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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

December, 1919.

THE MONTH.

The Enabling Bill.

QUITE the most important speech in the Second Reading debate in the House of Commons on the Enabling Bill was that made by Sir William Joynson-Hicks who, alone of all the speakers, seemed to get to the heart of the question. We all know by this time the leading points in the case for the Bill, and we know also that its friends urge as one of their strongest appeals in its support that it has received the assent of all parties in the Church. Mr. Bonar Law himself said in the House that he hesitated as to giving time for the discussion of the Bill until he had assured himself that the Church as a whole desired the change. "He satisfied himself that they did—all sections." While not in the least desiring to controvert that statement, it is yet permissible to say that it needs to be explained and qualified. If the vote given at the special session of the Representative Church Council is to be taken as expressing the mind of the Church, then undoubtedly all sections have accepted the measure, for the scheme was carried with only one dissentient; but the claim to unanimity needs to be qualified to this extent, that whilst there are large numbers in all sections of the Church, who welcome a measure which it is believed will enable the Church to do its work more efficiently, there are also large numbers in all sections who view the proposed changes, whether they be merely administrative or deeply fundamental, with no small measure of anxiety. Whether they are right, or whether the out-and-out supporters of the Bill are right, remains to be seen: it is impossible to say until the new system gets to work. The time for further discussion seems to have passed, for if the figures stand for anything it seems practically certain that the Bill will be passed into law this session. The majority for the Second Reading was enormous: in a House of

320, only 16 voted against the Bill. Whether the majority would have been quite so large if the House had had before it the Bill as originally drafted we take leave to doubt. It came down from the House of Lords where it had been severely criticised and amended, and it was the Bill, so amended, that the House of Commons all but unanimously accepted. The measure has been referred to a Committee—incidentally we regret that it is not to be considered in Committee of the whole House—and some further amendments will doubtless be introduced. But we do not anticipate that any vital changes will be made, and it is probable that ultimately the Bill will be passed very much in its present form. But that some further amendments and safeguards are needed we have no doubt.

Sir W. Joynson Hicks' View.

The position was admirably defined by Sir W. Joynson-Hicks, who stated quite frankly that very few Bills had given him more anxiety, and that his vote for the Bill would be recorded with grave misgivings. He admitted that he had been greatly impressed by the Bishop of Chelmsford's letter in the *Times* of that morning supporting the Bill, and we imagine that the strong backing the measure has received from Dr. Watts-Ditchfield, who is President of the Church of England Self-Government Association, did much to convince other Members of Parliament both of the need for and the practical character of the Bill. But it is only right that certain contingencies should be fairly faced, and Sir W. Joynson-Hicks indicated a few possible dangers ahead. These were connected with such questions as Prayer-Book Revision, the Act of Uniformity, Disestablishment, the appointment of Bishops and the Final Court of Appeal.

Speaking on behalf of a very large number of Evangelical Protestant Churchmen, he said that they were not prepared to have great alterations made in the Book of Common Prayer. Under the Bill not only external questions could be dealt with, but subsection 6 of Clause 3 was as wide as the hemisphere. It stated :—" A measure passed in accordance with this Act may relate to any matter concerning the Church of England." Even the Act of Uniformity might be repealed, and the doctrines of the Church put in the melting pot. He hoped his hon. friends opposite would consent in Committee to amendments to deal with mundane affairs only, and to prevent the Bill from dealing with such other matters as he had outlined. He held that there could be no national Church without establishment, and he feared that the Bill must inevitably lead to the disestablishment of the Church. It would make the Church a sectional body. To-day, as Evangelical Churchmen, they gloried in the fact that Wesleyans and other Nonconformists could attend

their own Church in the morning and might attend the Church of England in the evening, that they might be married in the Anglican Church and be buried under the rites of that Church. That was the very essence of a national Church. The Cheltenham Evangelical Conference had passed three resolutions. If the provisions of these were embodied in the Bill he should feel much greater confidence. First, the appointment by the Crown to the Archbishopric and other ecclesiastical positions. He was proud to say that, with a Nonconformist Radical Prime Minister, the Church of England had never had a better succession of Bishops than those which had been appointed during the last two years. If the Church Council were to appoint the Bishops there would be anger and wrangling, wire-pulling, and log-rolling. The second resolution was that the Constitution of the final Court of Appeal in ecclesiastical causes should not be touched under the provisions of the Bill, and, thirdly, that baptismal franchise for the electorate should be maintained. He wanted to see the Church widened, not narrowed. He believed that there rested upon the Church an enormous responsibility for the future years; let them do nothing that would interfere with her spiritual power and force.

Undoubtedly this weighty and important speech reflects what is in the minds of a large number of Evangelical and Protestant churchpeople. They have no desire to be obstructive: they long to see the Church become a greater force in our national life, and so far as this Bill will conduce to that end they wish it well; but they know from a long experience that it is necessary to take every possible precaution to safeguard the constitutional position of the Church of England in its Reformed and Protestant character, and they are justified, therefore, in their desire that the limitations of the present measure should be clearly defined.

The Church Assembly.

It may be doubted whether, among the ordinary rank and file of Church-going congregations, there are many who have any adequate idea of how near we are to the setting up of a National Church Assembly. It has been widely assumed, even by those who take a deep interest in the question, that if the Enabling Bill does not pass the whole scheme agreed upon by the Representative Church Council falls to the ground. But this is not so. The position is put with admirable clearness by the Archbishop of York in his *Diocesan Gazette* of November 15, and we quote his words:—

The Enabling Bill does not create the Assembly; it only asks Parliament to confer certain powers upon it of initiating legislation in matters which require Parliamentary sanction. It is for the Church itself to decide what it desires its representative Assembly to be. It is for Parliament to decide whether it is willing to confer certain powers upon this Assembly. The Enabling Bill therefore presupposes the existence of the Assembly; and if, as we hope, it becomes law it would be inoperative unless and until

the Assembly is constituted. Put shortly, the Assembly does not depend upon the Enabling Bill, but the Enabling Bill depends upon the Assembly. That is why it is so important that as soon as possible the Assembly should come into being. But if unfortunately the Enabling Bill should not become law, the Assembly must still be formed. Although in that event it would be without the measure of statutory authority and the statutory powers which we wish it to have, it would still be the representative Body of the Church with functions of the greatest importance in the Church's corporate life.

The importance of the Archbishop's statement will not be overlooked: it shows how important it is that every preparation should be made without the least delay for seeing that the elections result in the return of loyal and faithful members of the Church. Much will depend upon the effectiveness of our organization, and the wise advice of an experienced correspondent of the *Record* should be acted upon at once. "There can be," he said, "only one opinion as to the duty of Evangelical Churchmen to prepare themselves for the grave position that is gradually shaping itself; and I fear that most of our friends are waiting for a lead. May I urge all of the Evangelical clergy and laity to put themselves into touch with the National Church League on this point, lest by inaction or delayed action they seriously prejudice the good cause?" The offices of the National Church League are at 6, Grosvenor Mansions, 82, Victoria Street, Westminster, S.W.1, and the Secretary, we doubt not, will be glad to render any assistance within the power of the League to clergy and others who may be desirous of knowing how best to act in the present circumstances.

The Reunion Problem.

We are exceedingly glad to find that a strong protest has been made against the postponement of the decision in regard to the Interchange of Pulpits until the Lambeth Conference has reported upon the general question of the relation of the Church to Nonconformity. Unfortunately the protest has not been successful, but it was good that it should be made, and this, too, by a Bishop of the independence of the Bishop of Norwich. Nor did he stand alone. In the letter he addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury he said he wrote also on behalf of the Bishops of Durham, St. Albans, Manchester, Carlisle, Ripon, Sodor and Man, Bristol, Hereford and Worcester. The purpose of the letter was to let the Archbishop know that they have been not a little distressed by the correspondence between the Archbishop and the Bishop of Gloucester.

THE GREAT PRAYER.

SHORT CHAPTERS ON JOHN XVII.

By the BISHOP OF DURHAM.

VII.

WE approach the Great Prayer for a final meditation. I will not waste space upon remarks over the inevitable meagreness of my commentary all along; over the omission of one topic and another full of the mind and love of the Intercessor; over the halting exposition of the topics handled. May He whose words I have presumed to attempt to unfold forgive His servant's best. May his brethren bear with him this once more, as we meet, listening, beside the Apostles. May the disciple's essay to speak about the utterances of the Lord Jesus be forbidden, in mercy, to muffle His own voice.

We closed our last study with the reflection that "the grand prerequisite to a regenerated world is a regenerated Church." The occasion for that remark, in the Great Prayer, was the Lord's repeated intimation that through His disciples, through His life and light in them, as individual souls and as a harmonious company, not through means more abstract, but through Him seen in them, the world should come to "believe that the Father had sent Him." Such, for this present æon or dispensation of His plans, was His purpose. He had the world heavy upon His heart, surely, throughout His intercession. It is true, as we saw in its place, that "He did not pray for the world," immediately, that hour. He prayed for His own. But that was not because the world, the vast complex of fallen humanity around them, was nothing to Him. He was Son of Him who "so loved the world that He gave," to birth and death, that very Son, His Eternal, His Only-begotten, His Beloved, on purpose that salvation might be open to any and every child of the world, believing. The treasures of grace He asked for His own were asked indeed *for them*, for their own life, and holiness, and deathless joy. But they were never asked as for them alone. The believer, the disciple, the saint, was to be saved, blest, kept, for purposes transcending his own happy being.

Just as the Prayer rises to its transcendent close the world comes up in the accents of the intercession: "that the world may believe that Thou didst send Me"; "that the world may know that Thou didst send Me." So did He forecast, so did He purpose. A conviction was somehow to come over common human thought, conscience, and will, in a measure vast and general, that the Jesus of Bethlehem and of Golgotha was indeed the Sent One of the Eternal Being, of the sovereign Holiness and Love. He should somehow be known to be the absolute manifestation of God, and the one and perfect Way given to man into the peace of pardon and inward rightness, and everlasting union with his Author.

This wonderful result, this spiritual miracle done upon that immense, intractable material, "the world," was full in the Lord's mind as He approached the climax of His intercession. And now we note that He connected the amazing prospect not with some supreme Theophany, some display of divine energies wholly new in kind, but with such a development of Himself in His mortal disciples as should weld them together into a unity profoundly spiritual in its essence, openly practical in its results. That unity was to be conditioned by secrets far deeper than any ecclesiastical amalgamation, for it was to be akin to the union of the Father and the Son. But it was to issue into results so tangible, so visible, so practical, that the common heart of fallen humanity should see that it was magnificently good, and should think, and hunger, and turn.

Once more let me emphasize the note that the phenomenon which should thus evangelize the world was, in the Lord's mind, not ecclesiastical so much as spiritual. It was to be *rather Christianity than Christendom.* That phrase I borrow from a noble and characteristic sermon by C. J. Vaughan, in his volume, *Restful Thoughts for Restless Times*—a sermon on John xvii. 21. Vaughan dwells on the sad fact that Christendom, if we take it to mean the sum of organized Christian communities, is at present certainly far from a convincing argument in favour of the supreme Mission of the Son. At this time rather specially we are constantly met by the cry that "men in the street" see little to win them in "the Churches," with their divisions, and with their scanty spiritual force. But the same cry often goes on to say, with more or less distinctness, that they do see things in the Christ which

arrest and attract. That feeling may be vague enough, and the knowledge that lies in it may be very thin, but it means something. And we may be sure that the human life which is filled and ruled by that Christ, the life of the out-and-out believer in the Crucified and Living One, alive with His love and joy, uplifted by His example, glad to serve, ready to suffer, the embodied illustration of His law and will, is as arresting and attracting to-day as it ever was. The "modern man" will see in it, if God stirs him to any thought over it, a token of the reality and the beauty of its Archetype, and it will prove a magnet to draw him to touch that Archetype for himself. Let such lives be vastly multiplied, and mighty will the magnet be. The more each is like to the Lord, the surer will they all be to coalesce in spiritual nearness, to melt into spiritual unity. And a collective spiritual Christianity will overcome where a too mechanical Christendom has failed. And so the world, on a new scale, will begin to believe, will begin to know. It will recognize that the unique Christ is God manifest. It will discern, in His living representatives, how beautiful is the Christ-filled life; it will understand as never otherwise how dear to a perfect God is that life, and that community of lives; it will believe "that the Father loveth them as He loveth the Son," and it will hunger and thirst to taste their secret.

