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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

A Monthly Magazine and Review

VOL. XXXIII.

(NEW SERIES, VOL. XIV.)

LONDON: ROBERT SCOTT, PUBLISHER
ROXBURGHE HOUSE, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.4
1919

Robert Scott, Roxburghe House, Paternoster Row, London, E.C.4

INDEX TO VOLUME XXXIII

SUBJECTS

AUTHORS

THE CHURCHMAN

January, 1919.

THE MONTH.

Memorial of the Nine Bishops.

WE are informed that the number of signatures to the Memorial promoted by the Bishop of Manchester and eight other diocesan Bishops against certain of the changes in the Communion Service which have been recommended by the Canterbury Convocation, now reaches upwards of 100,000, including nearly three thousand clergy. The number would have been very much larger but for the fact that at the time when the Memorial was being circulated for signature the epidemic of influenza, which impartially visited every part of the country, was at its height. As it is, however, the list of signatures is an impressive one, not merely on account of its numbers but also of its weight and influence as shown by the names which have been published in the *Record*, a large proportion of which are those of Moderate or High Churchmen. It can hardly be supposed that these changes will be pressed in the face of an opposition so strong as this, especially when we remember that little more than two years ago the Upper House of Canterbury Convocation voted against them by 15 to 5. We trust that the new Convocations will reconsider the scheme of revision as a whole. There is need for some revision, and for some greater elasticity than is permissible at present, but the Church as a whole does not want and will not stand a revision which amounts to a virtual concession of the principal demands of the Romanising party.

Sixteenth Century Controversies.

In the Report of the Committee appointed by the Archbishops to consider the question of the Worship of the Church, the following paragraph occurs :—

"The need of revision is felt with special acuteness in colonial and

missionary churches in which the connection of the Prayer Book with the controversies of the sixteenth century has no particular value or importance." A good deal might be said upon this statement, but it may be sufficient here to note that the controversies of the sixteenth century so far as they related to the Prayer Book dealt mainly with such questions as the "Real Presence," the sacrificial nature of the Holy Communion, Reservation, Auricular Confession, Vestments, etc. These are the very subjects around which controversy is raging to-day in both colonial and missionary dioceses; for unhappily those who are reintroducing sacerdotal and medieval teaching and practice do not confine themselves to the Church in this country. In more than one colonial diocese Churchmen have had to organise themselves in defence of the principles re-asserted in the sixteenth century on lines almost identical with those of the National Church League, simply because of the activity of those who are reviving all the controversies of the sixteenth century by reintroducing the very teaching from which those controversies delivered the Church.

Changes in the Communion Service.

It is a pleasure to announce that the very important letter to his diocese issued by the Bishop of Liverpool in connection with the proposed changes in the Service of Holy Communion, may now be obtained as a separate leaflet from the Church Book Room (82, Victoria Street, S.W. 1) at the price of 3s. net per 100, and we hope that many of our readers will avail themselves of the opportunity of circulating this telling message very widely among their friends. No clearer or more impressive exposition of the true inwardness of the proposed changes has yet appeared, and the Bishop's arguments will be found to be unanswerable. Assuredly the Bishop of Liverpool is no reactionary. In the discussions on Revision he has shown himself to be clear-sighted, far-seeing and progressive. He was prepared to make large concessions, but when he saw the trend of the changes proposed he was compelled to withdraw his support. He has now expressed his strong disapproval of the proposals to alter the Prayer of Consecration, because it seemed to him that with the permissive use of Vestments, and of Reservation and with these alterations in the Consecration Prayer "Prayer-Book Revision was being used to change the character of the central

Service of our Church and to bring it back very much nearer to what [he believes] to be the erroneous teaching of the Middle Ages." The Bishop in his letter describes the proposed changes—the introduction of a new prayer and the "apparently innocent" rearrangement of certain of our present prayers; and then goes on to explain the effect of these alterations. For lucidity of expression and forcefulness of argument the Bishop's statement is most useful. We venture to quote one passage:—

> The effect of these alterations would be not only to introduce into our Prayer Book a view of the Lord's Supper which 370 years ago the compilers of the Prayer Book distinctly excluded, but also to make the consecrated Bread and Wine a Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, which our present Prayer Book never asserts. We offer indeed to God, at the Holy Communion, the Sacrifice of our alms, of ourselves, and of thankful hearts, and, as some people think, of the unconsecrated Bread and Wine symbolising the fruits of the earth. But to speak of the consecrated Bread and Wine as a Sacrifice is to open wide the door to misunderstanding and error in the future. Moreover, there is no doubt that the latter part of the new Consecration Prayer would lend itself to the teaching and practices which follow a belief in a localised Presence of our Lord on the Holy Table, and would be quoted as supporting the doctrine of the real objective Presence in the Bread and the Wine. Nothing can, now, prevent those who believe in such a localised Presence from *privately* praying to it; but for the first time in the history of the Reformed Church of England we are asked so to alter the structure of our Communion Office as to make the Service, in its central and most solemn part, capable of being made a vehicle for the worship of a localised Presence, and of supporting a theory of the Holy Communion which was deliberately avoided at the Reformation. When Professor Hort was asked to suggest words to be placed over a Holy Table in an English Church in Switzerland, he sent the Versicle and Response which form the most ancient part of our Communion Office, and with which the solemn act of consecration may be said to begin:—"Sursum Corda. Habemus ad Dominum." "Lift *up* your hearts; we lift them *up* unto the Lord." It is to the Living and Ascended Christ enthroned in glory, and yet present as Host in every Service of Holy Communion, not under the forms of Bread and Wine, but in the midst of His faithful people, ready to refresh and strengthen them with the spiritual food of His own most precious Body and Blood that we offer, in this great central Service, our heartfelt worship and adoration.

It is exceedingly important that these views should be thoroughly understood and assimilated by Church of England people, and, therefore, we say again that we hope the Bishop of Liverpool's letter will be extensively circulated.

Another Kikuyu Conference.

It is distinctly unfortunate that there was so much delay in the arrival in this country of the Official Report of the second Kikuyu Conference, and it is also a loss that, now that it has arrived, it should have attracted

so little attention and provoked so little comment. We hoped to find in the *C.M. Review* for December some statement representing the views of the Church Missionary Society upon the Conference and what was effected at it, but possibly the report arrived too late for the purpose and we must wait in patience till the next issue, for some light and guidance are needed upon what is really a new situation. The Conference, which met at Kikuyu towards the end of July, is hardly likely to provoke the controversy which its predecessor of 1913 engendered; for one thing the Bishop of Zanzibar (Dr. Weston), who led the opposition, was himself present on this occasion and was given the opportunity of presenting his views. He explained his position at some length and was listened to with close attention, but the counter-proposals he submitted found no favour with the Conference. It is possible, of course, to admire his courage and persistency, but his scheme was hopeless from the first; if it had been accepted, not only would it have wrecked the cause of Church unity in East Africa; it would have had a disastrous effect upon the progress of unity at home. That the Bishop of Zanzibar longs for unity is clearly apparent—but it must be unity on his own lines. So also do the other members of the Conference—but they are for moving towards that goal by a different road, each mission being ready to go as far as possible and practicable under the present conditions. They took occasion to express their own aspirations in the most definite way:—

"In setting our hand to this Constitution, we, the representatives of the allied Societies, being profoundly convinced, for the sake of our common Lord, and of those African Christians to whom our controversies are as yet unknown, of the need for a united Church in British East Africa, earnestly entreat the home authorities to take such steps as may be necessary, in consultation with the Churches concerned, to remove the difficulties which at present make this ideal impossible.

"In the meantime, we adopt the basis of Alliance, not as the 'ideal,' but as the 'utmost possible' in view of our present unhappy divisions. The members of the Alliance pledge themselves not to rest until they can all share one ministry."

What this second Kikuyu Conference has accomplished is the formation of a working Alliance, to the constitution of which the two Bishops (Uganda and Mombasa) and representatives of the Church Missionary Society, the African Inland Mission, the Church of Scotland Mission, the United Methodist Church Missionary Society and the British and Foreign Bible Society have set their names. The contracting parties have agreed:—

1 To respect one another's spheres, as set out in a map, which a duly authorised representative of each of the Allied Societies shall sign, as an acknowledgment of the assent of each such Society to the Alliance (provided that nothing in this constitution shall be so understood as to prejudice the episcopal or other ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the local Church authorities in any of the Allied Societies over all the members of their own communion). (*a*) Any missionary shall be free to visit and minister to members of his own church living in the sphere of an Allied Society, provided that he shall first intimate his intention of so doing to the local representative of the Society occupying that sphere. (*b*) All missionary work within a district shall be under the jurisdiction of the Society responsible for that district.

2 To respect the autonomy of each Allied Society within its own sphere.

3. To foster the desire for union, and by every possible means to prepare the minds of all Christians for early union.

4. To develop the local Church organizations along similar lines of District and Parochial Councils.

5. To recognise the status (see notes) of every Christian which is assigned to him by the branch of the Church of Christ to which he belongs.

Note (*a*). This refers to the position of a catechumen, or of a baptised or communicant member of some branch of the Church of Christ in connection with the Allied Societies.

Note (*b*). While earnestly desiring such a measure of unity that full intercommunion between the members of the Allied Missions may become possible, we recognise that in existing conditions, such intercommunion between episcopal and non-episcopal Missions is not yet possible.

Note (*c*). The Bishops of the two dioceses concerned in the Alliance realise the dangers to which native converts are exposed through isolation. They deeply regret that it is impossible in the present circumstances to bid the members of their Church to seek the Holy Communion at the hands of ministers not episcopally ordained. But they will be grateful for such spiritual help as it may be possible for other Missions to give to those who may be for the time isolated from the ministrations of their own Church.

Note (*d*). The responsible authorities of the Allied Missions will welcome as guests to their Communion any communicant member of the Allied Missions for whom the ministrations of his own church are for the time inaccessible, and as to whose moral and spiritual fitness they are satisfied, provided always that no obligation shall rest on any such member to avail himself of this liberty.

6. To discouarge proselytising.

7. To respect the decision, in all cases of discipline, made concerning their own members by the respective Allied Societies.

It may be said—indeed it has been said—that such an Alliance does not take us very far along the road to unity; perhaps it does not, but it is at least an important and significant beginning of the journey, and we may be quite sure there will be no turning back till the goal is reached. In regard to the articles of agreement, it may be said that they are, in the main, clear and positive, but it is a pity that the position outlined in Note (*b*) was not more clearly related to that defined in Note (*d*). In the former it is acknowledged that full intercommunion between episcopal and non-episcopal

missions "is not yet possible"; in the latter it is pointed out that the Allied Missions "will welcome as guests" "any communicant member of the Allied Missions for whom the ministrations of his own Church are for the time inaccessible." No doubt the apparent inconsistency can be explained, but at the moment it is not easy to reconcile the two statements. The question of intercommunion is the crux of the problem, and it was hoped that Kikuyu might have given a stronger lead. Not that we wish unduly to criticize; on the contrary we are most thankful for what has been accomplished and we pray God that it may lead to a great advance towards the achievement of that "oneness" of the Lord's people for which He prayed. It was, perhaps, a wise step, having regard to the terms of the Archbishop of Canterbury's "Opinion," to dispense with the United Communion Service at the close of the Conference such as that which shed glory upon the first Kikuyu Conference, although it was made the chief ground of complaint by the Bishop of Zanzibar.

Self-Government for the Church.

The Report of Lord Selborne's Committee on the Relations of Church and State has been superseded, and the Church has now before it for its consideration the Report of a Committee of the Representative Church Council, appointed last year to report upon the recommendations of the earlier body and if desirable to prepare a scheme. This new Committee was a larger, if not a stronger, body than that over which Lord Selborne presided. It consisted of ten bishops, twenty-five members of the Lower Houses of Convocation and thirty-two members of the Houses of Laymen, representing many different shades of opinion. They reported that it is essential to the well-being of the Church of England that means should be devised for giving it a larger measure of self-government, and they proposed a new scheme, but except in one or two important particulars (e.g., the adoption of the baptismal instead of the Confirmation franchise for electors) it follows the lines of the previous Report, upon which, indeed, it is based. The Committee was too large to admit of unanimity, but the extent of the diversity of opinion manifested is not known; probably when the Report is submitted to the Representative Church Council we may have a little more light on the subject. One thing, however, is certain; it is already pro-

voking a great amount of criticism from quite different quarters. Some members of the Committee itself, representing what they claim to be the " Catholic " position, have issued a Minority Report ; the *Guardian* hailed the Report as an example of " more tinkering " ; and the Dean of Canterbury, in one of his most forceful articles in the *Record,* assailed it from the position *inter alia* of the rights of Convocation—a point which had been strangely overlooked. Dr. Wace showed that " in neither of these schemes have the relations between the proposed new body and the existing constitution of Church and State been fully considered," and he declared that all agitation at present for an " Enabling Bill " to carry the new scheme into effect is futile. " The present Report observes," he argued, " that ' the successful working of the whole scheme depends upon the Houses of Convocation being reformed at as early a date as possible, especially in the direction of a larger proportion of the non-official to the official members, and of proportioning the total number of members of the two Lower Houses to the number of members of the House of Laymen of the Church Assembly, and this is expressly contemplated in Clause 15 of the constitution of the Church Assembly which we recommend.' Parliament, however, could not be expected to consider any enabling Bill in which these essential elements are undefined in the Assembly to which some of its functions are to be partially transferred. Nothing can practically be done until the Convocations are reformed, and Convocation thus seems to remain in possession of the ground." We are persuaded that there is great force in the Dean of Canterbury's contention, and the discussion, indeed we might say the dissension, which the appearance of the Report has provoked, makes it clear that the more thoughtful and sagacious Churchmen are fully alive to the perils which the adoption of such a scheme would entail. It may be that there is need for a drastic revision of the relations of Church and State ; it may be that there is need for the Church to obtain wider and larger powers of self-government, but the evidence is daily becoming clearer that the constitutional questions which such changes would involve are of such far-reaching magnitude that nothing should be attempted without the clearest possible evidence that the scheme of reform would make for the greater efficiency of the Church of England with the least possible disturbance of its present constitutional position.

