10s. 6d. net.) A pleasant gossipy volume full of incident and experience. The author died a few weeks after revising the proofs.

WAR LITERATURE.

IN HOC VINCE. The Story of a Red Cross Flag. By Florence L. Barclay. (*G. P. Putnam's Sons.* 1s. net.) A tastefully bound reprint of Mrs. Barclay's contribution to "King Albert's Book," together with a few sentences showing the symbolism of the story. These words are in the nature of a prophecy:

> "The Calvary of self-sacrifice must ever mean a blood-stained cross. But Calvary leads to the triumph of Resurrection, to the glory of Ascension. Surely, from the Calvary of her suffering, Belgium shall rise again to a new and fuller life, and shall ascend to heights she has not reached before."

We hope this forecast may prove true.

IN HOC SIGNO. Hymns of War and Peace, with Tunes. (*S.P.C.K.* 6d. net.) The musical edition of a choice collection of hymns.

PAPERS FOR WAR-TIME. No. 23, "The Price of Blood," by Kenneth Maclennan; No. 24, "Biology and War," by J. Arthur Thomson, LL.D. (*Humphrey Milford.* 2d. each.)

QUARTERLIES.

THE HIBBERT JOURNAL (*Williams and Norgate*, 10s. per annum) has many articles bearing on the war. Professor Bergson writes on "Life and Matter at War"; L. P. Jacks on "The Tyranny of Mere Things"; Evelyn Underhill on "Problems of Conflict"; Professor Percy Gardner and the Rev. A. W. F. Blunt contribute "Two Studies of German 'Kultur'"; Count Keyserling writes on "The Meaning of the War," and M. W. Robieson on "German Socialist Theory and War." Among lighter articles may be named those by the Rev. Francis E. Clark, who explains "The Christian Endeavour Movement," and Captain Cecil Price, who writes on "The Boy Scouts."

THE INTERNATIONAL REVIEW OF MISSIONS (Henry Froude, 2s. 6d. net) has the following among other articles: "Black and White in South Africa" (Maurice S. Evans); "Christian Literature in the Mission-Field" (John H. Ritson); "Some Aspects of the Work of a Treasurer of a Foreign Mission Board" (Dwight H. Day); "The Vital Forces of Southern Buddhism in Relation to the Gospel.—II. In Burma" (W. C. B. Purser); "Missionary Intercession and the Crisis" (A. G. Hogg); "Self-Support in the Church in the Mission-Field" (Henry T. Hodgkin); and "The Negro Christian Student Conference" (Harlan P. Beach).

MONTHLY MAGAZINES.

THE BRITISH REVIEW (*Williams and Norgate*, 1s. net) has for its coloured supplement "The Gathering Storm," an unpublished water-colour by David Cox. The articles include "The Renascence of Serbia," by Mr. A. H. E. Taylor; "The Diary of a French Soldier," by M. Paul Pansy; "The Truce and the Welsh Church," by Mr. Ralph Snowden; "British Music and the War," by Mr. Herbert Antcliffe; and "The Martyrdom of Father Jean," by Mr. Cecil Roberts.

THE ENGLISH CHURCH REVIEW (*Longmans, Green and Co.*, 6d. net) has articles by M. L. Wayne on "Count Albert de Mun"; the Rev. C. E. Rolt on "The Fellowship of the Mystery"; and H. E. Tudor on "Spiritual Vision." The Editor, Dr. Sparrow Simpson, continues his studies on "The Protestant Conception of the Church," and contributes an article on "Lamennais." The Rev. R. W. Burnie concludes his papers on "Invocation of Saints in Early Practice."

THE CHURCH MISSIONARY REVIEW (*C.M.S. House*, 6d.) includes articles by the Rev. H. Sykes ("C.M.S. Palestine Mission, 1815-1915"); the Rev. C. D. Snell ("Non-Christian Religions of India"); the Rev. W. P. Buncombe ("Evangelistic Campaign in Japan"); and others.