Such a hope is indeed a thing to kindle the spiritual ambition of every sincere disciple. It is far different from the ideals which seem in our day, too easily, to move with a vague optimism a host of minds which still cling to the dream of *a natural* advance of mankind from bad to good, from good to better. The great War, no doubt, for many thoughtful men, Christian or not, has put a tremendous check upon such expectations. But it has not annulled them, even within the Church. To me, I must confess, many things are said to-day about "the Kingdom of God," its nature, its scope, the means to bring it in with power, which have a strangely naturalistic ring. They leave out of all account, too often, that mystery, "original sin, the corruption of man's heart," which is sternly emphasized in those precise terms in a powerful little poem (*Gold Hair*) not by a Puritan dogmatist but by Robert Browning. It has little to say, too often, about the King of the Kingdom, in His glory of humiliation and exaltation, the glory of the cradle, the cross, and the throne. One would sometimes think that its hope was little higher than a vast and "glorified" social reform, issuing into universal comfort,

culture, and goodwill, in a life whose experiences should have little to do with an eternal glory in prospect, "the better Country, that is the heavenly," the House, the Temple, where "they cannot die any more, but are equal to the angels." Far other is the hope that looks for such an action of the Lord upon the world as shall mean a new and glorious manifestation of His grace in a vastly multiplied host of lives transformed by His Word and Spirit, spent "soberly, righteously, godly, in this present age, looking for that blissful hope."

A question may easily arise here—I know that it does arise over such prospects—does all this mean a genuine universal conversion, before the second Coming of the Son of Man? I dare not here dwell on that problem. All I can say thus in passing, is that on the one hand the forecasts of the Lord and the Apostles seem gravely to negative such a prospect, baldly stated. "When He cometh, shall He find faith on the earth?" But on the other hand here is this great Lord's Prayer, and it certainly contemplates *some* vast results on the world, through a spiritual coalescence of His disciples, and it stands apart from any explicit reference to His second Coming. For myself I am willing to leave the riddle, in peace, with Him, while humbly believing that that Coming may not be remote in the future now. May not a great, an almost sudden, revival and development of Christianity in Christians come upon us, perhaps when seemingly least likely? And then may there not follow a vast attention of the world, not without mighty conflicts of light with darkness? And then may not the Coming supervene, to crown and glorify the work done through the disciples, with the manifested grace and omnipotent energy of the Master?

However this shall prove to be, in that plan of "times and seasons, which the Father hath put in His own power," the hour of glory will strike at last. The Intercessor lifts His prayer towards it as He prepares to close this holiest utterance, and to go forthwith to the "amazement," the "bewilderment," of Gethsemane, the sweat of blood, the supreme surrender for us of His pure "natural" desire not to endure the fathomless pain. "Father, I will that they whom Thou hast given Me be with Me where I am, that they may behold My glory which Thou gavest Me; for Thou lovedst Me before the foundation of the world." The wonderful phrase rises almost above prayer: "Father, I will." An eternal certainty, sure as the throne

and as the King upon it, speaks through that word. No long presumptuous comment shall be ventured, as we close our meditations with it. We will only, in spirit, kneel, and listen, and worship. It is the voice of a "love that passeth knowledge," for it asks, concerning mortals of the dust, that their Lord may have their company for ever. They are such to Him that to save them is not enough; He must have them, and have them close to Him, and have them so eternally. And here speaks a voice whose surpassing truth and beauty is vitally conditioned by this, that it is the utterance of Incarnate GOD. Only HE, Man with men on earth, can also foretell that the Heaven of heaven for men will be to see HIMSELF, "as He is."

Away with dreams of Heaven which leave out "the Lamb who is the light thereof." Thanks be to God who gives to the transfigured sinner this Heaven in prospect, this open vision, fathomless in its light, and life and love; "for ever with the Lord."

HANDLEY DUNELM.

(*Concluded.*)

Note to No. VI: p. 583, *lines 7 and 8 from foot.*
Instead of "(as in the case of the second and third Gospels certainly)," read "(the second and third Gospels certainly had not)."

STUDIES IN TEXTS.

Suggestions for Sermons from Current Literature.

BY THE REV. HARRINGTON C. LEES, M.A.

XII. CHRISTMAS AND CHRISTIAN EVIDENCE.

Text.—"That holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God"—(St. Luke i. 35).

"I believe in Jesus Christ, conceived of the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary"—(Apostles' Creed).

[Book of the Month: THE VIRGIN BIRTH OF OUR LORD,[1] by Rev. L. Prestige = P. Other reff., *Virgin Birth*, by Canon Knowling = K. *The Ascent through Christ*, by Dr. Griffith-Jones = J.]

"At every baptism, since about the year 150 at least, the Christian neophyte has made profession of his faith that Christ was born of a virgin" (P. page v).

[1] Published by Robert Scott. 3*s.* 6*d.* net. Excellent, modern. Not blind belief but true faith. This Study is scarcely suitable for Christmas Day, but it might well come on the Sunday after.

I. THE BIOLOGICAL SIDE OF THE STORY. It is part of the essence of every Christian creed. The supernatural life and resurrection are in harmony with a supernatural birth. It is not against what biology knows of the deep physiological mysteries of nature. "Professor G. J. Romanes, at a period in his life when he would probably have classed himself among reverent Agnostics, wrote: 'Even if a virgin has ever conceived and borne a son, and even if such a fact in the human species has been unique, still it would not betoken any breach of physiological continuity'" (J. 262). He afterwards became a Christian. But Huxley said similar things. Parthenogenesis need not be a difficulty to the intellect of scientific reasoners.

II. THE MYTHOLOGICAL SIDE. The Jews were the last people among whom such a story could have arisen, unless it had been true. "'Such a fable as the birth of the Messiah from a *virgin* could have arisen anywhere else easier than among the Jews,' wrote the great historian Neander, himself a Jewish convert" (K. 37). The mythological stories usually told of so-called virgin births are not in this class of thought at all. Frequently grotesque, and often impure. "The first and third gospels, each with its Birth narrative as an integral part of it, have the right to be treated as historical documents of high value for the reconstruction of the events with which they deal; their right is such that if they related to ordinary events of secular history it would not be questioned, far less seriously challenged; and the witness of each to the crucial fact is perfectly straightforward, single-minded, and thoroughgoing" (P. 49).

III. THE HISTORICAL SIDE. (*a*) *St. Luke.* "It may indeed be said, without the slightest fear of contradiction, that the author of the third gospel, universally assumed to be St. Luke, assented without qualification to the belief that Christ was born of a virgin" (P. 6). "Saint Luke has now been ascertained, at all points where he has been found capable of being tested, to be a careful and an accurate observer" (P. 10). We must allow some weight to "the character of the evangelist's mind, trained, as Greek medical men were trained, scientifically. Whatever else Saint Luke was, he was not credulous" (P. 15). Sir W. Ramsay says: "The present writer takes the view that Luke's history is unsurpassed in respect to its trustworthiness" (P. 13).

(*b*) *St. Matthew.* St. Matthew tells a frank story, which can only mean that he believed in the virgin birth. Moreover, there are

other implications. " In the latter portion of this double narrative (chapter ii.) Saint Joseph is nowhere referred to as the father of Jesus; but five times the expression occurs 'the Child and His mother,' when we should naturally expect the writer to say 'thy (his) Child' or 'the Child and His parents.' The inference to be drawn from the continual use of this unusual phrase is that the writer did not regard Saint Joseph as the father of the Child" (P. 26). And the following considerations also have their place. " That the infant Jesus was the legitimate Heir was proved for Matthew by the miracles which were performed on His behalf and by the prophecies which were at once fulfilled by the circumstances of His childhood" (P. 63).

(*c*) *St. Mark.* Omits the story: but then " Saint Mark's Gospel does not purport to be a life of Christ, and his interest is not, like that of Saint Luke, centred in the purely historical figure of our Lord as such" (P. 66). " There is no room in the book for anything so irrelevant to the main purpose of his scheme as a description of Christ's childhood or an exposition of the nature of His birth" (P. 67). Yet observe this does not mean ignorance of the story. " Saint Mark is the only one of the four evangelists who does not mention Saint Joseph. He does not even indirectly refer to him. Christ's mother and His 'brethren' have their place, but His 'father' might never have existed" (P. 67). " The other two evangelists, each in different terms, represent the Jews as calling Christ the son of Joseph. But in place of their expressions, 'Is not this the carpenter's son?' or 'Is not this the son of Joseph?' Saint Mark writes simply, 'Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary?'" (P. 67).

(*d*) *St. John.* Does not directly mention the mode of the Incarnation. But there was no need: for " the essence of the testimony of this evangelist is that it professes to be a record of what he himself had seen and heard. 'He that hath seen hath borne witness' is the keynote of the book. But the Birth of Christ obviously took place at a time anterior to the recollection of the disciple whom He loved; and that in itself is enough to bar it out of the record" (P. 68, 69). In St. John i. 9–14 and similar passages he is " employing a speaking silence, and his statement of the Incarnation, which after all goes hardly any further than the statement of it to be gathered from different passages in the writings of

Saint Paul, is meant not to supersede but to explain the Virgin Birth" (P. 70).

(*e*) *St. Paul.* Tells no Incarnation story. But this is hardly wonderful. In Galatians iv. 4, for instance, there is a possible reference. Zahn asks "Why does Paul here only mention the mother?" "Plainly because in the thought of Paul there was no room for Joseph as the father of Jesus beside His heavenly Father" (K. 65). "When, therefore, we find no explicit reference to the Virgin Birth we are neither more nor less astonished than we are at the discovery that the Galilean ministry is not mentioned, and that such names as Nazareth, Bethlehem, Capernaum, and Bethsaida do not occur in any of St. Paul's epistles. It cannot justly be said in either case that silence is a proof of ignorance" (P. 65).

IV. THE CRITICAL SIDE. So much for the documents. But are St. Matthew and St. Luke, for instance, dependable? "Neither of them has received from the results of historical research anything but confirmation" (P. 61). The fact that they tell different but not contradictory stories is in itself valuable evidence. "Their independence is of great importance and their divergence is not" (P. 61).

V. THE PRIVATE SIDE. Who told the stories? "St. Luke regarded them as proceeding from St. Mary," says Harnack (P. 7). And his testimony is the more striking in that he does not himself believe the story. "As every commentator observes, and justly, the story is told throughout from her point of view. It belongs entirely to her; her revelation, her feelings, her kinsfolk, her humble and triumphant wonder, fill the page" (P. 14).

Then what of St. Matthew's account? Mr. Prestige desires to "suggest that these chapters represent the story imparted after their conversion to the 'brethren' of the Lord by the Blessed Virgin" (P. 30). This would be the complement to the stories "in Saint Luke's gospel. Those dwell upon her own experiences, her motherly love and wonder and admiration for her Child, and are precisely what she might have confided to her women friends; to the children of Saint Joseph she would more naturally have spoken of what concerned the man, the husband, and their own father" (P. 31).

ATONEMENT BY BLOOD.[1]

By the Rev. W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D.

SOME years ago I had an opportunity of going to see Dore's great picture, "Christ leaving the Prætorium." We were given a card on our entrance and were told where to stand, so that we might look at the picture from the standpoint of the artist.

There is a perspective in art, so that people who look at pictures may be able as far as possible to appreciate them from the point of view of the man who painted them; there is also a perspective in literature, whereby a person who reads a book is enabled to see something of the author's purpose, and through such perspective to understand his meaning of it. There is also a perspective in the Bible, and I want to suggest that perhaps the most important standpoint from which to view the Bible is that of sacrifice. It would seem as though sacrifice gives us the proper perspective from which to view the whole content of Scripture from Genesis to The Revelation.

My subject is concerned with this great reality of sacrifice.

I.

I. The Need of the Atonement.

First of all, I wish to say a word or two about the *need* of sacrifice and the need of Atonement. In order to realize the need of sacrifice, we must think very definitely about the fact of sin. Sin implies, as we know, the consciousness of God's law; then the consciousness of our obligation to that law; and then the consciousness that that law has been broken. And the result that I desire to emphasize for a moment is, that we are conscious of what has been brought before us—guilt, which is one of those fundamental elements of human life that cannot in any way be explained, still less gotten rid of.

We have a great deal of discussion to-day in regard to what is called evolution, the development of the human being and the human race, but there is one fact that militates against many of these theories, that of guilt, which is humanly irremediable and humanly irreversible. Guilt is one of the fundamental realities

[1] An address given at a Conference on Fundamentals held in Philadelphia.

which testify to the fact and awfulness of sin. And what is the result of sin? You have already heard it. "The soul that sinneth it shall die." "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."

Death in the Bible is threefold; and it is always separation —never annihilation. There is physical death—the separation of the soul from the body. There is spiritual death—the separation of the soul from God. There is everlasting death—in the full meaning of the term—the separation of the soul and body, hereafter, from God.

When we go into detail we notice there are three main results of sin. There is the *penalty* of sin, with its consciousness of a *burden*; there is the *power* of sin, with its consciousness of *bondage*; and there is the *presence* of sin, with its consciousness of a *barrier*. It is essential that these should be taken away. The *burden* must be removed by *forgiveness*, the *bondage* must be removed by *freedom*, and the *barrier* must be removed by *fellowship*.

This is the Bible view of sin, and it needs to be emphasized, because superficial ideas of sin carry with them superficial ideas of sacrifice. It is a long time ago now since a well-known scholar, Robertson Smith, said that the fundamental idea of sacrifice is communion, the eating with the Deity; and this view captivated the minds of many different scholars, with the result that there has been an almost universal teaching of this thought.