In these circumstances we have great sympathy with the Bishop of Hereford's contention that the whole question should be referred to a Royal Commission. No doubt this would mean delay, but better that than that by the adoption of hastily-considered and ill-conceived " reforms " the Church should be landed in inevitable disaster. We cannot disguise from ourselves the fear that if either of these schemes were presented to Parliament the short answer would be—the Church can have self-government if it cares to pay the price. And that price would probably be disestablishment and disendowment.

EARLY LITURGIES.

By the Rev. Harold Smith, D.D., Tutor, London College of Divinity.

MUCH attention has of recent years been directed to Early Liturgies; and while much remains obscure, there is general agreement of scholars on many points, on which the views of older writers are now abandoned.

The term "Primitive Liturgies" is decidedly misleading; it connects with the idea, now almost universally abandoned, that these liturgies were drawn up in the time of the Apostles or their immediate followers, perhaps being forms of some common Apostolic liturgy. As a matter of fact, fixed liturgies were of very gradual growth; the great liturgies did not come into existence in a full shape till the fifth century, and seem for some time to have admitted of additions and modifications even in important parts; in the case of the bulk of Eastern liturgies our existing MSS. are of much later date. It does not therefore follow that, because some element in a liturgy can be traced to an early date, the whole or even the bulk of it belongs to that date.

We can trace several stages in the development of liturgies. As in non-liturgical services now, there grew up a usual phraseology of praise and prayer. Meanwhile the service was acquiring a fixed order, various elements occurring in a definite sequence. "There existed at first no more than a mere outline, to be followed out in general by all who celebrated, but to be filled in in detail at the discretion of the individual celebrant."[1] Next came fixed formulas or items in the service, surrounded by much that was still fluid, left to the discretion of the officiant; and finally all became fixed.

About A.D. 95 Clement wrote his letter in the name of the Church of Rome to that of Corinth. Near its close he offers a long prayer (three chapters). Lightfoot has shown this prayer to be full of echoes of the prayers of the Synagogue and Temple, and of coincidences with the language of Christian liturgies. It is "an excellent example of the style of solemn prayer in which the ecclesiastical leaders of that time were wont to express themselves at meetings for worship."[2]

[1] Procter-Frere, p. 435. [2] Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, p. 50.

We find a few fixed forms in the " Didache " (" Teaching of the Twelve Apostles "), which however stand quite apart from anything in later liturgies. The date and origin of this work are still under discussion ; the present tendency is not to regard it nearly so high as on its first discovery, but to assign it, or at least the latter part of it, other than the " Two Ways," to some " backwater " in the second century. (The importance of new discoveries is usually exaggerated at first.) In it the Eucharist seems still joined with the Agape. Three thanksgivings are provided—first, " for the Cup," then " for the Broken Bread," then " after having been filled." But it is added, " Let the prophets offer thanksgiving as much as they desire."

We get our first clear outline of the Christian Sunday service in Justin Martyr (about A.D. 150). " On the day called that of the Sun all who live in cities or in the country gather together, and the memoirs [1] of the Apostles, or the writings of the Prophets, are read as long as time permits. Then when the reader has ceased, the president gives by word of mouth admonition and exhortation to follow these good things. Then we all rise together and offer prayers ; and when we have finished the prayers, bread and wine and water are brought, and the president offers prayers and likewise thanksgivings to the best of his ability, and the people assent by saying ' Amen.' Then comes the distribution and each one's participation in the elements over which thanksgiving has been offered, and portions are sent through the deacons to those not present." (A collection is made and left in the hands of the president for the benefit of widows, orphans, sick, prisoners and strangers ; " he is the guardian of all who are in need.") [2]

We have here a fixed outline of service, though apparently not fixed forms. There are lessons, sermon, general prayers, special eucharistic prayer by the president, communion. Elsewhere [3] Justin adds the kiss of peace, at the close of the general prayers and before the elements are brought in ; and he gives the subject of the eucharistic prayer, " Praise and glory to the Father of the Universe through the name of the Son and of the Holy Spirit," for the creation of the world and all in it for man's sake, and for deliverance from evil and redemption through the Passion.

We notice the distinction between the earlier part of the service

[1] I.e., the Gospels. [2] *Apol.* I, 67.
[3] *Apol.* I, 65 ; Dial. 41 ; see Srawley, *Early History of Liturgy*, 34.

and the Eucharist itself. Elsewhere we find these were sometimes separated.

We get from Fathers of the end of century II and of century III various details of the services, both of the preliminary and popular one, later known as the "catechumens' service," answering in character very closely to our Morning Prayer; and of the Eucharist proper, "the service of the Faithful." In Cyprian we first meet with the common liturgical formula, "Sursum corda. Habemus ad Dominum." "The priest (sacerdos) in the preface preceding the Prayer, prepares the minds of the brethren by saying, 'Lift up your hearts'; that while the people reply, 'We lift them up unto the Lord,' they may be reminded that they ought to think of nothing else besides the Lord." [1] Side by side with liturgical development went doctrinal development; Irenaeus regards the Eucharist as an offering to God of the firstfruits of the earth; but Cyprian definitely conceives of it as the sacrifice of the Lord's Body and Blood.[2]

In the fourth century we find developed liturgies and full accounts of the main (not the preliminary) service, especially in Syria. We have a Sacramentary of Sarapion, Bishop of Thmuis, a friend of Athanasius, who addressed to him his work on the Holy Spirit; it was probably written about 350, but was only lately discovered in a MS. of century XI at Mt. Athos.[3] We have a long account of the Eucharist in Cyril of Jerusalem's Catechetical Lecture XXIII, about A.D.347. The Pilgrimage of Silvia (or rather Etheria) gives a full account of services at Jerusalem near the end of the century, though without an outline of the liturgy itself. We have also belonging to this period a number of "Church Orders," some of which contain a liturgy. The best known of these, and the only one about whose approximate date there is general agreement, is the "Apostolic Constitutions," written not long before or after A.D. 375; the liturgy here given is often called "the Clementine," because these Constitutions were supposed to be published through Clement. It is clearly of the Syrian type.[4] But within the last few years the view has gained wide acceptance that a writing (or writings) of Hippolytus (about 220) is best preserved in some earlier "Church Orders," extant in Egyptian and Ethiopic, with consider-

[1] Lord's Prayer. xxxi (22). [2] Srawley, 133.
[3] Edited by Bp. J. Wordsworth, *Bishop Sarapion's Prayer Book*.
[4] Trans. in Ante-Nicene Christian Library; also Warren, *Liturgy and Worship of Ante-Nicene Church*.

able Latin fragments. The Ethiopic Church Order includes a liturgy; as the liturgical elements in the other sources are considerably less, this probably did not form part of the original work, but is clearly of very early date. The value of the liturgies in the "Church Orders" is that, unlike those in current use, we can be reasonably sure they have remained unaltered; while other sources (e.g., Cyril's lectures and many notices in Chrysostom) show they were not pure works of imagination.

Combining these sources, we find the general outline of the liturgy in century IV to be as follows. Probably it was largely the same, though rather simpler and less fixed, in the latter part of century III.

I. The preliminary—"Catechumens'"—service, consisted of lessons from all parts of Holy Scripture, with Psalms or Canticles sung between them; a Sermon; and Prayers, including at the close special prayers for each class of persons who might not remain for the later service.

II. The Eucharist itself began with Prayers, usually including a Litany said by the Deacon. Then came the Offertory—the presentation of the elements and other offerings of the people; and the Kiss of Peace. This was followed by the most solemn part of the service—known as the "Anaphora." It began with a Salutation, either "The Lord be with you," or "The Grace of our Lord . . ." Then comes the "Sursum Corda," etc.; then a long Prayer, beginning "It is truly meet and right before all things to sing praise unto Thee," and speaking of the work of Creation, which usually leads up to the "Ter Sanctus," and of Redemption, which includes the account of the Institution of the Eucharist. Then comes the Oblation with the Anamnesis, e.g., "Remembering therefore His Passion and Death, Resurrection and Ascension, and Future Coming, we offer to Thee our King and our God, according to His institution, this Bread and this Cup." Then the Invocation or Epiclesis—a prayer that the Holy Spirit may come upon the elements, that the communicants may be sanctified and receive grace; [1] or, apparently a later development, to make the Bread and Wine the Body and Blood of Christ. Then the Intercession, a prayer for all Christ's Church; and the Lord's Prayer. Then came the Communion, followed by Thanksgiving. In this latter part, after the conclusion of the long

[1] Cp. the American Office.

prayer, our authorities vary considerably; it was probably not fixed till after the rest.

But while this is a general outline, there were many variations, and all parts did not occur everywhere. Thus the Sanctus does not occur in the Ethiopic Church Order; nor the Words of Institution in the East Syrian Liturgy,[1] which is probably the earliest, or at least the least altered, of the Great Liturgies. The Anamnesis, or Commemoration of the Passion and Resurrection, is not found in Sarapion, nor in the East Syrian Liturgy. Again, variations and developments are found in the Epiclesis or prayer for the coming of the Holy Spirit. We find evidence from all quarters from Irenaeus downwards of the presence of some such invocation; but in some cases, e.g., Sarapion and apparently Irenaeus and Athanasius, it is for the coming of the *Word* rather than the *Spirit*. Again, in the Ethiopic Church Order, and in the East Syrian Liturgy, the Invocation is primarily "a request for the divine intervention, that the blessings of the Sacrament may be secured to the worshippers"[2]; but in Sarapion, Cyril, the Apostolic Constitutions and later liturgies generally, it is a prayer that the elements may be made (Cyril) or become (Sarapion), or be shown as (Apostolic Constitutions) the Body and Blood of Christ. This is of course consistent with simple views of the nature of the Sacrament, but leads easily to extravagant ones. In the East this Invocation has usually been regarded as the point of Consecration, not the recital of the words of Institution. In the Roman "Canon," though there is no direct mention of the Holy Spirit in this connection, there are two paragraphs which seem to answer to the Epiclesis; one of them is of the older type—a prayer that "these things" may be "carried by the hands of Thy Holy Angels to Thy altar on high, in the sight of Thy Divine Majesty; that as many of us who have received, by this participation of the altar, the sacred Body and Blood of Thy Son, may be filled with all heavenly benediction and grace." In an earlier paragraph there is a prayer that God would make the offering blessed and acceptable, "that it may become to us the Body and Blood of Thy most beloved Son our Lord Jesus Christ."[3]

[1] They may have been left to the memory, as now.

[2] Srawley, 209; cp. 235.

[3] But "De Sacramentis" (N. Italy) has, "because it is a figure of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Cyril of Jerusalem is the first to speak of the elements being changed or converted by consecration; this language was adopted also by Chrysostom.[1] "To this new development we may attribute the more explicit forms of invocation which appear in the later liturgical prayers. To the same cause we may attribute the 'localizing' tendency exhibited in Cyril of Jerusalem and Chrysostom, which emphasizes the solemnity of the moment following upon the consecration." We see the same fourth-century development in conception of the Eucharistic sacrifice. In Clement, the Didache and Irenaeus it is primarily eucharistic. In Justin, combined with this, we have special emphasis on the memorial of the Passion. Cyprian is the first definitely to speak of the eucharistic sacrifice as an offering of the Body and Blood of Christ. The liturgical forms of this period do not advance beyond the eucharistic and commemorative aspects in the general terms of their language. But in the language of Cyril of Jerusalem and Chrysostom we find a much more advanced conception. The Eucharist is "the holy and awful sacrifice," "the sacrifice of propitiation." "We offer Christ sacrificed for our sins, while we propitiate the living God on behalf of the living and the dead."[2]

The Great Liturgies belong to the fifth century, though of course their main structure and many of their component parts are earlier. "We cannot appeal to what are often called the 'Ancient Liturgies' as a proof that a certain custom is Apostolic; for the great liturgies date from not before the fifth century; even with the latest discoveries there are, by comparison, not many customs which can be *proved* to be earlier than the time of Constantine. While the fifth century was very active in the development of liturgies, the fourth century also saw great development."[3] "Even when we have reduced them to their most ancient form . . . these liturgies are still far from having the simplicity of the fourth century."[4] And for some time even the central portion admitted of occasional additions, while the outlying parts have undergone more extensive changes, spread over a much longer period. Ceremonies in particular have had a tendency to multiply. Therefore it does not follow that a liturgy known to exist at a certain date had taken by then its present shape.

[1] Srawley, 235–6. [2] Srawley, 236–7.
[3] Maclean, *Early Christian Worship*, 124.
[4] Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, 82.

Extant liturgies fall into several families—best classed as four Eastern and two Western. In the East the liturgies, or at least the anaphoras, are commonly called by the name of some saint, with which the church using them claims connection; except perhaps in the case of some of the later ones, the connection of the saint with the liturgy amounts to nothing more than this. E.g., the liturgy of St. James belonged to Jerusalem, the Church of St. James; that of St. Mark to that of Alexandria, traditionally founded by St. Mark; but these liturgies were not in existence till long after the days of those saints.

I. The West Syrian family, connected with the churches of Jerusalem and Antioch, has as its oldest representative the Liturgy of St. James. This was originally the normal one in these patriarchates, but is now, in its Greek form, superseded by the Byzantine, being in use only on St. James' Day, October 23, at Jerusalem, Cyprus, Zante, etc. It is first mentioned, as the work of St. James, in a canon of the council of 692; but Jerome quotes a liturgical phrase found in it; and the fact that the Jacobites, who finally separated from the Orthodox Church in the middle of the sixth century, have kept its anaphora in Syriac as their fundamental one, shows it must have been consecrated by long use before this separation. The Syrian Christians of St. Thomas in S.W. India now use the Jacobite rite. There are a number of other Syriac anaphoras. None of the MSS. of the Greek Liturgy of St. James is older than the tenth century; most are much later.

II. The Egyptian family has as its oldest representative the Greek Liturgy of St. Mark. Of this, three MSS. are known, from the twelfth century onwards. Some papyrus fragments, of century VII–VIII, seem to give an earlier form of it. It has long been superseded in the Orthodox Church by the Byzantine rite. There are, however, also various Coptic and Ethiopic liturgies, the oldest of which agree substantially with that of St. Mark. Thus while the ancient Greek liturgies of the Patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem are now dead, or nearly so, they survive in other languages among the Jacobites—the West Syrian among the Syrians, the Egyptian among the Copts and Abyssinians.

III. In the Orthodox Church the Byzantine family—springing from the churches of Cæsarea (in Cappodocia) and Constantinople, but ultimately a descendant of the West Syrian—has now set aside

all others. Its representatives are the Liturgies of St. Basil, St. Chrysostom, and the " Presanctified." These are used not only in Greece and at Constantinople, but in the national churches, e.g., of Russia, Roumania, and Serbia. The ecclesiastical language in such countries may be Slavonic, Roumanian, Georgian, or Arabic, but the rite is the same. (Here appears a marked contrast with the Roman Church, with its tendency to keep to Latin ; though it too in the Uniat Churches of the East allows the native ecclesiastical language.) The Liturgy of St. Basil was originally the normal one ; it is now used only on certain days, e.g., Sundays in Lent, Easter and Christmas Eves ; on ordinary occasions that of St. Chrysostom is used. The Liturgy of St. Basil is quoted several times early in century VI, as by Basil of Cæsarea. There has been some assimilation between the two main liturgies. Cranmer had the 1526 edition of these liturgies before him : he drew from them not only our " Prayer of St. Chrysostom," which now comes in the early part of that Liturgy, but probably originally belonged to St. Basil's, but also the " Invocation " in the Prayer of Consecration, 1549 (omitted 1552), and perhaps some phrases in the Litany.

IV. The East Syrian family, springing from the Churches of Edessa, Nisibis and Seleucia, has Syriac for its original language. We often forget how important the ancient Persian (Nestorian) Church was, spreading over Central Asia and sending missionaries even to China, till crushed in the thirteenth century between the Mongol hammer and the Moslem anvil. The chief liturgy of its surviving representatives, the Assyrian or Chaldean Christians (and of the Chaldean Uniats), is that of " The Apostles, Addai and Mari." (Two other anaphoras, called after Theodore and Nestorius, are used by them certain times in the year.) The Christians of Malabar (S.W. India), being of Nestorian origin, used the same liturgies ; but at the Synod of Diamper, 1599, when these Syrians accepted the Roman obedience, the later liturgies were destroyed, as named after heretics, and the main one revised and expurgated, to remove all traces of Nestorian error. As the records of the Synod tell us precisely what changes were made, we can reconstruct the liturgy as it was before this, and find it practically identical with that of Addai and Mari, as used in Assyria. (As revised, it is still used by the Syrian Uniat Church in Malabar.) The only important difference is that while the Chaldean liturgy omits the words of Institution, which

are now in practice repeated from memory according to the other liturgies, the Malabar one had them in another form. See Dom Conolly's article in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. xv., 396, 569; at the close of the second article Mr. Edmund Bishop points out the value of the liturgical forms of this church. "Whilst the liturgy of Addai and Mari, the normal liturgy of the East Syrian Church, is quite eastern in character, it is conservative of its ancient form and spirit, and will well enable us, thanks to the preservation (with other documents) of the Ethiopic Church Order, to get behind the existing Greek liturgies and to measure the wide difference which separates these last . . . from the primitive types."

The two Western families are the Roman and the Gallican.

V. The Gallican (or Hispano-Gallican) has two (or three) subdivisions: (*a*) The Gallican proper—the liturgy of the Church of Gaul down to the time of Pepin and Charles the Great. That of the old British and Irish Churches, as far as we know it, was a variety of this. No MS. books of purely Celtic origin survive except the "Bangor Antiphoner"; all the rest are of mixed character, in which the Roman elements predominate.[1] Even from Gaul no complete Mass of a purely Gallican character has survived; we have to reconstruct the order of service from scraps of mutilated service-books, notices of Gallican writers (esp. Germanus of Paris) and the analogy of the Mozarabic Liturgy.[2]

(*b*) The Mozarabic, used in the Visigothic Church of Spain, and lasting during the Arab domination, but after the reconquest of Toledo in 1085 gradually superseded by the Roman rite. At the beginning of the sixteenth century Cardinal Ximenes, in order to preserve it, had its books printed, with supplements from Roman sources, and founded a college of priests at Toledo to perpetuate its use. Its use just survives in chapels at Toledo and Salamanca. From it Cranmer seems to have drawn the service for the consecration of the water for Baptism (most of it was taken into the main baptismal service in 1552); and the form in which the Words of Institution are given in our Communion Office is at least extraordinarily close to that of the Mozarabic, differing considerably from the Roman.

(*c*) To these may perhaps be added the Ambrosian, of Milan and N. Italy. This lies between the Gallican and the Roman, and is

[1] Procter-Frere, 9. [2] Swete, *Services and Service Books*, 91.

sometimes classed with the latter. But it may well have been originally essentially Gallican, but gradually assimilated to the Roman. It is still in use at Milan.

The Gallican rite, besides having a much larger number of variations than the Roman, has also a distinctly Eastern element, of which there are two explanations. We must set aside two ideas still commonly found in popular books, but rejected by scholars. The first is that the Gallican service came from Asia Minor in the second century, at or before the time of Irenaeus, and that it may be called the Ephesian Liturgy, or the Liturgy of St. John. But there is no evidence whatever for this, and the Liturgy has a fourth or fifth century look, not one of the second. The other is that the English pre-Reformation use was essentially Gallican rather than Roman; the reverse is the truth. The Celtic (= Gallican) practice was rejected at the Synod of Whitby (664) and the Council of Cloveshoo (747). The later Roman use had indeed adopted a number of Gallican elements, and the various English uses, which differing among themselves, also differed from that of Rome; but the differences were confined to minor points, in particular not extending to the Canon (the central portion of the Mass—the Prayer of Consecration); and local variations were then allowed everywhere. "All the existing English Service-books are of the Roman type, with at most some small Gallican or Celtic features adopted into them; and it is from such books that the Prayer-book is derived."[1] "The only known liturgy of the English for nine hundred years before the Reformation was the Roman Missal, with local variations of "use," which were then customary throughout the Roman Communion."[2]

The two explanations now offered of the Eastern elements in the Gallican Liturgy are (1) that a wave of Eastern influence passed into the West in the latter part of century IV, affecting Milan and the Church of Gaul and Spain; but not Rome, which was essentially conservative.[3] The other view (2) is just the reverse, that the oldest Roman service was of much the same type as the Gallican, but underwent a revision about century IV.[4] The language of the Church of Rome was certainly Greek till the time of Hippolytus, well into the third century, and perhaps later still. An objection to this view is that the African liturgy is practically identical with the Roman,

[1] Procter-Frere, 10.
[2] Upton, *Outlines of P. Book History*, 21.
[3] See Duchesne, 93.
[4] See Procter-Frere, 508.

and that we have no hints of such a revision. But the whole early history of the Roman rite is keenly debated, and can only be touched upon here. Connected with this is also the question of the Ambrosian liturgy, which some maintain preserves the ancient Latin rite, of which the Roman is a degraded form. There comes in also the question of the origin of the work "De Sacramentis," probably of the beginning of century v, which may give the earliest form of the Ambrosian liturgy, or may belong to some Church in N. Italy (e.g., Ravenna), where the usages of Rome and Milan were combined; or may preserve the oldest form of the Roman service.[1] Its most striking divergence from the Roman Canon is that, in place of "that it may become to us the Body and Blood of Thy dearly beloved Son our Lord Jesus Christ," it has "because it is the figure of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ."

VI. The Roman rite is the great rite of the West, having set aside all others, just as the Byzantine has ousted all others in the Orthodox Church. The oldest part of it, the Canon, has probably been only slightly altered since the fourth century; its list of martyrs closes with some obscure Roman ones of the middle of that century. We read only of slight additions and changes made to the Canon by Leo the Great and Gregory the Great, but there may well have been others on a small scale—e.g., the phrase, "the glorious ever-virgin Mary, Mother of our God and Lord Jesus Christ," looks as if it might have received some fifth-century expansion. And the intercession for the dead did not form an essential and regular element of the Canon before the ninth century. For other possible or probable changes see Upton, pp. 48 ff. But taken as a whole "its language testifies to a primitive stage of development, and shows little trace of the more developed ideas current in Greek circles at the end of the fourth century."[2]

The three best known types of the Roman Sacramentary are known by the names of three great Popes, Leo (*d.* 461), Gelasius (496), and Gregory (604), but in each case by no means accurately. That of Leo, though it may proceed almost from his time, and is a local Roman book, is merely a collection of variable forms (Collects, "Secrets," Post-Communions, Prefaces) made by some ecclesiastic for his own use; the only MS. containing it (at Verona) is incomplete, and does not include the Canon. The Gelasian Sacramentary is

[1] See Srawley, 172. [2] Srawley, 192.

really the Roman rite as current in France before the middle of the reign of Charles the Great; as its Canon contains the additions made by Gregory, it cannot proceed from Gelasius. This king asked Pope Adrian I to send him from Rome the Sacramentary drawn up by St. Gregory; this was done some time between 784 and 791. This Sacramentary was at once largely copied in France—many copies about this time are still extant. But in copying it was at once supplemented (perhaps by Alcuin) by much from the Roman Sacramentary previously current in France. But even in the book as sent by Adrian there are elements which must be later than the time of Gregory.[1] Thus neither of these books actually goes back as a whole to its alleged author; and while the basis of both is Roman, they have come to us through Frankish hands. Later on, various Gallican elements came into the Roman Liturgy as used in the Emperor's chapel; this composite liturgy spread through the Frankish empire, and finally established itself even at Rome. Thus the Roman rite from century XI onwards includes a number of Gallican elements.

There is some advantage in comparing the structure and contents of the Roman Anaphora with that of the usual Greek Liturgy. (The Anaphora includes the Sursum Corda, Preface, Sanctus, as well as the Canon.) We find important points of difference. "The Intercession has been inserted in two places. Hardly anything has survived of the commemoration of the Work of Redemption, except the commemoration of the Institution; while the Invocation," to which the greatest importance is attached in the East, "has been greatly obscured."[2] This must be borne in mind before condemning any part of our English use as unliturgical; the Roman rite is by no means correct by a Greek standard; ours is not to be condemned simply for its departures from this.

The English Communion Office of 1549 was, like our other services, based on the framework of the Sarum Office. In the part preceding the Canon there was scarcely anything new as a whole; the Lord's Prayer, Collect for Purity, Introit, Kyrie, Gloria in Excelsis, Collect, Epistle, Gospel, Nicene Creed, Offertory, Sursum Corda, Preface, Sanctus—all come from the old rite, which was simply somewhat shortened. But not only was the Layman's Preparation—from the Order of Communion—inserted between Consecration and Communion, but the Canon was completely rewritten; here and there

[1] See Duchesne, 123 B. [2] Procter-Frere, 445.

it remains close to the old form, but it more often is completely different.[1] Yet "the Canon which Cranmer substituted was on the whole founded upon the Gregorian; it was one long prayer ending with the Lord's Prayer, and containing the three elements of intercession, commemoration and oblation, which the Roman liturgy shared with all ancient liturgies whether Eastern or Western."[2] But in 1552 this service took quite a new form. Apart from ritual changes, the introduction of the Commandments, and the removal of the Gloria in Excelsis to the end, the most important were (1) the Preparation Service from the "Order of Communion" was put before Consecration instead of after; (2) the Canon was completely cut up, only about one-third of it, including the commemoration of Redemption, with the Words of Institution, being left in its old position: the Intercessions were put earlier in the service; the Invocation, introduced from Greek liturgies in 1549, was omitted, while the Oblation, with the omission of the Anamnesis and other elements, was put, with the Lord's Prayer, after Reception. All the few places in which the wording of the Canon of 1549 was close to the Missal were struck out, except for the closing words of the Prayer of Oblation, "not weighing our merits . . ."[3] Dr. Swete's comment on these changes is valuable. "The Communion Service of 1549 was on the whole a revised Sarum; it belonged to the Roman family of liturgies. This can scarcely be said of the present English liturgy; while it makes large use of Sarum and other ancient materials, in its structure it follows an order peculiar to itself. In other words, it heads a new liturgical family. . . . There is no reason why English Churchmen should regret the fact, or pine for a restoration of the Roman Mass. . . . It would have been a grave misfortune if the great English race had been tied for all time to customs and forms which rest ultimately upon the local traditions of an Italian Church."