But all the while the Bible said something different and deeper. It emphasizes not communion, but *expiation*, as the fundamental idea of sacrifice, and this is supported by the most recent researches. The Bible has always had something to say for itself in regard to sacrifice, and all through the ages it has been right on this point, as it has been right on every other.

What, then, is sin? It is a *debt* that needs to be paid; it is a *degradation* that needs to be removed; it is a *defilement* that needs to be cleansed; it is a *darkness* that needs to be lighted; it is a *disease* that needs to be healed; it is a *death* that needs to be *abolished*.

II. The Means of the Atonement.

Now, second, we come to the *means* of sacrifice. Sacrifice is necessary, for we are told in Hebrews ix. 22, "without shedding of blood is no remission." What is the source of sacrifice? Where

did sacrifice originate? The Bible does not tell us. The first account we have of sacrifice is, as you know, in the story of Cain and Abel. Some people say that Cain as an agriculturist naturally brought the best he had, and that Abel naturally brought the best he had. Have you ever considered this point? Why should God have been pleased with the death of a lamb? What was in the divine nature which would have made the killing of a lamb a pleasure or a satisfaction? What was in that lamb slain that could possibly give pleasure to God?

When we turn to Hebrews xi. 4, we find it says, "By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts." Now faith is always the response of man to a divine revelation. When therefore it says, "By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain," it was in response to something God had said about sacrifice; and although we are not told this in so many words, there can be no doubt that sacrifice originated with God. He was not pleased with the slaying of a lamb as such, but He used that for His own purpose, as a type and symbol of the great sacrifice to come. I maintain, therefore, that the words in Hebrews, and the thought of the beasts slain for the coats of skins, in Genesis iii., both testify to the fact that sacrifice originated with God.

What are we to say about the nature of sacrifice? In Leviticus xvii. 11 there is a verse which is the keynote of the whole Bible on this subject. "For the life of the flesh is in the blood and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul." You will find in this the character of sacrifice: "The life of the flesh is in the blood." There was no virtue in the blood as such: it was the symbol of the life given over to death.

Then we notice the origin of sacrifice. Sacrifice is God's gift and the outcome of His love. We read, "I have given it," not "You gave it to me," but "I have given it to you." We have here and elsewhere the blood offered, and then the blood sprinkled. The first is the fact, the other is the factor. The one is the objective reality, the other the subjective reception. The blood must first be offered and then sprinkled. The one is the gift and the other the application.

We are told definitely in Hebrews x. 4, that "it is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins." The death of the Lord Jesus Christ was a sacrifice. He surrendered His life unto death; in that lay the efficacy of His sacrifice for the sins of the whole world. Notice that the *blood* of Christ means much more than His *death*. It means both His death and His life. As we look at the New Testament we find that blood is associated with Christ's death, resurrection and ascension. In Matthew xxvi. 28, we read of the death: "For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." It is also associated with His resurrection. In Hebrew xiii. 20 we find: "Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant." It is also associated with His ascension. In Hebrews ix. 11, 12, it is said, "But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood, he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." And thus we have the means whereby our sins can be removed.

III. The Power of the Atonement.

That brings me to my third point—the *power* of the atonement. What does it do? First, it removes that *burden* which I have mentioned and reinstates us in our position with God. In Ephesians i. 7 and Colossians i. 14 we are told that in Christ "we have *redemption* through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." In Romans iii. 25 that we have *propitiation* through His blood. In Romans v. 9 that we have *justification* through His blood. Redemption removes the burden. Justification reinstates us in our position. We in England have what is called there the "royal clemency." A man may go to prison and be pardoned by the act of the king, who has the authority and power to exercise clemency; so that the man who is permitted to do so may go out at once from prison. But as we see him go down the road we know he was a prisoner. He broke the law of the land but has been pardoned. What the king cannot do is to reinstate the man as though he had never sinned. But what the King of England cannot do the King of kings can do.

God looks upon us not only as pardoned but as justified. Redemption brings man to God, but justification brings God to man; and in order that you and I may be saved, it is not only necessary to be brought to God—mercy could do that—but it is necessary for God to be brought to us; and only righteousness could do that.

In the second place, the blood of Jesus removes the *bondage* to which I have referred. We are often told of this slavery. In Acts xx. 28 we find: "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." Peter i. 19 speaks of the "precious blood of Christ." In Revelation v. 9 we read of redemption by His blood. After the slavery comes consecration. Hebrews xiii. 12 tells of sanctifying the people with His own blood—consecrated by his Blood. In Revelation xii. 11: "And they overcame him by the blood of the Lamb." And so we have removal from bondage, and renewal of our spiritual condition.

In the third place, the blood removes the *barrier* to which I have referred, and restores us to communion. We are told in Colossians i. 20: "And, having made peace through the blood of his cross." We have in Hebrews ix. 12: "but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place"; and in Revelation i. 5: "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood." Revelation vii. 14: "These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb"—all suggesting the idea of peace, and with the peace comes fellowship. Hebrews x. 19: "Having . . . boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus." Ephesians ii. 13: "Ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ."

And so the *burden* is removed by *forgiveness*; the *bondage* is removed by *freedom*, and the *barrier* is removed by *fellowship*. The first is the means of our *position* before God; the second is the means of our *condition*, and the third is the means of our *communion*. And that is only another way of saying that in Him we have life, for as sin brings death, so Christ brings life.

Just as there is a threefold death, so there is a threefold life. As death means separation and not annihilation, so life always means union and never mere existence. There is physical life—the union

of the soul and body; there is spiritual life—the union of the soul with God (John xvii. 3), "and this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent"; and there is everlasting life—in the full sense—the union of soul and body with God for ever.

II.

What are we to say to these things? There are three things to which I want to call your attention by way of application.

(1) The first thing is that we are to *recognize* the fact and reality of the atonement. I have been saying much about the blood of Jesus Christ. The New Testament is clear on this point, because there is associated with it the thought of atonement. There are those who tell us we are not to think of this as part of our faith. I have with me a quotation from a book. I am sorry to mention it, because I might by so doing advertise it, and that is about the last thing I should like to do; but because this is a Conference on Fundamentals I must do so. It is called "A Guide to the Study of the Christian Religion," and it comes from the University of Chicago. This is the quotation in regard to the point of my address: "To insist dogmatically as an *a priori* principle that 'without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins,' is both futile and foolish in an age which has long ago abandoned the conception of bloody sacrifice and which is loudly demanding the abolition of capital punishment." That comes from a recent book, and I want to say this: If that statement is right, the New Testament is wrong; and if the New Testament is right, that book is not "a guide to the Christian religion."

I read with interest a paragraph from the "Moslem World" the other day. It was this: "Is it not high time for some American theological writers and teachers to break with Germany, where the art of emptying the Gospel of its real content has been practised for half a century? There are yet too many pro-Germans among theologians both in England and America." Dr. Denney in his preface to the book, "The Death of Christ," says: "There have been conspicuous examples of essays and even treatises on the atonement, standing in no discoverable relation to the New Testament law." Professor Law of Toronto in his "Tests of Life" said: "One may or may not accept the teaching of the New Testament,

but intellectual honesty compels us at least to recognize it as it is."

Sin is an offence against God, and I believe that common forgetfulness of this accounts for what I may call the " bloodless " religion of so many in the present day. Dr. Forsyth in his book, " The Cruciality of the Cross," says : " Blood means judgment, expiation, atonement. This is a side which it is absolutely impossible to drop from Christianity without giving the Gospel quite away."

During the last four years we have had some wonderful illustrations of the atonement in connexion with the war. Before the war people were hostile to vicarious sacrifice, and such words as " monstrous " and " absurd " were used. But during the last four years we have had some wonderful illustrations of this great principle. Of course, as you know, I am not in any sense of the word referring to the idea of men dying and thereby being saved. That is not my subject to-night, and I will only say this : So far as I can gather, the men as a body do not believe in it. You can see the absurdity of it, that our young men when they die on the battlefield immediately go to heaven, when you realize that this would be an inducement for all to go over and not come back alive. Fathers and mothers instead of praying for their boys to return would pray that they might not come back ; they would pray that they might be killed and go to heaven right away.

We have in Oxford Professor Gilbert Murray who is altogether opposed to Evangelical Christianity. He says in this connexion : " As for me personally, there is one thought always with me—the thought that other men are dying for me. That is the sort of community we now are, a community in which a man dies for his brother." And so to-day we have this thought again and again brought before us, by the way in which the old, old story has been illustrated by the examples of men. One missionary stated that while in India making an address and using the illustration of England interposing on behalf of Belgium he found the illustration quite acceptable, where before the war people would not listen to the vicariousness of Christ !

Some years ago a young preacher in South Wales saw in his congregation an old minister. After the meeting was over the two were introduced and the young minister said : " I should be very grateful if you would kindly criticize my sermon, because you are a man of experience and I am only a beginner."

"Well," said the old man, "I liked your sermon; there was a great deal in it; it was well delivered; but, I did not notice any cross in it."

The young man answered, "You see, sir, it wasn't in my text."

"Well," said the old man, "I am an old man and you are a beginner; take this word from me. Whatever may be your text, be sure to make a branch line from it to the cross."

That is the glory of our Gospel. We are to recognize the fact and the force of atonement by blood.

(2) We are to *receive* it—not only to recognize it, but to receive it. In Romans iii. 25 we read: "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God"; and the contrast of it is in Hebrews x. 29—those who receive on the one hand and those who reject on the other.

If there is any one here by any possibility who has never yet received this atonement, my brother or sister, why not now? I heard some time ago the story told by Dr. Vance, of Nashville, Tennessee. He was called upon to visit a Scotchman in one of the slums of the city. The man was a stranger and was very ill of consumption. He told Dr. Vance his story of back in Scotland how he came from a Christian home but ran away and played the prodigal. "And now," said Dr. Vance, "he turned to me with great hunger in his eyes, and said, 'Minister, I want you to help me to get home.'" Thinking he wanted to get back to Scotland, the Doctor asked him if he was a member of the St. Andrew's Society. The sick man said, "You do not understand me; it is my long home, I mean," and Dr. Vance then knew that he wanted him to tell him how to get saved. Dr. Vance said, "What was I to say? Was I to preach about the merits of an unselfish life? He was dying. I told him of the suffering on the cross. I tried to make him understand how on Calvary's cross Christ died that we might be saved. As I quoted the promises I saw a look of peace come into his face and heard him say that he was satisfied, and I went down the dirty stairs as though walking on air."

(3) And my last point is that we must not only recognize the truth, not only receive it, but we must *rejoice*. "Worthy the Lamb that is slain" is to be the theme of Heaven's praises. Why should we not have it here and now? Paul says, "God forbid that I

should boast, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ." We know a boastful man is a contemptible specimen. There are some things in the New Testament about which we can boast, and boast without any fear of anything unworthy of us. We think of the wonderful words of Martin Luther—I never tire of referring to them—" Thou, Lord Jesus, art my righteousness. I am Thy sin. Thou hast given me what is Thine and has taken what is mine. What Thou wert not Thou didst become, that I might become what I was not."

This is what we find in 2 Corinthians v. 21 : " For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin ; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him."

Perish every human story,
Every system taught or tried,
God forbid that I should glory
Save in Jesus crucified.
Here let faith repose and cherish,
Jesus crucified for me.
Those who trust Him never perish,
They are safe beneath the tree.

Here my soul by faith would enter,
Pleased no more with fancy's dreams,
Here is love's refulgent centre,
Here are mercy's brightest beams.
Here is wisdom in perfection,
Here the end of fleshly strife.
Lord, Thou art my Resurrection,
Jesus, Thou my spirit's life.

Thy great love to me revealing,
Dwell within my worthless heart.
Let Thy wounding be my healing,
Let Thy death new life impart.
Lord, Thy love can ne'er be measured,
Nor Thy mercy half be told.
Thou hast more within Thee treasured
Than a sinner's heart can hold.

O ! that I should never wander
From the sinner's sweetest theme.
O ! for grace that I may ponder
All my steps, and walk in Him.
Earth is old and Time is hoary,
Systems to confusion slide.
God forbid that I should glory
Save in Jesus crucified.

FRANCIS AUGUSTUS BEVAN:
A TRIBUTE AND AN IMPRESSION.

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

THE passing from our midst of so notable a figure as Mr. Bevan, is for Evangelical Churchmen an event of the first significance. We mourn with reason, and we look back with just pride and satisfaction. I need therefore offer no apologies for attempting to portray so characteristic and honoured a personality, nor need I waste time in any further preface. The Churchman seems a conspicuously appropriate vehicle for such a contribution to the literature of the Evangelical body in the Church.