There is thus no sufficient case for regarding any variation of our office from the structure of early liturgies as *ipso facto* self-condemned; it should be considered on its own merits, scriptural and devotional, with full recognition of the fact that it has approved itself to a number of generations of English Churchmen. Why should liturgical formation, like church building, be bound to con-

[1] See comparison in Procter-Frere: many of the resemblances marked are of thought rather than words.

[2] Swete, 117. [3] P. 126.

form to ancient or mediaeval designs? Our service is no doubt capable of improvement—though opinions may differ as to such improvements; we might here and there enrich it from ancient liturgies or by following their precedents. But these precedents are not binding. We must not exaggerate the importance of these liturgies; they cannot be regarded as at all primitive. The earliest complete ones belong to century v, a time farther from the Apostles than we are from the Reformers, and they have often admitted later elements. Their elaboration, too, is hardly a recommendation. In particular, they, as a rule, reflect the decided development of eucharistic doctrines and language which arose in the middle of the fourth century, which many of us will regard as a departure from primitive simplicity and truth.

HAROLD SMITH.

THE COMITY OF THE CHURCHES ON THE MISSION FIELD.[1]

By the Rev. George G. Findlay, B.A., D.D., Wesleyan Theological College, Headinglye, Leeds.

IT is a sad thing, from whatever point of view regarded, that at this time of day the matter of comity as between Christian Missions should need discussion. In this connection we must look beyond the literal sense of the word *comity*, which strictly taken means no more than courtesy, a friendly disposition and manner in social intercourse. Christian decency surely dictates so much as this. Amidst heathen surroundings missionary comity cannot stop at mere sentiment and civility, but passes into co-operation; failing that, it is likely to give place to antagonism. It is scarcely possible for men under the conditions of missionary life to labour within the same community pursuing their separate tasks in isolation, as we mostly do in this country, and ignoring the work of fellow-labourers of other Churches. Their paths are constantly crossing; their operations interlace; they help or hinder each other at every turn; the force of circumstances compels the representatives of one Church to recognize and utilize, or to disown and virtually oppose, the doings of the other. A polite neutrality is out of the question; it is a case of "He that is not with me is against me." From all I know of the Mission fields of my own Church, I judge that fellowship is a warmer and heartier experience there than here. Missionaries feel themselves more closely interdependent and are more sensibly members one of another than we at home; and where friction arises, it becomes more inflamed than in the atmosphere of a Christian land. And what is true in this respect of a single Church or Missionary organization, holds as between the Churches themselves.

The mere fact of being strangers in a strange land makes men interesting to each other. Englishmen who at home would not be on speaking terms, abroad become "chummy" (as we say); their social hunger draws them together. For lack of other comradeship and nearer kindred, they make acquaintance and discover how much they have in common. In the case of missionaries amongst the

[1] A Paper read before the Leeds C.M.S. Clergy Union.

heathen, the motives for communion are immeasurably stronger; they are enforced by a common repulsion and horror, by combat with a common and powerful foe. The matters dividing the servants of the Lord Christ which loomed so large in the home country, before this monstrous antithesis dwindle into insignificance. How childish to contend over modes of Church-government or forms of baptism in the presence of the Brahman theosophist or the negro devil-worshipper! In such a position men feel how great a thing it is, how binding a bond, to be fellow-Christians; they hear more clearly the voice which said: "One is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren."

Such influences have operated from the first, in a quite spontaneous and informal way, on the foreign field. Nowhere, for example, has there been witnessed truer friendship and co-operation than existed between the pioneers of the Church Missionary Society and of the Wesleyan Missionary Society a century ago, in West Africa, in Australia and New Zealand. The warmth of heart generated by the Evangelical Revival, and as yet unchilled, contributed to this fraternity. At the same time, I am bound to say that in some other quarters—in the West Indies frequently, in Newfoundland and Canada—the first Wesleyan Missions suffered contempt and denunciation, even violent persecution, at the hands of clergymen of a different way of thinking; there was a revival amongst Colonials in the early nineteenth century of the animus of seventeenth and eighteenth century State-churchmen toward Dissenters and Methodists, which had bitter political ingredients and was often bitterly reciprocated. Generally speaking, as the century advanced and as population became denser and more settled in England overseas, the relations of the Churches approximated to those familiar at home. Individual friendships, and contentions, between missionaries of different denominations, both became rarer; a decorous indifference, a kind of armed neutrality, supervened. The separate Churches minded their own business, and went their own way.

The internal growth of the several Missions and the evolution of the rival Church-systems, while beneficial in so many respects, made against the continuance on these fields of inter-Church comity; pre-occupied with the interests and the companionships of their particular Communions, the Church-leaders were less inclined to "look on the things of others" beyond the fence; in short, the

missionary grew into the regimented Colonial clergyman or minister.

This development in the Colonies coincided with the Oxford Movement in England, which brought about a powerful renewal of High Church principles and claims and set the clergy very generally in a pronounced polemic attitude toward Nonconformity. The new temper soon made itself felt on the Mission field. In New Zealand, for instance, the advent of Bishop Selwyn—that accomplished and high-minded man and devoted missionary, but uncompromising High Churchman—transformed the inter-Church situation. The brotherly relations between Anglicans and Methodists in that growing Colony were broken off. Intercourse was discouraged; mutual consultation ceased, co-operation became a thing of the past. Churchmen stood aloof from Dissenters; Christ's people were divided, in the face of the heathen, into two opposite camps. Ecclesiastical policy neutralized the instincts of the Christian heart and overbore the sense of a common citizenship in the Kingdom of God.

The age of what one may call unreflective and informal comity in British Mission-work, manifesting itself in private friendship and sporadic unorganized co-operation, passed away, as the Colonies filled up and their Churches grew out of the stage of pioneer adventure into that of regularised ecclesiastical life. Up to the middle of the last century the main strength of the modern British Missionary Societies was spent on Colonial fields; our Missions to non-Christian lands were, in most regions, too small and isolated to give rise to serious questions of comity and co-operation. But with the progress of the century, after the crisis of the Mutiny in India, the opening of China and Japan to foreign intercourse, and the exploration of interior Africa, the British and American Churches took up the great problems of the evangelization of the Far East and the Dark Continent. The drawbacks of Protestant sectarianism now came into evidence as they had not done before, in face of the great organized Pagan systems, and the massed Paganism and Muhammedanism of those immense countries. The disabling effect of Christian divisions—the scandal and perplexity they caused to the heathen folk, the contempt they provoked amongst Moslems, and at a later stage the resentment they excited in the Native Churches as their corporate national consciousness developed—these and the like influences have forced the question of unity upon the missionary bodies; they are occasioning deep searchings of heart to all who

are concerned with the world-progress of the Gospel and the future of the Kingdom of Christ in Asia and in Africa. The missionary situation to-day resembles that of the armies of the Entente on the Western front, as this appeared at the spring of the present year. Brought up against the fortress-walls of Hinduism, or the solid and deep-dug entrenchments of Chinese bigotry, our scattered ill-equipped forces were comparatively powerless. The necessity for economy of material, sub-division of labour, co-operation in study, prayer, counsel, concerted action of all kinds and in the employment of every arm of the Christian warfare, were forced on the minds of the most unwilling; men who at home had been complacent in the self-sufficiency of their own Church and impatient of dissent—disposed, as the eye or hand in the body of Christ, to say to the foot, "I have no need of thee"—were brought to a humbler mind; they were compelled to feel the weakness of isolation under the stress of their labour on the larger and more critical Mission fields.

Hence the inter-Church Conferences, Councils, Boards, Committees, which have become a growingly dominant feature of missionary work in those lands—a feature more developed and elaborated in proportion to the development, social and intellectual, of the type of non-Christian religion to be dealt with, in proportion to the solidity of its resistance and the intricacy and difficulty of the problems it presented. At the same time, with the multiplication of Missions and missionaries upon the field, the necessity for collaboration, and the opportunities for mutual help and furtherance, increased in still greater ratio. The waste involved in overlapping, and in the duplicating of institutions for parallel purposes, became glaringly evident. The evils resulting from unadjusted standards of membership, and from the uncontrolled migration from Church to Church of converts under discipline or of dissatisfied agents—rascals, some of them, who exploited our divisions—pressed on the attention of missionary pastors. These and the like difficulties accompanying disunion enforced imperiously, on Indian and Chinese missionaries most of all, the need for a common understanding and concerted action. Not merely an *entente cordiale*, but an effective working alliance amongst Evangelical Churches was called for in the Far Eastern, and perhaps less urgently in the West and South African fields. Such alliance is taking shape, and is bearing fruit.

This trend of circumstances has given to comity on the Mission

field a practical import, and a positive content, of great significance for the future. Out of common sympathies and counsels common institutions have inevitably grown, especially in the departments of medical, educational, and literary work. The Christian College of Madras, which is said to be the largest modern educational institute in Asia, is a conspicuous product of this movement; founded by the Free Church of Scotland, it is now supported and manned by a combination of some half-dozen missionary bodies, of which the Church Missionary Society, I believe, is one. Some years ago I had the opportunity, when in India, of visiting this noble institution, and observed with delight its imposing structure and its commanding and beneficent influence, pervading the whole south of the Peninsula. Co-operation is extending itself there even to the field of theologica study and training for the ministry; witness the recent establishment of the united Theological School in Bangalore.

The statement and discussions upon Missionary Co-operation and Unity which appears in the published reports of the World Missionary Conference held at Edinburgh in 1910, show how numerous and manifold are the activities on foot in this direction, what vital questions they raise for the whole Church, and how far their scope reaches beyond mere comity and friendly recognition. The Edinburgh Conference signalized the second step—the great stride, one might venture to say—in the advance toward reunion of the Churches which is in progress on the Mission Field. The Missionary Societies have entered now on the stage of deliberate and comprehensive collaboration, of scientific co-ordination (as one may say). In seeking to fulfil Christ's last and largest command, to "disciple all the nations," the Christian Society is in the way of rediscovering and re-asserting its lost unity.

I had the privilege of taking part in that memorable meeting at Edinburgh—the greatest assemblage of the world-Christian forces ever gathered, the most ecumenical since the Councils of the undivided Church. Speaking for myself, let me say, that I was never present in any ecclesiastical assembly where the overshadowing power of Christ appeared to be so deeply felt, and the guidance of His sovereign Spirit so strongly realized from first to last. I remember well the introduction of the Report of the 8th Commission, upon Co-operation and Unity—the tense feeling that prevailed, the sense resting upon us all that this was the critical moment of the Conference, the

fear lest some counter-demonstration might arise, some manifestation of disunity which would go far to discredit the Conference and reawaken the spirit of jealousy and division on the Mission Field. The Church of Rome, to be sure, was not represented in the Conference-hall, though one of her most revered Bishops sent us a friendly and affectionate greeting. But there were those who felt no little shyness and hesitation in endorsing the prevailing sentiment, who feared committing themselves to some step which would compromise their Church-principles. It was a great satisfaction to the promoters of the Conference, and an earnest of its success, when the Committee of the S.P.G.—not without demur and division of opinion in its ranks—accepted the invitation to join the Conference and that venerable and important Society (as I heard some one express it) was "roped in" with the rest. The event may prove epoch-making; it was at any rate momentous for the Conference itself. The High Church leaders present—such as Bishops Gore and Talbot, Lord William Cecil (now Bishop of Exeter), Bishop Montgomery, then Secretary of the S.P.G., and Dr. Frere our neighbour at Mirfield—while frankly expressing their reserves and cautions and at some points obviously embarrassed, were amongst the most brotherly and cordial of the delegates in their sentiments and the most valued contributors to the discussions of the Conference.

As a parallel example of the progress made on the foreign field toward the confederation, and of the way in which the old middle walls of partition are yielding under the pressure of missionary exigencies, I may refer to the experience of my own brother for many years a Methodist missionary to India. He was the organizing Secretary, some twenty years back, of the South India Missionary Association, which for the first time brought all Christian Missionaries in that region, with the exception of the Roman Catholics and the Lutherans, into open fellowship. He told me of the long correspondence and difficult negotiations he had with missionary clergymen of High Church views, the scruples, in most cases courteously and regretfully expressed, which a number of these excellent men felt about associating with Dissenting ministers, his deep thankfulness that these hindrances were at last overcome and that the Association was made complete by the adhesion of the missionaries of the S.P.G. They brought to the common stock elements of discipline and training, with a standpoint and habit of mind, of unique

value and which their fellows in the service of Christ could ill dispense with. The linking up with the rest of this detachment of the missionary host in South India he felt to be a triumph for the common cause.

Occurrences like this are bound to react on the Church of God here at home. That reflection I will not venture to pursue. But I wish to add one word upon the part the Native Churches are likely to play in the question before us. The ultimate decision, after all, must rest with them; sooner or later they will take the settlement out of our hands. The more advanced Churches are growing impatient of our delays, our obstinate prejudices and misgivings toward each other, our persistent aloofness, our tedious diplomacy in this matter so vital to them. Nothing I heard at the Edinburgh Conference impressed me more than a speech of a few sentences coming from the lips of a Chinese delegate, who spoke with a quiet decision and a dry humour adding to the force of his words. "We thank you," he said, "from the depth of our hearts for bringing us your Christ; but we do not thank you for importing your Church-divisions and shibboleths along with Him. Anglican and Nonconformist, High Church and Low, Presbyterian, Baptist, Methodist, and the rest—these names are very significant to you, they are rooted in your soil and are a part of your history; but they fail to interest us Chinese. We can ill understand them; we have no use for them. They narrow and impoverish our communion; they weaken us in the face of the heathen. We Chinese Christians will not remain permanently boxed up in the compartments of British Christianity." That is a certainty we shall have to reckon with on every foreign missionary field, in some of them at no distant date. It may be in God's plans that China shall point the way to reunion for British Christendom, and once more "the things that are not shall bring to nought the things that are."

GEORGE G. FINDLAY.

THE PROLEGOMENA OF CHRISTIAN EVIDENCES.

By the Rev. E. Abbey Tindall, M.A., Rector of Didsbury.

THE literature of Christian Apologetics, in volume and in pamphlet, flows copiously from the press. Much of it fails to gauge accurately either the nature or the extent of infidelity. The problem is many-sided. The worldliness of the soldiers who jeered in the judgment-hall, the apathy of the disciples who slept in Gethsemane, and the interested opposition of the craftsmen at Ephesus cannot be included in the same category. The doubts of Thomas, and the lukewarmness of the Laodiceans arose from different causes. The flippancy of Gibbon, the agnosticism of Spencer and Huxley, the bravado of the Hyde Park orator have little in common. The elastic word *unbelief* includes them all, but the moral and intellectual distinctions are great. Different methods of reply must be adopted according to the special circumstances of each individual disputant. Here our concern is solely with intellectual objections.

The conceit which craves for self-advertisement, the moral propensity which repudiates restraint, and discontent with the existing social environment produce the rationalistic society and the street-corner atheist. These are engaged in an open warfare with Christianity. The infidel argument is a weapon in the conflict, not the *casus belli*. Not the conviction of the intellect, but the conversion of the heart must be sought. Direct evangelistic testimony is the only answer. The guilt of sin must be exposed, and a personal Saviour presented. At the same time admission must be openly made that the visible Church is not perfect, that the laws of a Christian country are often dictated by the greed of the rich and the influence of the mighty, and that life has become a struggle in which the weak are too readily allowed to go under while victory is for the strong. The love which sympathizes will reveal the Love which bled, and make manifest the meaning of His Sacrifice.

The remarkable progress made in the Natural Sciences during the past hundred years, the constant succession of new discoveries, and the increasing ability to explain by ordinary causes the varied

phenomena which fall under human observation, have created a habit of mind which earnestly seeks for truth but is obsessed by a materialistic bias. This affords scope for Christian evidences. By plain reasoning we may hope to convince. But much caution is requisite.

An inappropriate rejoinder defeats its own purpose. The futility of reminding an unbeliever that it is proverbially difficult to prove a negative is apparent to those who realize the limitations of this proposition. "No sane person," says the writer of a recent evidential tract, "would undertake to prove that any particular small article is nowhere to be found in London, because an exhaustive knowledge of the entire contents of the metropolis would be required in order to know that any specific thing did not exist there. And London is not the whole universe. And the atheist believes that nowhere in the cosmos does God exist." Is God comparable to a "small article"? In this parish there are no day-schools, tram-cars, or resident medical practitioners. To justify this negative statement must I know what is being done in every house, to what use every vehicle is put, and by what occupation every person is supported? The fact is certain, and a small acquaintance with the neighbourhood is sufficient to ascertain the veracity of the assertion. So when the atheist argues that the existence of God should be easily demonstrable, there is force in his contention. The silence and patience of God in dealing with the evils of the day are mysteries to the Christian. He cannot be localized, as the author just quoted comes dangerously near to attempting. "Show me clear signs of his activity," cries the agnostic. "He is not inactive," pleads the believer. Both are puzzled. "Canst thou by searching find out God?"

The science of Apologetics has a history. In the ceaseless impacts of unbelief upon faith since the days of Celsus Naturalism has been frequently compelled to change its ground: nor has the task of Christian defence been always able to assume the same form. Dr. Mozley in his Bampton Lectures of 1865 argued that miracles are of evidential value as an external witness to the authority and reliability of revelation. "If it was the Will of God to give a revelation, there are plain and obvious reasons for asserting that miracles are necessary as the guarantee and voucher for that revelation." The author of *Literature and Dogma*, with the illus-

tration of a pen-wiper turned into a pen, replied with crushing effect that a lack of connection between the revelation and the miracle was destructive of the demonstrative value of the latter. Dr. Mozley's contention needed re-statement. The error was in conceiving the miracles as external to, rather than as integral parts of, the revelation.

Similarly at one time certain spokesmen of Science claimed that miracles are impossible as being violations of the orderliness and uniformity of Nature. A daring assumption is the foundation of this fallacy. The question-begging hypothesis of an anti-theistic origin of the universe is behind the plea. If there be a God, His ability to interfere is unquestionable. Accordingly the position has been modified. In the dual stronghold that miracles do not happen and that a mistake of the witness is more probable than the occurrence of the marvel, our antagonists are entrenched in a more formidable redoubt.

Logical proofs of the possibility of miracles are still frequently published. They are out-of-date before the printers' ink is dry. The improbability, not the impossibility, is now the issue. The Christian view that Divine revelation has been imparted more by historic action than by express declaration meets the case. The miracles of Egypt were infinitely more than portentous confirmation of the truthfulness of Moses in proclaiming the approach of a day of deliverance. They were the means by which that deliverance was obtained. The hand of God accomplished what human skill could not achieve. The emancipation of Israel was a revelation of the Divine Will, not a mere fortuitous evolution of racial development. The miracles of Christ were no mere corroboration of the words of His preaching. They occurred because "God was in Christ Jesus reconciling the world unto Himself." They explain in His unique personality the power of His Atonement. The Resurrection of our Lord was not a simple testimony to His claims. By it certainly He was "declared to be the Son of God." But without it there could be no real redemption of mankind. It is an essential part of the Truth revealed, the prelude of the regeneration of the world. Thus revelation by historic fact requires occasional epochs of the miraculous. We accept the miracles, because we accept the Word of God, not vice versâ.

This view offers much assistance in the difficult problems of

the Incarnation. Accepting Dr. Gore's verdict that the evidence "is not such as to compel belief," emphasizing also the silence of St. Mark of the earliest Apostolic preaching, and (if you will) of St. Paul and St. John, we yet hold that the appearance in the world in time of a Being, Who was at once Divine and therefore pre-existent and also sinless both in respect of hereditary failing and personal guilt, necessitated a miracle. To have put this from the first in a foremost place would have challenged the incredulity of mankind. But when a Church of believers began to run the risks demanded by their faith of speculation in a sphere in which ignorance was profound, Apostles and Apostolic men told what they knew from full and careful inquiry of the story of the birth of Christ. It was not the miracle which induced a following of Christ, but the Man Christ Jesus is Himself the miracle.

A clear differentiation of the Scriptural miracles from the legendary anecdotes of ecclesiastical annals is not only in itself desirable, but by the argument adduced is immediately practicable. The latter may be consigned to the ridicule of agnosticism and the regret of spiritual faith, for they do not bear the hall-mark of a direct revelation from God. Only so are miracles credible in the present condition of human thought.

The predictive element of prophecy has also been appealed to as an independent confirmation of the prophetic message. In this capacity its value has been weakened under the fire of our opponents. In consequence Christian writers have striven to eliminate prediction from the records, to argue that its literal fulfilment is not a vital matter, and to insist on the exhortative worth of preaching. The prophets themselves thought otherwise. Seven times in Isaiah xl.–lxvi. the fulfilment of prediction is claimed as evidential. By gifted foresight a statesman may foretell some event in the near future; but who can discern that which is afar off? God, to Whom the future is as clearly foredetermined as the past is sure, speaks with a knowledge which gives to His words a character which is impossible to men. The absence of prediction when He speaks would be a hiding of the Truth and a denial of any revelation. Still the predictions are not thaumaturgic. There is obscurity to our understanding. Faith in God stands first, and thence followeth credence in His word.

The uproar which the publication of the *Origin of Species* aroused

was not creditable to Christian intelligence. Agnostic and Christian both perceive the perpetual changefulness in all visible phenomena They agree that these alterations are wrought in accordance with some plan. Paley's argument from design was valid until Darwin took note of method in Nature, and accounted for it by " natural selection " or the working of other natural forces. This was quite congruous with Christian theism, merely adding to the design the tools of the Designer. That God should employ intermediate agency ought not to astonish those who believe that in the greatest of all His works He used the mediation of the man Christ Jesus to accomplish our salvation. The real issue is whether Evolution affords a sufficient explanation of the universe, and whether its processes would continue at work without higher guidance.

An essential feature in the theory of Evolution is the importance it attaches to the principle of continuity. The Evolutionist, in order to work out his ideas, must assume as a starting-point some condition of the physical universe. His theory may begin *at*, but not *with*, the first creation. He cannot go so far as to deny a Creator. Nor is he able to bridge the gulf which separates the inorganic from the organic. Hypothetic suggestions of the possible origin of life only admit that the whole question is beyond his powers of investigation. The connection between the mind and the brain is inexplicable unless we recognize the existence of the spiritual apart from the material.

Materialism offers the gloomiest prospect of the future. " The theory of Evolution," says Huxley, " encourages no millennial expectations. If for millions of years our globe has taken the upward road, yet, some time, the summit will be reached and the downward route commenced." The resources of Nature are failing. The soil of the Earth wears out in respect of productiveness by its continuous contribution of food for man. Some element in each of the successive geological deposits which form the surface of the globe has become essential to the maintenance and comfort of man's life. But the supply is limited. " That all the labours of the ages," to quote the Hon. Bertrand Russell, " all the devotion, all the inspiration, all the noon-day brightness of human genius, are destined to extinction in the vast death of the solar system, and that the whole temple of man's achievement must inevitably be buried beneath the débris of a universe in ruins—all these things,

if not quite beyond dispute, are yet so nearly certain that no philosophy which rejects them can hope to stand." There is a limit to the survival of the fittest. Hopeless irretrievable collapse is the fate of all alike.

But these dismal speculations are also contradicted in the name of Science. The materialistic tendency is rebutted as effectually from that side as from the theological. Lord Kelvin has utterly routed it by the convincing thought that inasmuch as every natural force is capable of being reversed in direction the world might conceivably be so turned backwards upon its former course that, if memory be a mere function of the brain, men would have the most vivid impression of all that was about to happen combined with no knowledge whatever of what had just taken place. So a Scientist refutes materialism. *Magna est veritas et prævalebit.* "In your patience ye shall win your souls."

Recent events have proved that the development of man is not accomplished by force. Sacrifice and suffering effect far wider results. Sometimes in death the goal is reached. Is that the end? Is all the greatness of man, all his spiritual selflessness to result in zero? No: Christian Hope spells re-assurance. "There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body. And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul: the last Adam (was made) a quickening spirit. Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural, and afterward that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from Heaven. As is the earthy such are they also that are earthy: and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly." Is this great faith truly tenable?

Faith is no peculiar prerogative of religion. Reason is of the greatest assistance in the acquisition of knowledge, but students frequently find it incumbent upon them to cast to the winds the fundamental rule which prohibits arguing from a particular case to a general assertion. A few observations and calculations induced Newton to announce the theory of gravitation and to formulate the laws of motion. A long series of tests has strengthened his position. The results are accepted by every investigator, but rationally proof is wanting. An infinite number of experiments

would be needed for complete demonstration. When Reason refuses further help, Faith steps in. Its ability to determine is unquestioned. Probability is an admitted guide in life, and probability is an aspect of faith.

The Christian advocate asks no more than is conceded to his scientific rival. But his faith submits to a scrutiny from which the other recoils. Acceptance of scientific laws demands a passive acquiescence, but consent to the theological proposition requires the active surrender of a life to its control. In the one case reason returns in the invention of new machinery for the exploitation to man's advantage of each discovery: in the other the output of energy is still governed by faith. The aim of religion is to uplift mankind morally and spiritually. The test of its truth is found in the measure of its efficacy. The foundation of the Church, its rapid extension, its triumph over persecution, its constant struggle with internal imperfection, illustrate upon every page of ecclesiastical history the power of a faith which, though often corrupt, always weak, generally resisted, and everywhere disputed, has gone forth conquering and to conquer.

The power of faith springs from the truth of that which is believed. Faith in vaccination has done more to eliminate disease than all the faith-healing which has no definite objective. Belief in military force did not fulfil the aspirations of Napoleon, nor secure world-domination for Germany. The false creeds of heathendom have not promoted the benefit of their adherents. The spurious accretions and superstitions of Christianity have not co-operated in the fight for liberty, the abolition of slavery, or the emancipation of women. The record of true Christian faith is fraught with glorious achievements. Faith is the link that unites us to the true God, or its victories are unaccountable.