Francis Augustus Bevan was born in London in the year 1840. His father was the famous banker whose genius for finance not only built up the edifice of an immense private and business fortune, but was also recognized by Government, which from time to time sought his counsel in financial questions. Quaker blood was in the veins of Francis; and that tincture may have imparted to him a certain equable temper which we knew so well. He was first schooled at Trent Cottage, under Mr. Tabor, before that celebrated teacher went to Cheam. From Tabor he passed to Harrow, then under the rule of Dr. Vaughan, the favourite school of Evangelical magnates. From Harrow, after two years of foreign travel, he went into the Bank in Lombard Street, which supplied to him the knowledge of men and movements, which others derive from books and colleges. The fact is noteworthy; for a certain practicality and a certain limitation of outlook are inevitable in one so early yoked to the car of commerce. He was diligent in his calling. The great commercial virtues were conspicuous in him. He was regular, punctual, sound in judgment, conciliatory, prudent, and kind in his dealing with men.

Accessible to all, princely and cheerful in his munificence, conscientious and discreet in the distribution of his alms, and void of any tinge of ostentation, he has added another name to the long roll of English philanthropists, all of whom are an honour to our

species, and most of whom have been nursed in the principles of Evangelical religion.

But amid the close and constant obligation of his daily life, Mr. Bevan found leisure for a considerable degree of mental and social culture. He loved cricket. He was a keen musician. He read novels, and travelled. As a boy he had been a good singer; and all his life he attended classical concerts with delight. He visited Switzerland frequently; and in early manhood travelled in Palestine. At the age of 68 he went to India and must have there seen many things to confirm his faith in Christian missions, and to kindle his zeal for the Empire, and some things also to fill so good and just a heart with misgiving and distress.

His predominant bent was towards politics. His family believe that he would have made a mark in the House of Commons. Those who have heard Mr. Bevan speak in public will remember his easy and luminous utterance, and will concur in the belief of his family. It is certain that his wide acquaintance with finance, and with the City of London, and his equally wide acquaintance with the religious needs of his country, would have qualified him to speak, and vote, with more than usual influence. His father, however, dissuaded Mr. Bevan from offering himself as a candidate for Parliament on grounds of health; and thus his undivided energies and powers were given to the cause of Christianity and philanthropy. None the less he was always acutely interested in political questions, and kept up personal connexions with a good many people notable in the world of politics. For many years he frequently attended debates, and listened, as many of us have done, to that strange medley of wisdom and special-pleading, out of which at length emerges as by a gracious fortuity, the Law of the greatest people in the world.

If now, before passing to an examination of the work of Mr. Bevan, we collect the features that have thus been separately delineated, we frame the portrait of an Englishman of singular excellence and charm. High-minded, humble, generous, devout, simple in his tastes, happy in his home, loved by his family, rich in friends, managing a great financial house with consummate tact and patience, disposing of an ample fortune with gracious yet discerning liberality, moderate in all things, and while free himself from the meaner anxieties that afflict half the world, prompt to appreciate, and to relieve those anxieties in others—Mr. Bevan has bequeathed to

us an example that all can admire, and that most can imitate in its largest aspects.

When at the age of 21, Francis Augustus Bevan became a partner in Barclay's Bank, the dominant religious force in the Church of England was still Evangelical. It is true that for near a generation the Tractarian reaction had infected the Church, but the secession of Newman in 1847 had given a shock to that movement; and the growing aberrations of the Ritualist section had alienated much of the public confidence which the first Tractarians had slowly acquired. The Evangelicals were in power. Along with power they had got place and patronage. Resting on the fame of their great predecessors, they became content with the present, and negligent of the future. They suffered the fate of all who thus act. They were overtaken sleeping. Another took their crown. Nevertheless though displaced they were not lost. They forfeited much, but they retained more. Though they have never recovered the position which once they held, they may yet recover it; and in a wiser and more wakeful spirit, may yet lead the English people to better things than even their fathers knew.

That the sceptre did not wholly pass from us was in a measure due to the labours of such men as Mr. Bevan. It is true that he could not impart to the Evangelical school what it most required, a zest of scholarship, a modern outlook, and a clear policy. But he maintained its funds, he supported its parishes and its societies, he adorned its principles, and he recommended its zeal for souls. He was treasurer to a large number of institutions. For years he occupied fortnightly the chair at the committee meetings of the London City Mission. He worked hard at the Church Patronage Trust, especially in conjunction with the sagacious Dr. Barlow, late Dean of Peterborough. He served on a good many other Trusts as well. I remember very clearly my interview with the Trustees of Belgrave Chapel, when they honoured me with invitation to succeed Marcus Rainsford in that chapel. Of the Trustees Mr. Bevan was one. He was present at that interview. I recall now the quiet and musical tones of his voice; the quickness of his questions; and the bright and genial words of his advice when he said, "You had better consult Mrs. Marston before giving us your final answer; a wise man always consults his wife."

There was perhaps about Mr. Bevan's churchmanship a certain

dimness of outline. He was one of a generation which sought to solve the sad problem of a divided Christianity by the method of denominational courtesies. That method has long ago ceased to exist. We want a method more defined and more efficient. That view coloured inevitably his patronage. Though always just and conscientious, yet his proclivity was towards a type of clergyman whose Churchmanship was also somewhat indistinct. The effect of this policy in patronage was not at first apparent. Nor did it much signify. But as time went on, the result appeared in more directions than one. A large number of Evangelical benefices were filled by men who had, in fact, no liking for Church questions, and little understanding of them. The consequence was that these men, taken as representatives of Evangelical doctrine, created an impression that the Evangelicals were only an accident in the Established Church. The men themselves accepted this valuation, sometimes with alacrity, and sometimes with unconcern. Thus the leadership of Church opinion passed from their hands. They were left in devout and honoured isolation. New and active minds turned to other counsellors for light and leading. If this account of some Evangelical patronage be correct, I cannot review it with complacency. I have ventured on this survey as a cautionary suggestion, for in some quarters the tendency is with us still.

No sketch of Mr. Bevan would be complete which omitted his profound personal religion. Here was the deep, pure fountain of his beautiful and life-long beneficence. His early impressions of religion were derived from home. His father and his mother, and his step-mother, were all devoted and exemplary Christians. Their piety was strict. As he grew in years he expanded in his views. He tempered the conservative tendency, native to great capitalists, by the liberal influences of the Gospel; and though never conspicuous in controversy, he adhered faithfully to the doctrines of the Reformation. The Bible was his daily study. The Sunday was religiously and devoutly observed. Family prayer was never omitted. He used regularly to expound a portion of Scripture to his household. His extempore prayers were beautiful. Immediate and habitual communion with God, the felt indwelling of the Holy Spirit, a personal dependence on the merits and the grace of Christ, were the secret talisman of his public and personal life. He walked by faith. He walked with God.

These qualities are primary and indispensable. The Evangelicals may have many faults, but they have amid them all deserved unspeakably well of the spiritual republic, because they have sustained at its very heart an imperishable witness to the reality and supremacy of personal religion. To this high praise Francis Augustus Bevan enjoys an ample claim. If he was not greater than the great men of his generation, he shone with the light of lights, and conferred on his contemporaries in a long life the blessing of a lofty Christian example.

Evangelicals, if they understand themselves and their principles, still await their best. The future is for them. They are called to yet higher things. The Church is looking for an Evangelicalism alert and tender, conscientious about truth, humanely sensitive to all great needs, free from rancour and stagnation. To that high level we are on the way; and among the noble guides who have pointed out the road, one and not the least conspicuous is Francis Augustus Bevan.

H. J. R. MARSTON.

THE FEEDINGS OF THE THOUSANDS: AN INQUIRY.

II.

By the Rev. J. B. McGovern, Rector of St. Stephen's, Chorlton-on-Medlock, Manchester.

IT only remains, before piecing the narratives together into a connected whole, to notice the questions concerning the provision of food. There may be on the surface a "seeming difference" between St. John's account and that of the Synoptists, but they do not even reach the stage of apparent, still less of absolute contradiction. The thrice recorded request of the disciples to dismiss the crowd to purchase food is supplemented by John's version of our Lord's question to Philip, which obviously held precedence in point of time,[1] and was the seed from which the former sprang. This simply means putting John vi. 5 before Matthew xiv. 15, Mark vi. 35, and Luke ix. 12—a legitimate process which Trench and Westcott ably defend, the latter thus:

"St. John appears to have brought together into one scene, as we now regard it, the first words spoken to Philip on the approach of the crowd, and the words in which they were afterwards taken up by Andrew, when the disciples themselves at evening re-stated the difficulty. If this view be true, so that the words addressed to Philip with his answer preceded the whole day's work, then the mention of 'two hundred pennyworth of bread' made by the disciples in St. Mark (vi. 37) gains great point, and so too the phrase, 'what He was about to do' (*v.* 6), which otherwise appears to be followed too quickly by its fulfilment."

But it is time to let the Evangelists be their own interpreters by blending the details supplied by each in chronological sequence, in effecting which I adopt Edersheim's method with passages here and there borrowed from his text. The narrative thus treated presents a complete and continuous history.

A triple combination or fortuitous concurrence of circumstances or events had, immediately prior to His fifth Passover, provided

[1] "A day of teaching and healing must be intercalated before the miracle of feeding was wrought" (Westcott). This is inferentially deducible from all four narratives, although Edersheim (I. 679) "cannot see any reason for this. All the events fit well into one day."

motives for the Lord's withdrawal " far from the madding crowd's ignoble strife," viz. grief consequent upon the death of John Baptist (Matt. xiv. 13), the fatigue of the disciples from their recent laborious missionary itinerary (Mark vi. 30, 31) and present disturbance from the increasingly thronging crowds of sight-seers, and (Luke ix. 9) the murderous Herod's determination " to see Him." [1]

" And He said unto them : Come ye yourselves apart into a desert place, and rest awhile " (Mark vi. 31) ; " and He took them and went aside privately into a desert place belonging to the city called Bethsaida " (Luke ix. 10), crossing by ship " over the sea of Galilee, which is *the sea* of Tiberias " (John vi. 1), " the name by which the lake was known to classical writers (Paus. v. 7, p. 391, λίμνη *Τιβεριάς*) " (Westcott), and so called from the magnificent city built on its shore by Herod Antipas in honour of the Emperor Tiberius Claudius Nero (A.D. 14–A.D. 37), (Josephus, *Antiq.* XVIII ; *Bell. Jud.* II. 9, § 1), and where the Mishna was compiled (A.D. 190), and the Musorah originated. It was " a well-known spot where Christ and the Apostles touched the shore. South of it was Gergesa, and beyond mountains and hills recede, and plains widen along the shore of the north side of the lake. A few ruins mark the site of Bethsaida-Julias on the edge of a hill, three or four miles north, and a mile further is the ford by which the crowd crossed the Jordan from Capernaum—a wide expanse of grass " (Edersheim).

" And the people saw them departing, and many knew Him, and ran afoot thither out of all cities and outwent them, and came together unto Him " (Mark vi. 33) ; " and a great multitude followed Him, because they saw His miracles which He did on them that were diseased. And Jesus went up into a mountain, and there He sat with His disciples. And the Passover, a feast of the Jews, was nigh. When Jesus then lifted up His eyes, and saw a great company " [of Passover pilgrims with the other over 5,000 combined] " come unto Him, He saith unto Philip : Whence shall we buy bread, that these may eat ? And this He said to prove him ; for He Himself knew what He would do. Philip answered Him : Two hundred pennyworth [2] of bread is not sufficient for them, that every one of them may take a little " (John vi. 2–7).

[1] Westcott rightly sees in this " the link which combines " the other motives, and " made a brief season of quiet retirement, and that outside the dominions of Herod, the natural counsel of wisdom and tenderness."

[2] " A hasty, indeterminate estimate, but one pointing to a considerable

" And Jesus went forth," descending the mountain to the desert plain of Bethsaida, " and was moved with compassion toward them, and He healed their sick " (Matt. xiv. 14), " and began to teach them many things " (Mark vi. 34), " and spake unto them of the Kingdom of God " (Luke ix. 11).

So the long bright day, filled with loving toil and speech, wears on apace, and when the shadows were lengthening on land and sea " His disciples came to Him, saying : This is a desert place, and the time is now past ; send the multitude away, that they may go into the villages, and buy themselves victuals. But Jesus said unto them : They need not depart ; give ye them to eat " (Matt. xiv. 15, 16) ; " how many loaves have ye ? go and see " (Mark vi. 38). " One of His disciples, Andrew, Simon Peter's brother, saith unto Him : There is a lad here, which hath five barley loaves, and two small fishes ; but what are they among so many " (John vi. 8, 9) —(" For they were about five thousand men ") (Luke ix. 14)—And " He said : Bring them hither to Me " (Matt. xiv. 18). " And He commanded them to make all sit down by companies upon the green grass. And they sat down in ranks, by hundreds, and by fifties " (Mark vi. 39, 40), " with their bright many-coloured dresses, like garden-beds (the literal rendering of *πρασιά* is *garden-bed*) on the turf " (Edersheim). " And when He had taken the five loaves and the two fishes, He looked up to heaven " (" and when He had given thanks," John vi. 11), " blessed[1] and brake the loaves, and gave *them* to His disciples to set before them ; and the two fishes[2] divided He among them all " (Mark vi. 41), and " when they were filled, He said unto His disciples : Gather up the fragments that remain, that nothing be lost. Therefore they gathered *them* together,

sum," is Dr. Salmond's " hasty indeterminate " comment. Why " hasty," if the sum was " considerable " ? Andrew was far more hasty in judging it to be inadequate, and less hasty than the Doctor who knows it to be " considerable," calculating it to be " something over £7 of our money," and admitting that it would mean about a third of a penny for each."