The doctrine of survival after death is inseparable from the teaching of Christ. Its omission would be fatal to the whole of His message to the world. For purpose of proof it is not to be placed in a department by itself. The analytical method is out of place here. The detachment of the body from the spirit otherwise than as it is accomplished in death forbids a real examination of the issue. Water is composed of oxygen and hydrogen, but the properties of water will not be investigated by experiment upon each of the two gases which form it. Life is a mysterious com-

bination of material and spiritual elements. Science may explore the body, but life defies her skill. The Christian revelation must be treated as a unity. Belief in a risen Saviour commenced an evangelization of all peoples which has often been hindered but never stayed. The historical witness to Christ shows that in Him is the power of Truth. Accepting Him, we accept His word. Because Christ is true, we believe in the resurrection of the dead and life everlasting.

Elucidation of the historical testimony to Christ is the supreme task of evidential polemics. The difficulty is increased by the ever-present intermixture of evil with good alike in the Church and in the individual. The tares have been sown with the wheat. The perpetual struggle of Christianity with the world is not parallel to a warfare between the armies of the nations. For evil must be eradicated from the heart, and in this life the process is never completed. Biography and history are the mines from which useful argument can be obtained, but the precious ore is enveloped in sand. The discerning perceive how the contest continues. But victory is coming for faith. Daily experience attests that Christ prevails over every form of self-will, and that He keeps in perfect peace those whose minds are stayed on Him.

The hindrances of Faith are no less than those of unbelief. They must be met with the same candour, the same confession of our inability to understand all things, and the same appeal to our experience in Christ. As an example reference may be made to the subject of prayer. Assurances that prayer will be answered cause disappointment when apparently it is not. If two persons desire opposite and contradictory boons, how shall both receive? If prayer is a determining force, does it change the mind of God? Replies to such questionings are often felt to be unsatisfactory. The suggestion that prayer is communion with God tending more to change our minds than to alter His is quite sound, but does not explain the promise, "Ask, and ye shall have." The reproof that the heart of the petitioner is not right with God savours of hardness. If the required answer necessitates a divine intervention, this, being akin to miracle, may be anticipated to convey also a fresh revelation of the divine Will. Perhaps attention is so focussed upon the expected form of reply that God's purpose is overlooked. Prompt obedience in following His guidance would lead to a better

understanding and truer appreciation of His kindness. And yet the difficulty is not wholly removed.

Ultimately we must rely on that experience of Christ which is the basis of all Christian evidence. Conversion, the new birth, the passage of the soul from death unto life is the beginning, witnessed unto us by a great cloud of witnesses in the saints of every age and land. Confidence in the promise of pardon, the reality of the daily help received for the resistance of temptation, deliverance from the sinful habits of the former life are facts which assure us that His message is true and His work effectual. There is misunderstanding and mis-apprehension. "Now we see as in a glass darkly." The mists of ignorance are the more perceived because we live in the dawn of that day when the Sun Himself is about to rise. In patience we await His coming to make all things clear. Eagerly we look forward to the time when Faith triumphant shall bring us into the explaining Light of His Presence.

E. ABBEY TINDALL.

THE SECOND EPISTLE OF ST. PAUL TO THE CORINTHIANS.

By the Rev. Herbert Marston, M.A., Rector of Lydford-on-Fosse, Somerset.

By the courtesy of the editor I am allowed to offer to the readers of the Churchman three articles on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians. In the first I attempt an impression and an analysis. In the second I shall attempt a translation of some passages remarkable either for beauty or for obscurity, adding a few notes. In the third I shall attempt to apply the Epistle to the trials and the questions of our age.

I

Discarding the arid technicalities of introduction, let us approach the Epistle with detached and living interest, as though reading it for the first time. To do this is easier in the case of this Epistle than it would be in the case of some others; for it has been less amply treated than most. Admirable scholars, like Plummer, have, indeed, done much to elucidate it. Yet nothing has been done for this Epistle comparable with that which Lightfoot did for the Epistles to the Galatians, Colossians, and Philippians. I do not aspire to emulate Lightfoot, save in the spirit of reverence and thoroughness, which has set the standard to every future student of St. Paul. Yet I trust to add something to the believing comprehension of this wonderful document, still inviting the hand of the master.

When St. Paul arrived at Thessalonica in the autumn of 57 A.D. the prospects of the Gospel were overcast, and the spirit of the Apostle was correspondingly dejected. The Churches of Galatia were threatening defection. The Asiatic seaboard was seething with tumult provoked by his preaching at Ephesus. Corinth had lapsed into wild disorders. Immoralities were practised by Christians in that city, which shocked even the pagan inhabitants. The spirit of faction, native to the Greek mind, had broken out in the Church. The outbreak was embittered by Jewish rancour. Rival sects were being formed, whose chiefs arrayed themselves under the names of venerated teachers, such as Apollos, Cephas and Paul.

The most insolent of these sectaries arrogated to themselves the title of " Christ's Own." Scandals at the public worship of the Church, and even at the Holy Eucharist, were notorious. Spiritual gifts were profaned by fanatical abuses. The reputation of Christians for sanity was jeopardised. The fundamentals of the Gospel were questioned ; and some went so far as to hold that God could not be known at all.

As the news of these troubles reached the Apostle, his spirit declined, his physical frame was sapped of its energy. Leaving Ephesus he sought relief in change of scene. He came to Troas. There a door for the Gospel was opened to him. Sick at heart he could not enter in. Taking leave of them he crossed to Macedonia. He longed for the coming of Titus ; but Titus came not. Restless and disappointed he moved towards Corinth. At Thessalonica he halted ; and there at last he met Titus returning from Corinth after a stay of some months. Would he bring consolation to the Apostle, or would he complete the tale of his distress ?

We can without difficulty reconstruct the interview between St Paul and Titus by means of this Epistle. The beautiful and moving letter is, as it were, woven round the thread of Titus's narrative. The young emissary detailed the long and intricate negotiations which he had conducted to a happy fruition. He described the crisis ; the revulsion of feeling ; the humiliation and repentance of the Church. St. Paul's first letter had been effectual. They were filled with the compunctions of divine sorrow. They were renouncing the false opinions. They were once more loyal. Of the majority this was all true. The rivals of St. Paul were discredited and their followers were wavering.

Upborne by the flood of joy with which these tidings filled his soul, the Apostle gathered up his depleted powers for a great effort. Conscious of the fulness of divine inspiration, mingling details of time and place with doctrine and appeal, touching with amazing versatility topics widely remote, he framed one of those letters " full of weight and power " at which his opponents trembled, and which the Church has canonised as inspired with an inspiration different in kind and in degree from all human inspirations. Such are the conditions out of which arose the Second Epistle to the Corinthians. The general tenor of that Epistle is clear, and yields itself up to patient analysis. Before, however, attempting that analysis,

let me offer a few observations on the style and structure of the Epistle.

Acknowledging that a certain similarity exists between this and the other epistles of St. Paul, we must also acknowledge that it is widely dissimilar from them. It is unique. It bears some resemblance to the Epistle to the Philippians. It bears hardly any resemblance to the first Epistle to Corinth. Its beauty, variety and delicacy are concealed from English readers by the clumsy and inaccurate translation in our Authorised Version. The pathos of the exordium, the solemn cadences of the fifth chapter, the vivid apologia of chapter eleven, can only be appreciated by those who can read the original. It is the despair of translators. One critic compares its eloquence to that of Demosthenes. The Epistle contains three sections. The first, consisting of the first seven chapters, deals with the Christian ministry. The second, consisting of chapters eight and nine, deals with the Collection for the poor saints in Judea. The third, consisting of the last four chapters, recurs to the Ministry, but treats it in connection with the cruel, groundless and ridiculous slanders cast on the Apostle by his rivals.

I cannot here omit a brief notice of the disintegrating hypothesis which finds favour in some quarters. A rage for the disintegration of ancient literature seized the German mind towards the close of the eighteenth century. One critic assailed the unity of the Homeric poems. Another laid hands on the Pentateuch. A third put Isaiah on the dissecting table. Semler, who is styled by Tholuck, "the father of modern rationalism," applied the method of disintegration to this epistle. He declared that the last four chapters, excepting the valediction, were no part of the Epistle; but were a separate letter previously written by St. Paul, and bound up accidentally with this Epistle. In support of this view Semler asserted that the contents of the last four chapters are inconsistent with the contents of the first nine. They are rancorous and vituperative, breathing animosity and distrust. The first nine are calm, affectionate and full of hope. St. Paul, he declares, could not have written the four chapters immediately after writing the nine chapters, without convicting himself of that levity which he so vigorously repudiates. Semler was followed by a second critic, who pulled the Epistle still further to pieces. He in turn was followed by a third, who declared that the Epistle is nothing but a set of notes collected from St. Paul's pocket-

books, and woven together by some person unknown. Thus the disintegrators have reduced the most beautiful and animated of St. Paul's writings to a fortuitous concourse of apostolic atoms.

For these lucubrations there is no vestige of external evidence. There is not a manuscript, not a version, which exhibits the Epistle in any form save that with which all men are familiar. The evidence alleged is internal evidence. I think it may be said, without a breach of charity, that subjective rationalism has coloured the view of the disintegrators, who, differing among themselves on many points, are agreed on one, namely, on evacuating the supernatural from the Epistle. To effect this they tore the fabric into pieces more or less numerous ; for they were all of one mind in thinking that a patchwork of fragments could hardly be the vehicle of supernatural communications.

In analysing the Epistle we will avoid the opposite methods of servile orthodoxy and of shallow rationalism. The former takes too little account of the emotions agitating St. Paul as he was writing. The latter treats the Epistle as a medical officer treats a corpse at a post-mortem examination.

The end which the Apostle had in view was the completing and perfecting of Christian life at Corinth. " Perfect holiness in the fear of God, " he writes ; " this we pray, for even your full equipment." In four short years the building on the one foundation laid by God had become woefully decayed and defiled. He will repair and cleanse the temple.

He begins by disclosing his love for them, his passion for the Gospel, the intensity and variety of his sufferings for that Gospel. He dwells on his recent calamities in Asia, on the consolations afforded by the compassion of God ; he had felt again the communion of Christ's sufferings ; for he had suffered that he might help those who suffered, and had been consoled that he might console others. He had been forced reluctantly by events to defer his promised visit to Corinth. But he repels indignantly the base insinuation that he had vacillated in purpose or trifled with the truth. He had indulged no levity either of affection or of conviction ; he had deferred his visit merely out of love, for he would not come a third time in sorrow. Let not the Corinthians mistake the nature of these experiences ; they were incidents in the triumph of the Victor, Jesus ; St. Paul was led a captive by his Lord adoring His

train and diffusing the fragrance of His Gospel wherever he went. From the glory and the shame of that triumphal progress no Christian must shrink.

At this point the grand theme of the Epistle comes large and luminous into view. The miseries just recited were inseparable from the faithful discharge of his Ministry. He and the other Apostles were Ministers of a New Covenant more glorious, more permanent than that of Moses. The qualifications for the Ministry were from God. The containing vessels were frail and earthy, but the treasure contained was divine. Life and death contended for the mastery in his bodily frame ; but the life was the life of Jesus and the dying was the death of Jesus. But even if life must be surrendered, if the outer man must perish, he would not shrink ; for he knew that he had a building of God not made with hands eternal in the heavens, should this earthly tabernacle be dissolved.

Did this language seem to them the language of ecstasy, let them recollect what the Christian ministry really is. Its constraining motive was the love of Christ ; its author was God Himself ; its matter was the Incarnation and the Atonement ; its appeal was to the world to be reconciled to God through the Sinless One made sin for sinful man. Oh, that his Corinthians will pay back what he has given them by accepting the grace of God with a whole heart ! They are not really hesitating. Titus has reported their loyalty and love. They have cleansed the temple ; let them perfect holiness both in flesh and spirit. This section of the Epistle closes with a graceful and generous eulogium on Titus, whose tact, zeal and patience have achieved the reconciliation between the Corinthians and their Father in the faith.

Abruptly he turns off to touch on the Collection for the saints at Judea. Handling the topic with admirable address he reminds Achaia of its professions of liberality made a year before. The Churches of Macedonia were poor. They had subscribed with astonishing generosity. Let not the city of the two seas, whose marts were laden with produce of East and West, be found unworthy of her fame and of her wealth. The contributions should be placed in the hands of chosen Commissioners, of whom Titus should be one. The Apostle concludes the section by a glowing apostrophe to the grace of God and of its all-sufficiency, which eighteen centuries of Christian experience have verified in part ; alas ! how small a part.

One topic more remained. The rivals of his teaching and of his status must be exposed. They had called him a madman, a visionary, a rogue conspiring with others to make a good thing out of the Gospel. He condescends to refute these calumnies. The calumniators are "Apostles overmuch." They put on the garb of meekness; but are in fact greedy, grasping, and despotic. They preach a Jesus who has no reality; their Christ is neither truly a Jew nor truly a man. Forsaking the spirit of liberty and love, they propagate principles of servitude and bitterness. Do they challenge him for proofs of his Apostleship? they should have them in plenty. Hebrews, are they? What else is he? Ministers of Christ are they? Which of them can match the catalogue of labours, sufferings and perils endured by him for the Gospel's sake? Have they seen Christ? He has had visions and revelations sufficient to turn the head of any man, and such as might have turned his own, but for the correcting "thorn in the flesh."