[1] Edersheim answers the very pertinent curiosity : What form of blessing would the Lord use ? " There can be little doubt that the words which Jesus spake, whether in Aramæan, Greek, or Hebrew were those so well known : ' Blessed art Thou, Jehovah our God, King of the World, Who causes to come forth (המוֹציא) bread from the earth.' "

[2] Ὀψάριον (John vi. 9), dried fish, sardines, " a familiar Galilean word (אַסמוֹנין, ophsonin, savoury dish, and אפיאן, Aphyan, or עפיין, Aphits, small fish, sardines), thus showing accurate local knowledge. This is one of those undesigned traits in the narrative which carry almost irresistible evidence.—(Edersheim).

and filled twelve baskets[1] with the fragments of the five barley loaves" (" and of the fishes," Mark vi. 43), " which remained over and above unto them that had eaten "[1] (John vi. 12, 13). " And they that had eaten were about five thousand men, beside women and children" (Matt. xiv. 21). " Then those men, when they had seen the miracle that Jesus did, said: This is of a truth that prophet that should come into the world " (John vi. 14). For " the murmur ran through the ranks: ' This is truly the Prophet, *the Coming One* (הבא habba) *into the world*.' And so the Baptist's last inquiry, ' Art Thou the Coming One ? ' was fully and publicly answered, and that by the Jews themselves " (Edersheim). " When Jesus therefore perceived that they would come and take Him by force, to make Him a King, He departed *again* into a mountain Himself alone " (John vi. 15).

So the simple four-told incident, harmonised, i.e. " fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every " narrator " supplieth," ends simply, and from its concluding sentences two salient facts result: (1) In addition to St. John's mention of the Passover, the *κοφίνοι* (*ut infra*) and the (somehow manifested) intention " to make Him a King " are clear suggestions by the narrators of the Jewish nationality of both the " great multitude " and the " great company." Edersheim rightly calls them " life touches," which confirm the historicity of the entire episode. (2) It is clear, even with the second word omitted, from *ἀνεχώρησε πάλιν εἰς τὸ ὄρος* that the Lord had come down from the mountain, which He had previously ascended, towards the shore to teach and cure, and afterwards withdrew to it again and alone.

B. The Feeding of the Four Thousand (Matt. xv. 29–39 ; Mark

[1] " Twelve baskets." Why " twelve " ? Opinions vary and waver. " It has been suggested that they may have been those in which the Twelve Apostles had carried the food which they required on their Missionary journey recently finished " (Salmond). " Probably the property of the twelve disciples, a basket being the usual travelling wallet of a Jew " (McClymont). " Twelve baskets: one for each apostle. Juvenal says that the furniture of a Jew consisted of a basket (for food) and some dried grass (for a bed): these were provided to avoid contamination. The testimony of the four, and minute agreement in the Synoptics, establish the historic certainty of the account " (Prof. Slater). Juvenal's pleasantries, although worn threadbare in this connection, deserve a final transference:

Judaeis, quorum *cophinus* fœnumque supellex. *Sat.* III. 14.
Quorum dedit ille locum, cophino fœnoque relicto. *Ibid.* VI. 542.

Westcott's explanation, whilst obviously embracing those just advanced, is the straightest: " The number implies that the work was given to the apostles, though they have not been specially mentioned."

viii. 1–10). It is idle to endeavour to account for the silence of Luke and John on this incident; it is more than idle to seek to identify it with that other just considered. Yet many otherwise precious moments have been idled away lavishly in vain strivings over both. The silences of Scripture are notoriously past finding out; hence "we may not know, we cannot tell" why Matthew and Mark do, and Luke and John do not, chronicle this deed of Christ. It is sheer knocking its head against the wall of the unknowable for exegesis to attempt the solution of either problem. Equally useless is it to try to coalesce the Feeding of the Four Thousand with the Feeding of the Five Thousand. An impartial examination of their resemblances and differences will, without further cavil, prove this to be so. Prior, however, to entering upon this, the artless story of the occurrence now about to be considered must lie before us, in blended form and without comment, as told by the narrators themselves. By "artless" I by no means mean void of art—which it certainly is not—but as composed, in both presentments, naturally (and therefore simply), i.e. manifesting art while concealing it.

"And Jesus departed" (Matt. xv. 29) "from the borders of Tyre and Sidon," and "came unto the sea of Galilee through the midst of the borders of Decapolis" (Mark vii. 31), "and went up into a mountain, and sat down there. And great multitudes came unto Him, having with them" some that were "lame, blind, dumb, maimed, and many others, and cast themselves down at Jesus' feet; and He healed them, insomuch that the multitude wondered when they saw the dumb to speak, the maimed to be whole, the lame to walk and the blind to see; and they glorified the God of Israel. Then Jesus called His disciples and said: I have compassion on the multitude, because they continue with Me now three days, and have nothing to eat, and I will not send them away fasting, lest they faint in the way. And His disciples say unto Him: Whence should we have so much bread in the wilderness, as to fill so great a multitude? And Jesus saith unto them: How many loaves have ye? And they said: Seven, and a few little fishes. And He commanded the multitude to sit down on the ground. And He took the seven loaves and the fishes, and gave thanks, and brake" them, "and gave to His disciples, and the disciples to the multitude. And they did all eat, and were filled: and they

took up of the broken " meat " that was left seven baskets full. And they that did eat were four thousand men, beside women and children. And He sent away the multitude " (Matt. xv. 29–39), " and straightway He entered into a ship with His disciples, and came into the parts of Dalmanutha," (Mark viii. 10), " into the coast of Magdala " (Matt. xv. 39).

In eleven verses each the two narrators write the simple story down straightforwardly. There is no need to seek the sources of it, nor to subject it to the " science of emendation." The story tells its own unvarnished tale, and does not suffer from merely adjusting prologue and epilogue to it in its own words, so as to lie a connected and graphic whole before us. Only the prologue and epilogue, as I have termed them, need delay us for a moment by way of defence of the adjustment.

As to the first, we need not linger over the possible whereabouts of Christ (as suggested by the ἦλθεν διὰ Σιδῶνος of ℵ B.D. Latt., " Came through Sidon," R.V.), nor over the intervening episodes, but note that Decapolis (region or confederation of the " Ten Cities ") was a large and indefinable district, on both sides of the Jordan, populous in those days, but, except Damascus, utterly barren in these. Pliny (V. 18) enumerates the ten cities (which lay east of Jordan) as Scythopolis (called by Josephus the largest, B. J. III. 9, § 8), Hippos, Gadara, Pella, Philadelphia, Gerasa, Dion, Canatha, Damascus, and Raphana ; Ptolemy (V. 17) gives Capitobis as one of the ten, and Smith adds that " an old Palmyrene inscription quoted by Reland includes Aliba, a town which, according to Eusebius, was twelve Roman miles east of Gadara." They were rebuilt after the Roman conquest B.C. 65 ; and it was through them that, on a previous occasion, the Gerasene demoniac " began to publish how great things Jesus had done for him " (Mark v. 20), and through their " borders " that He now came once more " unto the Sea of Galilee," closing His first northern and Decapolis ministries by one incident and His passing by ship " into the coasts of Magdala " and " the parts of Dalmanutha."

Secondly, the two expressions " coasts of Magdala " (" borders of Magadan," R.V.) and " parts of Dalmanutha " are not contradictory, their vicinity near the plain of Gennesaret precluding that charge. And little more profit is to be gained by heated disputes over the rival claims of *Μαγδαλά* and *Μαγαδάν*. It is a case

of *utrum horum mavis accipe*. The former may have the support of the T.R. and A.V. only, and the latter of B.D. and Sinait, but *cuiue bono?* The Vulg. has Magedan and Syr. Magedun. All three situations are pure guess-work, and it is *opus et oleum perdere* to essay to locate them.

Here I reach the main purport of this inquiry—the relationship (if any) between the two Feedings of the Multitudes; their resemblances and dissemblances and their separateness one from the other.

The often alleged kinship between the two incidents is entirely apparent and superficial. They stand as entirely disconnected as they would do had one of the two been non-existent. Beyond community of occasion and aim and slight similarity of outline there is absolutely no affinity between them, still less assimilation in and of the two reports by primitive (that is, oral) or any other tradition. The oldest gospel tradition of Matthew xvi. 9–10 and Mark viii. 20 (of which presently) demolishes the doublet theory.

The points of resemblance, to minimise or emphasise which no useful purpose is served, are interesting: (1) the *locus in quo* is, in both instances, of the same desert character and near to the sea; (2) a similar anxiety of the disciples concerning the provisioning of the crowds;[1] (3) Christ's compassion for them repeated; (4) the identity of the materials of both meals; (5) the self-same methods were observed: the order to sit, the blessing, the distribution, and the gathering of the fragments; and (6) the departure by ship. Prof. Slater adds a seventh with a curious comment: "To these similarities should be added the item that the number in both cases *excludes* 'women and children.'"

[1] This so-called resemblance is not one in reality. Though the anxiety was similar at both occurrences, it was manifested differently. Principal Salmond's answer (on Mark viii. 4) is conclusive: "The deficiencies of the disciples are never concealed. Their question betrayed their forgetfulness and the little they had yet learned. It is to be noticed also that it is not quite the same as their question on the previous occasion. Then their difficulty was about the large sum of money that would be needed to purchase provisions. Here it is the difficulty of finding anywhere in the sparsely-peopled district in which they were now a sufficient supply for such a multitude of mouths." This amply invalidates Prof. Slater's comment on Matt. xv. 33 that "Meyer's suggestion [of assimilation of the two accounts in the course of *oral* transmission] would partly remove the difficulty found in the question of the disciples, which in that case might not belong to the second occurrence." "*Might not*" is, to a logician, too flimsy a method of disposing of an even supposed difficulty to be entertained for a moment.

The italicised word is inaccurate. Χωρὶς means "beside," in addition to, as well as "without," or "not counting." But either word suggests inclusion, substantially if not numerically.

If resemblances, which are more than "undesigned coincidences," could and should establish identity of facts these certainly do so. But, unfortunately for the adherents of the doublet theory, these resemblances *are* precisely "undesigned coincidences." Hence their utter worthlessness as arguments. They are on a par with circumstantial evidence, which is notoriously faulty. Extrinsic similarity, down to details, between two given facts is no proof of their intrinsic identity, else were the narratives of Waterloo and Inkerman two separate accounts of the same battle.[1]

But the three outstanding facts which demolish this contention and entirely differentiate the two incidents are—

(*a*) The characteristic difference between the two multitudes. This was more than "apparent" as Bishop Drury terms it—an expression which his own comment (*l.c.* p. 58) neutralises: "In estimating the relation of the miracle of the Four Thousand to that of the Five Thousand, one thing at least claims careful notice, namely, the apparent difference of character between the two multitudes. In the first place all four Evangelists describe the Five Thousand as composed in the main of crowds who saw Jesus departing from the western shore and followed Him on foot so as to outrun Him and meet Him when He landed on the eastern shore. St. John gives the clue to the occasion by telling us that the Passover was near. They were a Jewish multitude, largely composed of people travelling to Jerusalem, with which their desire to 'make Him a King' is perfectly consistent. On the other hand, the Four Thousand seem to have been more or less inhabitants of the district, doubtless having their numbers swelled from more distant parts, 'for divers of them came from far.' There is no trace of *political* excitement, or of Jewish origin. The whole context points to a crowd mainly gathered from the cities of Decapolis, 'having with them those that were lame, blind, dumb, maimed,' a feature much less prominent at the earlier miracle, where we only read 'He

[1] "There is no need," remarks Edersheim, "for the ingenious apology [of Bleek] that, in the remembrance and tradition of the first and second feeding, the similarity of the two events had led to greater similarity in their narration than the actual circumstances would perhaps have waranted."

healed the sick.' . . . Once more, St. Matthew's phrase 'They glorified *the God of Israel,*' in his record of the second miracle, comes most naturally from a non-Jewish crowd, who despite their belief in their own local deities were moved by our Lord's works of mercy to glorify the God of His people."

Thus the radically distinct mental attitudes of the two crowds towards Christ establish beyond reasonable cavil their radically distinct nationalities, and irrefragably the utter separateness of the two happenings.

(*b*) The second unmistakable point which marks off the two bodies of guests at the two banquets lies in the respective use of, and remarkable distinction between, *κόφινος* and *σπύρις* on the two occasions. Too much cannot be made of this otherwise curious change of word, which is no mean factor in determining the component national elements of those guests, and was clearly meant to indicate the difference between those elements as well as to record two sets of facts. Between the *κόφινος* and the *σπύρις* there was just the relationship of genus and species, both belonging to the former whilst being variants of the latter. Both were baskets in the sense that our picnic-baskets and hampers are ; and both differed from each other in equal proportions to those, as all four also indicate journeys of shorter and longer distances. It is by this latter indication that *σπύρις* settles the semi-Gentile character of the second multitude as *κόφινος*[1] does the Jewish one of the first. There is no " undesigned coincidence " theory admissible here. The word was deliberately chosen to paint what had occurred. And this is strikingly confirmed by the two subsequent references (Matt. xvi. 9–10 ; Mark viii. 19–20) to the two Feedings which carefully preserve and emphasise the distinction between the two words. Both our Lord in His distinguishing use, and the Evangelists in their distinguishing record, of them show their anxiety for accuracy of fact. It is a pity that our A.V. suggests no such vital difference in its rendering of both words by " baskets " repeated only too faithfully in each case ; even the R.V. makes but a pitiful attempt at distinction by " basketfuls," and that only in Mark. Beza wisely and accurately distinguished them by " cophinus " and

[1] " Those baskets (*κόφινοι*), known in Jewish writings by a similar name (Kephiphah, כְּפִיפָה מְצָנִית from מְצָר metser-wicker or willow), made of wicker or willows, were in common use, but considered of the poorest kind."—Edersheim.

"sporta" respectively in the two narratives and emphatically at Matthew xvi. 9–10 and Mark viii. 19–20; and Wiclif equally wisely renders the first by "coffens ful of broken mete," and the second by "legsis of broken mete." Except the Italian (which gives *corbello* and *paniere* to distinguish the two kinds) most modern vernacular versions (German, French, Russian, Swedish, Baskish, Spanish, Welsh, and Irish Gaelic) are as expert as the A.V. and R.V., in clumsily hiding the two meanings under the self-same word. Bishop Drury's comment is well worth reproducing here to clinch this limb of my argument (*l.c.* p. 59): "This contrast between the crowds is emphasised (as Bishop Lightfoot pointed out) by the well-known difference of vessels used in collecting the fragments. The κόφινος was the recognized note of a Jew, and the Five Thousand used κόφινοι. The σπύρις, used by the Four Thousand, was a larger vessel, a rough country maund or hamper, large and strong enough in some cases to carry a man, for St. Paul's life once hung on a σπύρις[1] in which he was let down from the window on the walls of Damascus! 'Just fancy,' Bishop Lightfoot once said to his pupils, 'the Great Apostle St. Paul let down in a fish-basket!' Thus the difference of word used in either miracle, and repeated when the two miracles are named together, is not merely an interesting differentiation of terms, but it confirms the *difference of nationality* which the narratives themselves suggest."

(*c*) The third proof of non-identity is that of *season*, which no impartial observer of facts can dismiss as nugatory. This is markedly indicated by the phrases both of Matthew (xv. 35) and Mark (viii. 6): ἀναπεσεῖν ἐπι τὴν γῆν and ἀναπεσεῖν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς respectively. This second group of guests are seated now, not on "the *green grass*," but "on the *ground*," which points to an altogether different, that is later, period of the year when, as Edersheim observes, "in the East the grass was burnt up." In some respects this fact separates the two Feedings even more conclusively than the two preceding ones.

And, amongst minor differences, the following may be instanced as not devoid of weight: (1) The πολιν παλλου of Mark viii. 1 in

[1] ἐν σπυρίδι (Acts ix. 25); ἐν σαργάνῃ (2 Cor. xi. 33), a word that is somewhat wider in its meaning than σπύρις though its equivalent, signifying a net-work of twisted cords or a basket of the same. There is no contradiction between Luke and Paul as the σπύρις was also made of plaited rope, but Bishop Lightfoot's pleasantry loses its piquancy somewhat.

a reading of great value, though not adopted by Griesbach nor in the A.V., but rightly inserted in the R.V., emphatically cuts the second Feeding from the first Feeding and thus establishes two separate facts. On this Principal Salmond trenchantly remarks:

"The evangelist says simply and distinctly that there was *again* a great multitude, and they had nothing to eat.' Why should we not accept his statement?"

(2) Numerical discrepancies: In one case 5,000, in the other 4,000 are fed; in the first instance there were five loaves and two fishes, in the second seven loaves and "a few small fishes," and again, twelve baskets were filled with fragments at the first Feeding, and seven at the second. All this must be reckoned with on grounds other than an insinuation of numerical jugglery.

(3) It is not without significance that at the first Feeding thanks were given by our Lord, *according to the Jewish custom* once and only over the bread, whereas at the second the fishes also were included in the blessing. This has all the appearance of a separate rite observed for a *Gentile* audience.

But the crowning proof of separateness between the two Feedings, which should over-ride all cavilling and smooth out all difficulties, is supplied by Him who presided at both as recorded by Matthew at xvi. 9–10, and Mark at viii. 19–20. Verily here, if anywhere, *Scriptura per scripturam interpretetur.*

J. B. McGOVERN.

EPISCOPACY AND WESLEYAN REUNION.

By the Rev. C. Sydney Carter, M.A.

THE Bishop of London's definite scheme for reunion with the Wesleyan Methodist Church provokes serious criticism, as it is in reality a challenge to the Evangelical view of the Church and the Ministry. For his proposal to allow existing Wesleyan ministers to *preach* in the reunited Church, but not to celebrate the Eucharist, without reordination, not only exalts the Ministry of the Sacrament over that of the Word, a superiority nowhere supported by our Church's formularies, but it advances a popular mechanical theory of Orders, held only by a section of Churchmen, as the fundamental and official teaching of the Church. In a published "Note" in the *London Quarterly Review* for July the Bishop animadverting on a suggested modification of his scheme—to the extent of temporarily suspending our existing rule of episcopal ordination so as to receive all *existing* Wesleyan ministers at the time of the Union *without reordination*—asserts that such a course would be equivalent to "abandoning episcopacy as the recognized organ of the unity and continuity of the Church," and would amount to declaring that "ministers of all denominations should be regarded as equally fitted to celebrate the Holy Communion and preach in our churches." But surely this is an extravagant and unwarrantable construction to put upon it? For such a compromise would in no way involve the "abandonment of episcopacy," but merely the temporary dislocation of a purely non-official "Tractarian" theory of it. The Bishop, I feel sure, would not think that the unity or continuity of the Church were jeopardized if in an emergency a layman should administer the Sacrament of Baptism: how then can it be in imminent peril if for an emergency period a certain number of presbyterianly ordained ministers were permitted to celebrate the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper? In view of such statements as these we do well to remind ourselves that it is not in accordance with a Divine or Scriptural injunction, but merely as a matter of Church order and regularity that we adhere to the ancient ecclesiastical custom of confining the administration of Holy Communion to the clergy.

The Bishop also asserts that at least the London Evangelical clergy would resent an "order" from him "to allow a minister of

any other denomination, without first receiving episcopal ordination, to celebrate the Holy Communion in their parish churches." The immediate question however is not concerned with the ministrations of an *individual* minister " of any other denomination," but whether a general rule is to be temporarily relaxed in the case of a large body of ministers of a definite and worldwide Church (the Wesleyan), who would have consummated a real organic union with us on a previously agreed doctrinal basis ! When we remember that down to 1660 individual foreign Reformed divines, only in Presbyterian Orders, were freely admitted to exercise their ministry in our Church, and that Presbyterian ministers in the Scotch Episcopal Church continued their ministries after 1610 and 1660 without any reordination, we naturally wonder what became then of "the unity and continuity of the Church " ? Was it irretrievably broken by such practices ? If not, we may well hope that it would also recover from the special and temporary abrogation of a domestic Church rule to-day. Since all the Wesleyan candidates for the Ministry would in future receive episcopal ordination, the principle and rule of the historic episcopate with an exclusively episcopally ordained ministry would still be retained and regarded as the uniform, regular and normal practice for the future. Moreover, the scruples and conscientious convictions of individual clergy with regard to the ministrations of the existing Wesleyan ministers, received into fellowship with us, would be safeguarded, since they would be under no obligation or compulsion to accept their ministrations in their particular churches, and surely for the priceless benefit of restoring in some measure the visible unity of the Catholic Church they should be willing to make some slight modification of what is not even an official theory of our Church polity ? For it must again be clearly emphasized that the fact that episcopal ordination has been exclusively required for our ministry since 1662 has not fastened on the Church the rigid Apostolical Succession theory of episcopacy. Such a view was not officially asserted at the time and was moreover in effect denied by the concurrent practice in the Scotch Church and by the proposal regarding the admission of foreign divines to our ministry made in the Comprehension Scheme formulated at the Jerusalem Chamber Conference in 1689. While we deplore the fact that the bitter political and controversial spirit of the day led to the enactment of this new rule in 1662, it is fairly evident that it denoted rather the culminating

triumph of episcopal over presbyterian government for the National Church than the condemnation of the validity of all but episcopal orders.

It is most important that we should not lose sight of the fact that the struggle for the previous eighty years had been between the protagonists of the divine right of presbytery as asserted in the first place by Cartwright, Travers and their followers and the divine right of prelacy as asserted by Bancroft, Laud and their followers. It was not, we must remember, a struggle for mutual toleration, as the medieval idea of " one State one religion " still tenaciously held the field, so that whichever side won no quarter would have been given to the vanquished. Had Presbytery been victorious, as it threatened to be early in the Civil War, it would have proscribed not only prelacy but the sectaries also. It would have set up a national Presbyterian Church *with no place at all for episcopacy.* We may safely say that the original English Presbyterians were far more rigid and intolerant in their views than their contemporary Elizabethan Churchmen. They regarded episcopacy as a positively unlawful and unscriptural form of government. This accounts for the clandestine and illegal devices pursued by Travers and men of his views, to obtain foreign Presbyterian Orders and then claim the protection of the statute of 1571 which permitted genuine foreign Reformed divines to minister in our churches with their existing Orders. Had the principles of these men spread more widely there is little doubt that they would have overthrown episcopacy in England altogether. With the knowledge, therefore, of these facts and the experience of the Commonwealth, with its harsh persecution and proscription of " Prelatists," behind them, it was not at all unnatural that the Restoration Churchmen, who still clung to the intolerant doctrine of one and only one form of religion for a nation, should want finally to safeguard this by allowing no exception whatever to the general rule of episcopal ordination. The stringent rule of 1662 was in the main a party triumph and denoted the end of the long-drawn-out battle between presbytery and prelacy in favour of the latter. It in no way involved a fresh theory of the exclusive value of episcopal government to safeguard the very being of a true Church and a valid sacrament. Had such a view been at all generally held at the time, not only would Presbyterian ministers in the revived sister episcopal Church of Scotland have been required

to be reordained, (which they were not,) but it is inconceivable that Convocation could have officially styled the foreign Presbyterian Churches in 1689 as "other Protestant *Churches*," or that the Jerusalem Chamber Conference proposals would have recommended the continuance of the practice which had obtained since the Reformation, of receiving these foreign divines to minister in England without reordination. We should also remember that the different and stricter line adopted towards the English Separatists was due not solely to the fact that most Caroline Churchmen regarded them as distinctly culpable and in a state of schism by wilfully rejecting episcopacy "where it could be had," but very largely also because they were regarded as "seditious" people disturbing the peace of the kingdom by attempting to frustrate the exclusive national form of Church government established by law.

"A zealous and impartial Protestant," a typical Restoration Churchman, writing in 1681 declared that "to strive for toleration is to contend against all government. It is not consistent with public peace and safety without a standing army; conventicles being eternal nurseries of sedition and rebellion. . . ." The cry of persecution was not, this representative Churchman affirmed, "so scandalous as anarchy, schism and eternal divisions and confusions both in Church and State," (quoted Hallam, *Hist. of England*, p. 721, note 1). In other words, Englishmen had no right to be anything but Episcopalians.

But the passing of the Toleration Act and the final overthrow of the medieval theory of exclusive national religions as well as the established position of nonconformist communities from two and a half centuries of history and progress have surely led them now to be regarded as sister churches analogous in standing to the foreign Reformed churches of the seventeenth century?