But he has said enough; he will glory no longer save in that weakness over which broods the power and presence of Jesus. For the rest, let his censors be silent; and let the Church make haste to receive him in purity and peace. He is preparing to come for the third time. His apostolic authority shall be exercised among them, unless they can before he arrives purge themselves wholly of the old leaven and welcome him with one heart penitent and reformed. For they must surely know, that, unless they are like reprobate metal, Jesus Christ is in them. Paul cannot believe that they will fail under that supreme test; let them examine themselves and so spare him the pain of examining them severely when he comes.

The Epistle draws to a close with a few eager and tender sentences which sound the note of cheerful hope, passing into the commendatory invocation of the sacred Trinity.

HERBERT MARSTON.

THE CHAPELS ROYAL OF BRITAIN.[1]

By J. Cresswell Roscamp, M.E.

I. CHAPELS OF ST. JOHN AND ST. PETER IN THE TOWER OF LONDON.

THERE are surely no buildings in Britain with so much present interest and past memories, so full of glad tidings and sad recollections, or containing so many relics of tragedy as do these Royal Chapels throughout the British Isles. Many more have passed away or are no longer in Royal hands, for in the olden days the monarchs were prone to take up their abode at many places, building their chapels wherein to worship. Those that remain have in many cases been shorn of the pomp and glory with which they were once resplendent, and their grim, grey old stones alone are left to tell their story of sorrow and joy, tears and laughter, tortures, gladness, sickness, birth, life and death, and to bear testimony also that through all the changing scenes of life they remain an emblem for us that as our Father was worshipped in the past so is He still and shall be for ever and ever, world without end.

The present articles can only deal with them in a cursory manner, and it is only proposed to give what appears to be the more interesting matter of all the hosts of information that is available.

The Chapels of St. John and St. Peter in the Tower of London are of exceptional interest. There are vague accounts of a chapel of an earlier date, but the present Chapel of St. John was built in the reign of William the Conqueror, under the guiding hand of Gundulph, the Bishop of Rochester. Commenced in 1078 it is situated in the White Tower, and is a very perfect specimen of ecclesiastical Norman architecture. Massively built and situate in the old Keep, it has a charming originality about it that deeply impresses one. It consists of a nave and two broad aisles separated from it by six stalwart, stone, circular pillars which support a gallery of equal breadth to the aisles, the East end forming a semi-circular apse, and with a most beautifully proportioned coved roof.

The Palace, once standing here and used in each reign as a

[1] These articles are inserted for their historical value; they will be read with interest.

Royal residence from the time of William Rufus to the reign of Charles II, was also commenced about the same time by William the Conqueror, but it has long since passed away.

The Chapel of St. Peter-ad-Vincula is a small structure not far distant from the White Tower, and was built in 1512 to replace a former one built by Edward I, which had been burnt down. There was also a chapel here before King Edward's time, and was probably of the same time as that dedicated to St. John the Evangelist. The history of this chapel is of scarcely less interest to that of Westminster Abbey, for here the remains of many whose names are indelibly written on the pages of English history were laid to rest. The chapel consists of a nave and north aisle separated by a row of low Tudor arches resting on a row of columns, and it measures sixty-six feet in length, fifty-four feet in width, with a height of twenty-five feet. The dedication of the Chapel to St. Peter in "Chains or Bonds" would point to the probability of its having been the place of worship for the prisoners in the fortress, while the Chapel of St. John would be reserved for the use of the Sovereign and his Court when in residence. There are two "altars" in the church, dedicated to St. Mary and St. Peter respectively, and a hagioscope or squint in the east wall enabled the priest officiating at St. Mary's "altar" to see the priest at St. Peter's.

Macaulay, in his *History of England*, speaks of the interments that took place in the chapel thus:—"Thither have been carried by the rude hands of gaolers, through successive ages, without one mourner following, the bleeding relics of men who had been the captains of armies, the leaders of parties, the oracles of senates and the ornaments of Courts." A memorial tablet near the door reads as follows:—

LIST OF REMARKABLE PERSONS BURIED IN THIS CHAPEL.

1.	Gerald Fitzgerald, Earl of Kildare	1534
2.	John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester	1535
3.	Sir Thomas More, the Chancellor	1535
4.	George Boleyn, Viscount Rochford	1536
5.	Queen Anne Boleyn	1536
6.	Thomas Cromwell, Earl of Essex	1540
7.	Margaret of Clarence, Countess of Salisbury	1541
8.	Queen Katherine Howard	1542
9.	Jane, Viscountess Rochford	1542
10.	Thomas, Lord Seymour of Sudeley	1549
11.	Edward Seymour, Duke of Somerset	1551

12. Sir Ralph Vane	1552
13. Sir Thomas Arundel	1552
14. John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland	1553
15. Lord Guildford Dudley	1554
16. Lady Jane Grey	1554
17. Henery Grey, Duke of Suffolk	1554
18. Thomas Howard, Duke of Norfolk	1572
19. Sir John Perrot	1592
20. Philip, Earl of Arundel	1595
21. Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex	1601
22. Sir Thomas Overbury	1613
23. Thomas, Lord Grey of Wilton	1614
24. Sir John Eliot.	1632
25. William, Viscount Stafford	1680
26. Arthur, Earl of Essex	1683
27. James, Duke of Monmouth	1685
28. George, Lord Jeffreys	1689
29. John Rotier	1703
30. Edward, Lord Griffin	1710
31. William, Marquis of Tullibardine	1746
32. William, Earl of Kilmarnock	1746
33. Arthur, Lord Balmerino	1746
34. Simon, Lord Fraser of Lovat	1747

Strange indeed are the vagaries of life, and stranger still they may become in death. Here in the centre before the "altar," lie the remains of the two Dukes of Somerset and Northumberland, through life ever engaged in strife and rivalry and now lying side by side in death. And on either side of these two lie the remains of the two ill-fated Queens of King Henry VIII, while near to are the bodies of the innocent Lady Jane Grey, "the nine-days Queen," and her husband, Lord Dudley, the victims of Queen Mary. And Lord Cromwell, the blacksmith's son, who served as a common soldier and rose eventually to be Grand Chamberlain of England, and then was arrested for treason and despite all his prayers for mercy became yet another name to be added to the list of Henry VIII's victims. The notorious Judge Jeffreys was buried here after dying of delirium tremens in the very prison to which he had sent so many, but his body was afterwards removed to the Church of St. Mary, Aldermanbury, on the application of his friends. Viscount Stafford, who, like his Royal master, Charles I, was executed, was also buried here, as was the body of Sir Thomas More, the witty chancellor of Henry VIII's reign, who even is recorded as making a jest as he walked to the scaffold.

Numerous records there are of christenings, marriages, and burials, the latter dating from the year 1550, while the marriages

date from 1586 and the christenings from 1587. The list given above only enumerate those buried actually in the chapel, and a large number were interred in the cemetery without, while still more were removed altogether.

Here exist the records, then, of days happily gone past when innocent people suffered death through spite and jealousy and others were foully butchered in the name of Christ, while others forfeited their lives because they knew not Christ and pursued the paths of evil. If we can all meet death whensoever it shall come with the quiet fortitude and deep-rooted faith that so many of these hapless victims of spites and intrigues showed, then indeed, may we look forward to the time when we shall be called upon to give an account of our stewardship in the full confidence that it will be said, " Well done thou good and faithful servant, enter thou into the Joy of thy Lord."

J. CRESSWELL ROSCAMP, M.E., ETC.

STUDIES IN TEXTS.

(Being suggestions for Sermons from recent expository literature.)

By the Rev. Harrington C. Lees, M.A.

"They sing a new song" (Rev. v. 9).

"They sing a new song" (Rev. xiv. 3).

"They sing the song of Moses and the song of the Lamb, saying, Great and marvellous are Thy works, O Lord, Thou King of Nations'" (Rev. xv. 3).

(Literature referred to. *Expositor*, July, 1918 = *E.*, 7, 18. Swete's *Apocalypse* = SA. Moffatt's Commentary on Apocalypse in *Expos.* G.T. = M. Donald Hankey's *Student in Arms* = DH.)

This is the song of those among others who have gained the victory over the Beast, and gave their blood to have the right.

It has its call for us in a New Year of Victory.

Prof. Rendel Harris (*E.*, 7, 18) says, "Apocalypse knows of three 'new songs' which may turn out to be one new song to which threefold reference is made."

Phrase not new (see Ps. xxxiii. 3; xl. 3; xcvi. 1; xcviii. 1; cxliv. 9; cxlix. 1 and Isa. xlii. 10).

Songs of Moses and Lamb, not opposed songs, but notes of heavenly songster with two wings, Law and Love, Force and Sacrifice. The reference of the phrase "new song" is definitely Gospel and Catholic, as against the idea of a song that only Jews could sing. It becomes a missionary watchword: "a prophecy of the new order inaugurated by Servant of Jehovah" (SA, p. 80). "Far more than mere National Messiah" (M., p. 386). The connexion is worth studying in the contexts.

i. *We have a Song of Victory.* Moses sang half in Exodus xv., "defiance as well as delight" here (*E.*, 7, 18, p. 12). A song of conquered nations, but transfigured peoples: not only a new map, but a better earth. New Testament destroys terrors, but discovers territories too. Water and blood in its cleansing waves. A new power in it.

ii. *We have a Song of Fellowship.* The song is a chorus and

not a solo. Every nation must contribute a distinctive note. Every individual can supply God with some particular service. A new brotherhood in it.

iii. *We have a Song of Hope.* Some new things are rapidly out of date. New song eternal in freshness. Its singers, while admitting the old is good, are for ever making provision of new wine-skins to receive each year's new vintage. A new joy in it.

iv. *We have a Song of Love.* John was told to look for the prevailing Lion, and beheld a Lamb that had been slain (Rev. v. 5, 6). There is gentleness in the triumph, else strength were mere brutality. Even in the world's pain we trace it. "Pain and suffering are something more than sheer cruelty, rather the conditions which turn human animals into men, and men into saints and heroes fit for the Kingdom of God" (D.H., p. 180). A new tenderness in it.

"Let the song go round the earth—
Jesus Christ is Lord!
Sound His praises, tell His worth,
Be His name adored;
Every clime and every tongue
Join the grand, the glorious song!"

For the songs which are being sung in Heaven are meant to be learned on earth, and rehearsed in the body, before they are perfectly rendered in the spirit.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

A MODERNIST AND THE CREEDS.

CONSCIENCE, CREEDS AND CRITICS. By C. W. Emmet. London: *Macmillan and Co.* 3*s.* net.

We trust we shall not be misunderstood when we say that Mr. Emmet is of all modernists who write for the information of the public the one that is least likely to give offence to those who differ from him. We disagree with his contention that the main difficulties concerning the Virgin Birth and the physical Resurrection of our Lord arise not so much from *a priori* arguments against miracles as from the ambiguity of the evidence in the New Testament. That is his own position and he frankly says so, but it is by no means the general conviction of those who agree with him. We cannot improve on his presentation of the position as he finds it.

"The Church will have been permitted to believe in the Virgin Birth and the Empty Tomb till the essential doctrines of the Incarnation and the Resurrection were sufficiently established to stand without their support, through a better understanding of the broad arguments from history and experience which are their true basis. The modern doctrine of Revelation must allow frankly for the use of illusion. In other words we shall not make God directly and personally responsible for the external forms in which religious truths have clothed themselves."

This is a claim we cannot admit. Christianity is an historical religion. Its first teachers based their faith on the empty tomb. The Lord Himself said He would rise again and the whole course of human history has been changed by belief in the emptiness of the tomb. It is something more than a passing illusion we have to meet. We have to face the fact that the disciples were changed from men who despaired into the inheritors of a glorious hope and a certainty of faith. Take the Gospel of the Resurrection out of the New Testament and where are we and what Christian, until the modern view of miracle became prevalent, ever thought that our Lord did not leave His tomb empty? We are reminded of a distinguished Modernist who boldly contends that the miraculous element in the New Testament is simply the poetry of revelation! On that ground there never would have been built an apostolic Church.

May we add that this book contains the clearest and most balanced account known to us of the great trials for heresy in the last century? Mr. Ward Cornish gave an excellent summary in his *History of the Church in the Nineteenth Century*, and when we say that Mr. Emmet has improved on that brilliant writer, we accord him very high praise. The whole book deserves notice for its attempt to make satisfactory what to most readers is in essence a most unsatisfactory position.

A ROMANIST AND THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

A STUDY OF ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL. By G. H. Trench. London: *John Murray.* 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

This work by a Roman Catholic layman well deserves study. It is written from the orthodox standpoint of the Johannine authorship and takes no notice of Modernist views of its contents. Evidently Mr. Trench is a scholar who has meditated long on the work of the beloved disciple, and

Protestant readers will find themselves for the most part in agreement with his commentary, which is written in intelligible English by a man who knows what he believes and why he believes it. Naturally, when he deals with specific Roman doctrine, we profoundly differ from him and we are struck by certain naïve dogmatism that is not always as satisfactory to the reader as to the author. For example, in commenting on St. John xx. 23, he admits with Westcott that others were present besides the Apostles when our Lord instituted " the Sacrament of penance." He adds—

" If the Church of Rome, for disciplinary reasons, has seen fit to confine in practice this absolving power to a certain body of officials, well and good; it is but part of the discipline which binds together the members of that, the most vital of the Christian denominations. Or the philosophy of this phenomenon may be that a power at first inherent in the general organism has, by the inevitable law or formula of that organism's development, become specialised into a function of a definite part of that organism. Just so the power of infallibility in doctrine, at first known to be inherent somehow in the Church collectively, has by the law of development become specialised into a function of the visible head of the Church ! "

As is usual with Roman Catholic authors, Mr. Trench identifies Mary the sister of Lazarus with Mary of Magdala—the woman that was a sinner. He endeavours to show that her sin was only known to very few, but the narrative in St. Luke will not bear this out, and it has always seemed fatal to this contention to find the Pharisees comforting the bereaved Mary, whom they would have avoided if she were a " sinner " in the sense evident to all candid readers of the third Gospel. We do not always agree with the details of the skilfully compiled Diary of our Lord's ministry, but very few students can come to the same conclusions when the material for exact determination of dates is so scanty. Mr. Trench is a man who has entered into the thought of St. John, and his commentary cannot fail to aid devotion and to win the sympathy of those who study its pages.