If, therefore, the Bishop of London's proposal for reordination, in a Reunion Scheme, with the entire Wesleyan Church should be conceded it would reverse the judgment and practice of our Reformers and their successors and would fasten on Evangelicals a yoke which neither our fathers nor we are able to bear. In spite of formal "Protestations" it would irrevocably fasten a particular theory of Episcopacy on the Church which even the Second Interim Report states is not now required to be held by any of her members. It would stereotype a rigid mechanical theory of the transmission of

grace which our Reformers deliberately repudiated and which our Church since then has more than once explicitly and implicitly denied. It would be almost impossible for Evangelicals ever again to declare that our Church held episcopacy as of the *bene esse* and not of the *esse* of a valid ministry, or to assert that a Sacrament administered by a non-episcopally ordained minister was of real, or, to use the most recent distinction, of "guaranteed" spiritual value and efficacy. It is one thing to insist that the Historic Episcopate must form the basis of a future reunited Church and quite another to require each separated non-episcopal Church by a definite and significant act to deny in advance the validity or "fully commissioned" effectiveness of its previous ministry before being welcomed into full fellowship with a reunited Episcopal Church. Dr. Forsyth's recent letter to the *Times* describing the suspicion engendered in the minds of many Free Churchmen that we are insisting on a "mere polity as vital to Church unity" because we hold that "that polity alone validates a kind of Sacrament which is a part of their call in the service of the Gospel to reject," should warn High Churchmen that some temporary surrender of their cherished convictions is absolutely essential not only to prove the sincerity of our desire, but if we are ever again to attain to a visible unity of the Church.

The War has taught us that the triumph of noble and righteous ideals can only be secured by the sacrifices of all classes of the community, and the same principle surely applies with regard to the grand ideal of recovering a reunited Christendom based on loyalty to its common Lord.

C. SYDNEY CARTER.

MONUMENTAL BRASSES.

By M. Adeline Boulter-Cooke.

UNIVERSAL as was the use of monumental brasses in Europe, England is particularly fortunate in the number which have been preserved to the present day, and which are of the greatest historical value and form authentic records of heraldry, arms and costumes of the period. Belgium, it is true, possesses—or possessed—some excellent specimens; two cathedrals contain some of the finest that Germany has to offer; French brasses were entirely destroyed during the reign of Terror, so that the four thousand and more which still remain in our country naturally gain an added interest and can scarcely be thought of too highly. It is curious, therefore, that despite their wide popularity, the metal or latten, as it was called, had to be obtained from the Continent up to about 1649, and the cost of procuring it and difficulty of transport very probably originated the difference between the style of the Flemish and the English brass since the latter was more sparing with the use of the precious metal.

Flemish brasses, of which there are some in England, are distinguished by having a background to the figure filled in with scroll work or elaborate designs, the lines being broad and shallow and cut with a flat, chisel-like tool.

In English brasses, with which, of course, we are all familiar, the figures are cut out in separate pieces and let into indents or matrices of corresponding form sunk to receive them in the face of the slab which constitutes the background. Perhaps the brass which best instances the divergence between the Continental and English method is the one at Constance, which commemorates Hallam, Bishop of Salisbury, who died in 1416 while attending the Council.

The early brasses are the most excellent and show masterly ability, simplicity and boldness of original treatment. The attempts at shading which were afterwards introduced deteriorated the plates, and when sheet brass was manufactured in England and easily obtainable, although the number of brasses increased exceedingly, they lack both execution and interest and thus declined in artistic value. Heraldic accessories such as coats of arms were

sometimes embellished with enamel, and this is seen in the earliest known brass in our country, the far-famed one of Sir John D'Aubernon, who died in 1277.

It is to be regretted that it was not the custom for the craftsman who designed and executed the work to sign it with his name or a mark, as considerable interest would have been derived in the same manner that the marks of founders on bells and masons' marks give rise to details concerned with the men who practised these arts. An avenue of thought and exploration is thus closed, and we know next to nothing about those who laboured so patiently upon the brasses which exist in all their perfection of detail and design at the present day. And where they have perished it has not been the fault of the original workers, but neglect, thoughtlessness or greed for the commercial value of the metal. There are, however, a few examples where the name has been engraved on the brass, and at Evreux in Normandy a brass is signed " Guillaume de Plalli me fecit."

Inscriptions on brasses are wonderfully fascinating but difficult, inasmuch as they vary considerably and time and practice is necessary to decipher them. The characters are either Lombardic or Longobardic, single letters placed in specially cut indents in the slab and arranged so as to form a border, or black letters of which there are two kinds. Inscribed strips of latten are placed in a variety of positions, some of which impart a peculiar effect especially when starting in curves from the throat or head or in strips held in the hand. They are usually in French or Latin and give the name of the person represented by the brass, a prayer that the departed soul may enjoy repose, or the simple words, " Jesu, Mercy."

Another very interesting peculiarity about brasses is the fact that some of them have been found to be graven on both sides. Two circumstances probably gave rise to this curious custom.

During the spoliation of monastic houses in the reign of Henry VIII numbers of brasses were reft from the position they had occupied for years, were engraved on the reverse side, and appropriated to memoralize some other person. Stories have been related about prosperous but mean-minded individuals who felt they were doing a good bargain in securing a brass of this description which naturally cost much less money than an entirely fresh plate. Sometimes, however, when, perhaps, the person was not very particular, the

inscription plates have been removed and reinscribed, or the person who desired a memorial in brass at the smallest cost had certain alterations effected by shading so as to bring it up to date and make his little world believe it to be an entirely new representation. Interesting as many of these palimpsests are, they throw much light on the doubtful practices of that period.

Very often sums of money were bequeathed by will to provide for suitable brasses, and although the greater number represent personages of exalted rank and wealth, high-born knights and their ladies, abbots and ecclesiastics, yet when the merchant princes increased in opulence they saw to it that they were also commemmorated in like manner although they did not disdain the signs of their trade, for instance, a sheep or a ram denoting a popular woolstapler. However, the merchants did more than arrange for the execution of brasses, for they left nobler memorials to succeeding generations in the stately churches which they either built or re-edified. Many of these are to be found in the Cotswold Country, where the famous wool made many fortunes. The beautiful church at Northleach probably surpasses all others in brasses to wool merchants which include the Forteys, who were benefactors to the church. John Fortey has one foot on a woolpack and another on a sheep; in the Busshe brass the sheep or ram has curling horns. An early fifteenth century brass at Chipping Campden represents William and Marion Greviel, and Chipping Norton also possesses some examples commemorating woolstaplers.

Although the most fascinating brasses represent figures, yet there are many which are simply engraved with crosses treated and ornamented in diverse ways. Some have figures within the crosshead, and an excellent example of this description is the fourteenth century brass of an ecclesiastic in Merton College Chapel; others merely show the Latin cross, or perhaps there is a symbol or a saint at the head. Another different form is the bracket with tall shafts, or figures standing in a bracket covered with canopies.

The size of brasses varies very considerably, and sometimes only half the figure is engraved; often they are of quite small dimensions, or they may be of considerable importance. The brasses commemorating persons of rank placed on superb "altar tombs" are naturally of great extent, while others—like the celebrated brass at Cowfold—are some ten feet in length and occupy the floor of the central aisle.

This is usually considered the finest brass in Sussex, although local tradition claims this distinction for the fine fifteenth century brass to Sir William Fiennes at Herstmonceaux.

The Cowfold brass represents Thomas Nelond, Prior of the Cluniac monastery of St. Pancras at Lewes, who died on April 18, 1429. He is habited as a Cluniac monk and stands under a Gothic canopy above which the Virgin and Child are seated beneath another canopy. St. Pancras and St. Thomas à Becket are also portrayed on this splendid brass. Like many celebrated brasses this is now most carefully covered, secured and padlocked, and it is impossible to view the saintly Prior who reposes underneath the carpet amid some dust without having resort to the custodian. Somehow such usage appears to be a mistake. People do not mutilate brasses like monuments by cutting their initials, and if time is an object it is most annoying to be compelled to attend upon the slow methods of vergers.

Sussex brasses are deservedly renowned, and both the Grinsteads contain interesting examples. When St. Swithun's church at East Grinstead was destroyed by fire in 1785 the brass of Sir T. Grey and R. Lewkener, of Brambletye, who were successively wedded to Catherine, daughter of Lord Scales, was removed from the ruins and replaced when the edifice was rebuilt. Catherine and her second husband had been great benefactors to the church, and the inscription on the brass, although some of the words are undecipherable, is so quaint and also so expressive of the ideas of the period that it is worth recording.

"Here under this marbille stone lyeth Dame Kateryne Grey, daughter of Thomas Wintyne lorde Scalis, wiff to Sir Thomas Grey Knyght and banneret and after wiff unto the honourable Esquyer Richard Lewkener the elder of Brambilletey and one of the ladys to Quene Elizabeth of blessid memory wiff of Edward the III and afterwards to quene Elizabeth wiff unto oure sofferyne lorde Kynge Henry the VII the wiche passe oute of this transitory worlde the IX day of June the yere of oure blessid lord God MCCCCCV and the same Dame Katheryne and Richard her husbande have founded—this present church—to the laude and honour of God—and a almshouse of III parsons on whose soulis Jhesus by Thy bitter passion have on them Thy marcyfulle compassion. Amen."

The best thirteenth century brass is that of Sir Roger de Trumpington, 1290, who accompanied Prince Edward to Palestine and is represented crosslegged. Fourteenth and fifteenth century brasses are particularly interesting, and in the latter century attained the

highest excellence both for design and execution, a very good specimen being the fine brass of Eleanor Bohun, Duchess of Gloucester. Another fine example is the brass of Robert Stanton, 1458, garbed in plate armour.

Brasses are, of course, specially valuable, not only from the representation of knights, ladies, ecclesiastics and merchants, but because they furnish authentic records of contemporary arms, costume and heraldry. The study of costume alone is sufficiently interesting, and although it cannot be considered that we perceive *portraits* of those commemorated, yet there is enough divergence for imagination to be let loose regarding their characters and their lives.

The little village of Stoke Charity possesses some good specimens of diverse kinds, and the brass of Thomas Wayte, who died on April 10, 1482, shows a special feature which is not commonly met with. It is a representation of Christ issuing from the tomb, which is made to appear quite like the raised altar tomb of the period; the hands of the emaciated Figure are crossed and the head, circled by a nimbus, is slightly bent. The slab, as is often the case, bears the family shield beside the name and a label inscribed " Jesu fili Dei miserere mei."

A large monument in the same church with brasses to Thomas Hampton and his wife Isabella, who died respectively in 1483 and 1475, is very characteristic of the manner in which the entire family were included in the memorial. Below the representation of the parents are engraved their two sons in loose robes and hands in the customary position of prayer, and six daughters all so exceedingly alike each other that the same " portrait " must certainly have been made to do duty for them all. Very likely, however, these long-necked ladies did not in the least resemble the Hampton damsels, four of whom we know were wedded, for panels on the side of the tomb contain heraldic shields of the houses into which they married. Is there not also a story that brass engravers kept sons and daughters to a certain recognized pattern to be cut off as required!

Whitchurch also boasts of a fine brass, now screwed to the wall, which includes a large family; but this is of much later date and therefore the costume is different and more becoming, for it need not be said that a ruff is particularly charming in brass.

The earliest brasses commemorating women are the celebrated

ones of Lady Camoys and Lady Joan Cobham. The costume of the period is followed more or less, loose tunics, wimples and veils; but the hair is sometimes worn free, or parted and plaited, or braided, or worn in nets as fashion decreed. Curious hats are worn by ladies of the Elizabethan period in conjunction with the ubiquitous ruff of the time and a species of close coif which is somewhat becoming.

Brasses to ecclesiastics are very frequent and are of considerable interest and value. Priests are frequently represented holding a Chalice, of which there is a good example at St. Peter's, Bristol. St. Cross possesses a very early example, which shows a priest wearing a cope.

A feature which almost all brasses possess in common is the position of the hands, which are invariably folded in prayer, and although the same attitude occurs over and over again it never fails to be appropriate. Almost it seems a pity that the custom of thus memoralizing the departed has practically died out, for though some modern brasses exist the modern spirit seems attracted for the most part by more material methods of remembrance. Who can say in this hard-headed century whether a larger vision has or has not been thus attained!

M. ADELINE BOULTER-COOKE.

DR. BARNARDO'S HOMES.

It is a pleasure to call attention to the fifty-third Annual Report of this splendid institution, just issued under the appropriate title "For God and Country." It gives a strikingly vivid and interesting account of the year's work on behalf of the destitute children of our country, and of the blessing which God has vouchsafed to the efforts of the workers. The Council state at the outset that they desire to sound the note of gratitude and praise. The work has moved steadily forward during 1918. A fine spirit has inspired the staff. The health and happiness of the children have been almost miraculous when the untoward conditions from which most of them come are remembered. With a deepening conviction the Council believe that in so far as their efforts have been put forward in the spirit of the Master, they have been unfailing as ever in their redemptive power.

The Great War has thrown upon Dr. Barnardo's Homes an unprecedented task. They received during the four and a half years of the conflict 2,220 babies and young children, whose fathers in most cases either had been killed or were fighting at the Front. The 7,131 children to-day in the care of the institution would scarcely have had a chance to become useful and noble citizens had not the Barnardo Homes reached out a hand and led them along the better way. We commend the work of the Homes to readers of the CHURCHMAN. For many years they have supported it by their prayers and their gifts. Having regard, however, to the enormous increase in the cost of living, the need of financial help is greater than ever.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. LUKE.