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

THE EVOLUTION OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY. By J. R. Cohu. London: *John Murray* 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Mr Cohu writes this book for " The Modern Churchman's Library." One of its predecessors has been the subject of acute controversy and is by no means calculated to win Evangelical approval. This work on the contrary is a fair presentation of the development of the Christian Ministry and is based on a careful study of all the facts known to historians. The position of the Episcopate in the Church is the crux of all reunion discussions and we know of few works that put so accurately and popularly a sustained historical argument as Mr. Cohu has crowded into his pages. He is never obscure and he has the rare gift of making plain exactly what he thinks. His position is broadly that of Bishop Lightfoot and it may be well to place again on record the view, which Mr. Cohu does not quote, of his great friend Bishop Westcott.

" I cannot find any basis for the High Church theory in the New Testament. It is based, as far as I can see, on assumed knowledge of what the divine plan must be. I had occasion to look through the New Testament not long ago with special reference to this question, and I was greatly impressed by a fact which seems to have been overlooked. All the apostolic writers are possessed (as I think rightly in essence) by the thought of the Lord's return. They show no sign of any purpose to create a permanent ecclesiastical organisation. Whatever is done is to meet a present need as, e.g.,

the mission of Titus to Crete. The very condition laid down for the Apostolate excludes the idea of the perpetuation of their office. Is not this true? What followed when the Lord (as I think) did come is a wonderful revelation of the providence of God."

This little known extract from a letter to Mr. Llewelyn Davies proves that Dr. Westcott is in agreement with the main contention of Mr. Cohu, and we venture to add that all historical investigation since the letter was written confirms his view that the Apostles left no successors. Christianity is the least exclusive of all religions and yet Churches have made membership of and life in Christ depend on a form of organisation that has grown with the centuries and cannot be recognised as in any way consistent with New Testament teaching.

SPIRITUALISM EXAMINED.

SPIRITUALISM AND THE CHRISTIAN FAITH. By E. W. Barnes, F.R.S. *Longmans.* 2*s.* net.

We have long desired a work on Spiritualism that would at once be sane, well versed in its history and true to the highest religious claims. We have read most of the recent works on the subject, from Sir William Barrett to Sir Oliver Lodge, and are familiar with the Reports of the Psychical Research Society, but we did not know of any book that had without bias scientifically and tersely analysed the evidence and shown how weak it is. Most of those who attack spiritualism show a *parti pris* spirit. It is hard to avoid this, for the most outstanding quality of spiritualistic literature is its inability to distinguish the rhetorical and trivial from the grave and important. Dr. Barnes comes to the subject with a well trained mind. He does not attempt to prove a negative, but with frank desire to get at truth he has arrived at conclusions that to us seem incontrovertible. "The common business of spiritualism is permeated by deceit and fraud: many who have sought aid from it have been alternately exalted and depressed, excited, baffled and duped. It has given them not tranquillity of spirit and usefulness of life, but morbid excitements and experiments alike unhealthy and unsatisfying." Those of us who have come into personal touch with the victims of spiritualism know how true this is.

We wish specially to draw attention to the argument that because a man has made a great reputation in one branch of research that is no guarantee that he has the necessary qualifications for evaluating psychological evidence. This requires a special type of mind and training, and experience has proved that self experimentation on the part of men supposed to be balanced has frequently worked mental evil. There is much still to be discovered in the domain of morbid and even normal psychology, but we do not believe that along the line of séances we shall arrive at knowledge of permanent value. The one thing that must be excluded from scientific inquiry is strong personal bias, and that is the one qualification—apparently—for the reception of sympathetic messages from those who are supposed to communicate with friends beyond the veil.

DR. NAIRNE AND JOHANNINE AUTHORSHIP.

JOHANNINE WRITINGS. By A. Nairne D.D. London: *Longmans, Green & Co.* 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Dr. Nairne is more satisfactory as an expositor of the teaching of the Johannine writers than as an historical critic. It is extremely difficult to grasp his view of the personality of the author and we are glad to find in

the Preface a first-rate criticism of his argument. Dr. Murray of Selwyn College shows clearly that the choice lies between history and romance—and we may add between a first hand authority and a secondary workman who wrought over the tradition he had received until it assumed a new orientation. Naturally Dr. Nairne is much impressed by the story of the raising of Lazarus, which he tries to explain away. "Was the evidence considered ambiguous by the other evangelists: that Lazarus was certainly raised, yet not perhaps from death but from a trance? The difference might seem of little matter to St. John, bathed as he was in the consciousness of that life eternal which is here and now in Christ. The sleeper rose at the call of the Lord; why linger on the manner of the calling? Not the swathed corpse so awfully emerging from the sepulchre, but the Lord's 'I am the resurrection and the life' is the truth that admits no ambiguity." He adds, "But this is mere conjecture; a refuge for superficial familiarity with the science of the passing day." We do not think that it will add to the acceptance of the truth to find the facts romance, and the plain man will seek other grounds for his belief in a message from God than he finds in a Christianity that is explained away. For us it is much easier to accept the facts in their simplicity than to find refuge in a rationalism that is false to the Canon that of contradictories one must be false. The man that could pen as history what he knew to be false in reality, is by no means a safe guide when he gives us a Christology that satisfies those who believe in the Divinity of Him Who was Truth incarnate. We have dwelt so long upon this part of a suggestive book that we run the risk of belittling its value. Few will lay it down without discovering freshness of outlook and stimulating suggestiveness in its pages.

TWO MISSIONARY BOOKS.

THE RIDDLE OF NEARER ASIA. By Basil Matthews, M.A. London: *C.M.S.* Price 2*s.* net.

Here is an intensely interesting as well as an immensely important volume. Mr. Matthews, who has a picturesque style, gives us "the drama of the East, the wonder of its past, the uneasy slumber of its present, and the mystery of its future"—as he tells us he saw it in the Spring of 1914, just before the outbreak of War, and of how he realized then the importance of Mesopotamia, Palestine, Syria and Asia Minor. He tells the tale of the storied past and outlines the task which lies before the Christian Church in lands which are "strategically a pivot on which world issues swing." Emphatically a book to be read and re-read.

IN THE EAST AFRICA WAR ZONE. By I. H. Briggs, C.M.S. Missionary in German East Africa. London: *C.M.S.* Price 1*s.* 3*d.* net.

This illuminating little book appears at a time when German East Africa looms large on the horizon, and Mr. Briggs has given us a fascinating account not only of the country, and the people, but of the history of the missionary enterprise of the C.M.S. in a dark corner of the earth. Of course the account of the internment camp at Niboriani, in which the missionaries were imprisoned, will be read with the deepest and most sympathetic interest. Needless to say the general get-up of the work leaves nothing to be desired.

OF HUMAN INTEREST.

SISTER MATTY AND COMPANY; A MIXED LOT. By Robert Holmes. Edinburgh and London: *Blackwood and Sons.* Price 6*s.* net.

Mr. Holmes made quite a hit with "Walter Greenway, Spy and Hero," and now establishes his reputation by this collection of life-stories. He

reveals himself in these pages as a person possessed of infinite tact and unfailing patience together with no small amount of humour. Some of the stories bring before us men and women who can only be described as "incorrigibles." In some cases the characters described eventually made good. "Sister" Matty was one of these and this is in many ways the most remarkable story in the book. But from first to last it is alive with human interest and proves that "truth is stranger than fiction."

QUESTION AND ANSWER.

THE PRIEST AND HIS VESTMENTS; OR, THE VICAR'S DISCUSSION. By Wm. James Stewart. London: *C. J. Thynne.*

Since the second issue of this book appeared, in July, Sir Robert Anderson, K.C.B., who contributed a characteristically forceful Introduction, has passed away. Mr. Stewart's carefully collected facts are unanswerable, but the discussion strikes us as being rather wearisome, though no doubt there are many to whom a work of this kind appeals, and those who have the time and patience to wade through the conversations between the Vicar and his parishioners will find themselves armed with arguments for the case against the Vestments.

THE MINISTRY OF THE SPIRIT.

THE HOLY SPIRIT AND THE INDIVIDUAL. By Arthur W. Robinson, D.D., Canon of Canterbury. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 2*s.* net.

This is a companion volume to the author's little books—*God and the World* and *Christ and the Church*, and like everything from his pen it is characterized by a deep insight into spiritual things and an unswerving fidelity to the teaching of Holy Scripture. No subject can be of greater importance than that of the ministry of the Holy Spirit, and especially at the present time, when so much is being said about reconstruction and when we need a revival of Pentecostal Power.

THE WELSH CHURCH IN HISTORY.

THE CHURCH IN WALES IN THE LIGHT OF HISTORY: An Historical and Philosophical Study. By the Rev. J. Vyrnwy Morgan, D.D., with Foreword by the Bishop of St. Davids. London: *Chapman and Hall.* 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Dr. Vyrnwy Morgan has given us a deeply interesting as well as a thought-provoking study on the Church in Wales. The forces which have been at work in the Principality during the last hundred years are but little understood in England, yet it is of importance that the true inwardness of the nationalist movement should be rightly appreciated. The aim of this volume, which carries with it the warm commendation of the Bishop of St. Davids, even though he is not prepared to endorse the author's views on all points, "is to bring out the parts of correspondence and links of connection between the activities of the Church and the Renaissance movement in Wales"; and the writer adduces facts which certainly go to refute the erroneous notion that the Church has hindered rather than helped the movement. In the true spirit of the historian, Dr. Morgan writes with perfect fairness, honesty, and calmness; indeed, he leaves it to the reader to form his con-

clusion upon the facts presented. Starting from an instructive survey of the Church, past and present, he proceeds to give a general account of the Renaissance in Wales. Then he unfolds the place and significance of the Church in the Educational Renaissance—both elementary and higher—and in the Literary Renaissance—poetic and prose. The chapter on the pulpit life of Wales is of strong and abiding interest. Dr. Morgan passes in review the work and influence of great preachers, among the more modern examples being John Griffith of Merthyr, Daniel Evans of Carnarvon, Dean Edwards of Bangor, Archdeacon Griffiths of Neath, and Dean Howell. Concerning the last-named the author says that Dean Howell was a broad-minded and cultivated Welshman :

He knew his own mind and he never belied his Churchmanship for the sake of popularity. He was loyal to the Church and to his own convictions.

But he had the deepest repugnance for anything in the form of sectarian animosity, and he was always able to act in cordiality with those who represented Nonconformist opinion. Indeed, one might imagine that he was in some respects more in sympathy with Nonconformist sentiment than with the sentiment which commonly prevailed in his own community. He certainly recognized all that the Nonconformist bodies had done and were doing for the education no less than for the religious life of Wales. He felt the force of the Renaissance movement in the Principality and contributed to its growth. He also sought to keep the Church in its corporate capacity in touch with it. He was a nationalist, not in a political, but in a social and ethical sense.

Dean Howell had been bred in Evangelical associations, and he had no sympathy with the priestly conception of the ministry; he was strongly averse to Ritualism and Sacerdotalism. The disruptionists, he said, were those who were forcing certain practices and ceremonials upon the parishioners against their wishes.

He never concealed his own opinion that the sacerdotalists in the Church were accentuating divisions, and he did not hold the view that the episcopal channel alone possessed the power of transmitting grace. He longed for unity, but unity, he thought, could never come by trying to bring the souls of men into the bondage of Priestism and Sacerdotalism. He did not believe in compulsory confession, nor in the requirement of absolution before a penitent can be admitted to the Communion. He strenuously adhered to the Reformed and Protestant character of the Church, and his motto was, Christliness rather than churchiness. Press articles and platform orations about unity were worse than useless, he thought, so long as ecclesiastical regulations tend to create barriers to unity, and to divide Christian people.

It was the simplicity and sincerity of his religion, both in its outer and inner aspect, that gave him, as a preacher and a man, so deep and so wide an influence on his parishioners, and on all with whom he was brought in contact. He was an eloquent man, but his strength was in his own fascinating personality. No one could hear him preach, or associate with him, without feeling the force of his character, and without feeling that he lived in a higher world. Yet he was greatly interested in the affairs of life, and in all movements that had for their object the elevation of his race and the advancement of Wales.

With such preachers we are not surprised that Dr. Morgan holds that "its pulpit history is one of the imperishable treasures of the Church." There is a chapter on the Church and Industrial Unrest, and in the concluding chapter, "The Adjustment of the Church to the Future Life of Wales," the writer shows us that he is a man of broad outlook and hopeful vision. No one who desires to become acquainted with the real position in Wales can afford to neglect this informing and stimulating volume.