CHRISTIANITY ACCORDING TO ST. LUKE. By the Rev. S. C. Carpenter, B.D. London: *S.P.C.K.* 10*s.* 6*d.*

Mr. Carpenter has given us a valuable study of the Third Gospel. He has read wisely and widely and is steeped in its contents. He realizes that we must see events through the eyes of contemporaries and that knowledge of the environment in which our Lord lived is essential for a full comprehension of the teaching that transformed the world. He also lays stress upon the fact that St. Luke wrote as a Churchman for members of the Church. That is quite true, but we think that Mr. Carpenter reads into first-century Churchmanship a great deal of present day Churchmanship which has an atmosphere that is in many respects different from that of the age of St. Luke. Many will be surprised that he carries his ideas of the place occupied by the Bible in the Church so far as to write, "Christian instruction is always given in the first instance by some representative of the Church. The attempt to produce conversions to Christianity by distributing copies of the Bible or even of the Gospels is mistaken. I do not at all assert that it is a useless or mischievous thing to do. But it is not an adequate method of producing conversions." It is assuredly true that the Apostles did not circulate the New Testament, but it is more than conceivable that men of the Apostolic outlook living in the twentieth century would gladly seize upon the opportunity of circulating the Scriptures as the best means of leading men to the knowledge of the Saviour. Many have in our day been led to Christ by reading the Word, and if they are immature Christians the same may be said of many who have been brought up in surroundings where the direct appeal of the Bible to the heart is discounted.

When we leave on one side this point of view we have nothing but praise for an excellent and independent study of the Third Gospel. Mr. Carpenter is fully alive to the connection between St. Paul and St. Luke; he is not a writer who seeks success by ill-founded novelty, and he gives us an outline of the various tendencies that combined in making St. Luke the man he was. He wisely says that the evidence that St. Paul considered Christianity as one of the mysteries is very slight, and he truly expounds 1 Corinthians x. 14–22: "What your mysteries profess to do, the Breaking of the Bread really does." In dealing with the Eschatological background our author shows the importance of the close relationship between St. Paul and his physician. In fact we learn from Mr. Carpenter the value of the Pauline outlook as an aid to the interpretation of St. Luke's writings.

This book is not a commentary—it is more elucidating however than most commentaries, for it deals with, as it were, the landscapes as distinct from the flower-beds of the Gospel. Here is a passage typical of many: "As a painter of portraits St. Luke excels. His short pen-pictures of Zaccharias, the Virgin Mother, Martha and Mary, Zacchaeus, and the repentant robber are masterly, and though it is St. Mark whose Gospel is supposed to contain the recollections of St. Peter, and St. Matthew who is commonly said to have had access to a special Petrine source, yet it is from St. Luke that we have these three penetrating touches that make St. Peter seem to us the most human of the Apostles (Luke v. 8, xxii. 31, 32, and xxii. 61). Finally, to his description of the 'woes' upon the scribes or lawyers which he has in common with

St. Matthew, St. Luke adds the dramatic touch: 'Ye have taken away the key of knowledge' (xi. 52)."

We cordially commend the sober exegesis and historical insight of the work of the Evangelist whose reputation for accuracy has been re-established in our time. Mr. Carpenter gives us careful summaries of the conclusions of English and foreign writers, and may be trusted in his presentation of their opinions. His *obiter dicta* are often very shrewd, and he has the gift of illuminating an argument by the assertion of something that is at once novel and self-evident. Is there not great force in the statement that our Lord "has created incidentally and almost casually, in the course of His redeeming of man's soul—the only true democracy that is ever likely to exist"? There are many such passages that pull the reader up, force him to think and send him on his reading with new ideas.

THE ATONEMENT.

THE ATONEMENT AND OURSELVES. By P. L. Snowden, Vicar of Hepworth. London: *S.P.C.K.* 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

The war has brought the doctrine of the Atonement into prominence. Before 1914 the tendency of writers and preachers was to shrink from the message of the Cross, and critics fastened on the contrast between the doctrine of the Atonement and the teaching of modern civilisation that showed clearly the upward march of humanity from the time of the "fall upward." We no longer dwell in the days of human content with humanity. We now know that human nature remains what it always was and that unless we are freed from the guilt and power of sin and helped to overcome temptation we cannot attain the goal of our aspirations. The need of redemption is being felt, and the study of the New Testament teaching on this question has taken possession of many of our best theological thinkers. "*Via Crucis—Via Crucis*" has once more become a prominent feature in the pulpits and in the thoughts of our people.

Mr. Snowden has written a war book. During his war work he had opportunities for meditation apart from books. The fruit of his thought is given in an exposition of the Atonement as a vindication of the holiness of God. He says: "In recent years the Church has shrunk from adequate presentation of God's justice, because, being unable to show how such claims could be satisfied. It was felt to amount to a religion of despair. As a result of this failure both the fear and the love of God have been dying out in the world, for experience proves that a person cannot be deeply loved unless his character is one which on due occasion calls for fear also." He holds that Divine Justice occupies a fundamental place in the New Testament, and that oneness with Christ is the note that should be sounded by all Christian teachers as the solution to the troubles of our day and the forerunner of the longed-for revival of religion.

Briefly the argument sustained is that the New Testament takes up the theology of the Old Testament which stresses the retributory attitude of God towards sin. It lays down that Christ was our ransom and our sacrifice, and this means that He paid the price of human sin by suffering the penalty demanded by Divine Holiness. "The history of the Atonement itself, from the beginning up to recent times—when an effort is made to explain this view away—proves that it is the original and powerful idea conveyed by this teaching: and some of the evidence to be adduced in favour of the view that, in the first instance, sin calls for divine retribution, and not

only penitence, is of the most authoritative nature." He then discusses the well-known passages on which this view rests.

We are glad to have so honest and fearless a presentation of one view of the Atonement—a view that cannot be explained away from the pages of Scripture. Mr. Snowden rightly thinks that salvation is not to be found in any system of thought or practice, but only " in union with the Personality or our Lord—His life and death. That is our religion, our Gospel. Christianity needs to be rebuilt upon the Cross of Christ." We agree, and whatever form the movement towards a revival of Apostolic Christianity may take, we are assured, if it is to be successful, it must be centred in the Cross. No Christian religious movement has ever left a permanent mark upon the thought of its time unless it proclaimed Christ Crucified. It was so in the beginning ; the influence of the great medievalists in so far as it was spiritual centred on the Cross ; the Reformation had the secret of its power in justification by personal faith in a crucified and living Saviour ; the Evangelical fathers preached the Cross ; and the work of Keble and Newman would not have forced its way had it not laid emphasis upon the Sacrifice for Sin in the death of our Lord. As long as we place the Cross in the background of the Gospel we cannot hope for revival—when the Cross regains its place Christianity will move forward, and we thank Mr. Snowden for a well-thought-out argument that cannot fail to impress deeply all who follow it Bible in hand to verify quotations.

S.P.C.K. VOLUMES.

THE INSPIRATION AND AUTHORITY OF HOLY SCRIPTURE. By G. D. Barry. 4*s.* 6*d.*

THE EARLY CHRISTIAN BOOKS. By W. J. Ferrar. 3*s.* 6*d.*

THE CREEDS AND MODERN THOUGHT. By C. Harris. 2*s.*

PHILOSOPHIC THOUGHT AND RELIGION. By D. A. Jones. 2*s.*

We have become so accustomed to well-printed and delightfully bound volumes from S.P.C.K. that we are inclined to forget the thought and labour involved in their production. We no longer expect dingy unattractiveness to characterize Theological Works. " The Handbooks of Christian Literature " have been enriched by the issue of the excellent works by Mr. Barry and Mr. Ferrar. Both books are needed, and we are glad to say they satisfy the need. We know no other volume that gives so concise and accurate an account of the place of Holy Scripture in the early Church, and we believe that no one can read it without feeling that the current disparagement of the Bible is a reversal of the testimony of the Apostolic and Primitive Church. Mr. Ferrar's admirable summary of the teaching of the Apostolic Fathers and other early Christian writings is lucid and accurate. We thank him for his inclusion of the so-called Odes of Solomon, although they do not fall into the period of this book.

Mr. D. A. Jones is rather thin in his discussion of the attitude of philosophic thought towards religion. He does not tell us enough, and somehow we have no definite impressions left on our mind. It has a number of pointed sentences which convince us the author could teach us much, but we do not believe any man in so short a space could accomplish what Mr. Jones sets out to perform.

On the other hand, Dr. Harris, by confining himself to the definite point that the Creeds are compatible with a developing theology, satisfies our minds and leaves us clearly under the conviction that a reconstruction of Christianity that rejects the statements of fact made in the Creeds cannot be considered the Christianity of Christ and His Apostles. We hope that his argument will receive the attention it deserves.

LITURGICAL COLOURS.

ENGLISH LITURGICAL COLOURS. By Sir William St. John Hope and E. C. Cuthbert F. Atchley. *S.P.C.K.* 25*s.* net.

This volume is a monument of industry and a mine of information upon the subject of the colours of the different vestments, " altar " hangings, and similar decorations of English Churches and Cathedrals, compiled from such inventories, registers, wills, and other sources of knowledge as have survived the ravages of time and the carelessness or enmity of men. The general result of the inquiry is that in respect of colour there was no hard and fast rule, for the simple reason that large numbers of parishes were poor, and consequently had to make use of what they could get. As the writers of this book say (p. 7), " In considering any usage of colours it is necessary to point out how much depends in the first place upon the wealth or poverty of a church and the number and quality of its goods. A church with many ornaments may easily follow a colour rule, but one with few must adapt itself to circumstances." To the same effect we find (p. 108), " The colour for funerals, obits, requiem mass, etc., was generally *black* according to the rules. Wills and inventories tell the same story, but they also furnish a number of variants which show that there was no such thing as uniformity." Nor do we see much reason why there should be. It is largely a matter of common sense and of taste, and the means to gratify it. Elaborate ornamentation with frequent changes, and rigid rules governing both, tend to fussiness over points which have no real importance, and draw away the attention from what really matters. As a historical record this book is of considerable interest, and as such it appeals to us, but for practical purposes in present-day use it leaves us cold. It is well furnished with appendices, bibliography and index, and the publishing department of the *S.P.C.K.* deserve great credit for the sumptuous form in which it is produced.

THE BLESSED SACRAMENT.

THE BLESSED SACRAMENT. By Preb. H. P. Denison, B.A. *Robert Scott.* 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

A curious book issued in connection with the Benediction controversy, and quite characteristic of the so-called " Catholic " mind. Every one else is wrong and always has been. We read of the " furious opposition of the Bishops "; of " well-worn Protestant clap-trap "; that the great bulk of English Church-people " have not got the intelligence either of the disciples or of the heretics," and more to the same effect. It will no doubt suit those who like this kind of thing, but it will neither conciliate nor convince opponents, and in general it suggests the probable weakness of a case so advocated. High Church-people fare as badly at Mr. Denison's hands as Protestants or Bishops do ; and it is interesting to have from such a quarter an attack upon the term " Real Presence " as commonly used. He reminds us that the word " Presence," as applied to the Sacrament, is " neither scriptural nor liturgical," and in this he is right: the advocates of the " Real Presence " have as many difficulties to face as those who, like the author, uphold Transubstantiation. He speaks of them as " creeping round and evading the truth of the word ' is ' and saying that the Body of Christ is ' present in ' the Sacrament ; whereas our Lord simply says that the Sacrament ' is ' His Body." The bulk of the book consists of a confused and contradictory attempt to show how the literal interpretation of " This *is* my body " leads us to Transubstantiation, but, unfortunately for the argument, the literal interpretation gets lost on the way.

W. G. J.

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

82 VICTORIA STREET, S.W.1.

LAST month mention was made in these Notes of a series of Confirmation leaflets and pamphlets which are published and recommended by the Church Book Room. In addition to these, arrangements have been made for the immediate issue of a pamphlet and two leaflets by the Rev. C. H. K. Boughton, B.D., Vicar of Calverley and Diocesan Inspector of Schools in Bradford. The manual is entitled *The Faith of a Churchman*, and consists of notes of teaching to be given at Confirmation Classes. These notes are intended as a basis for the class leader's instruction, and can be put into the hands of the candidates either during or at the close of the classes. The notes are clear and very helpful, and are arranged under the following headings:—The Meaning of Confirmation; The Christian Covenant; The Privileges of the Covenant; The Duties of the Covenant—Renunciation, Faith, Obedience; The Fulfilment of the Covenant—Prayer, Bible Reading, Public Worship, Sacraments; Baptism; Baptism and Confirmation; Holy Communion; Some Counsels to Communicants; The Challenge of Confirmation. The manual will be published at 2*d.* or 14*s.* per 100 net. *Will you join the Senior Division?* is a leaflet meant for distribution in church and elsewhere before Confirmation classes commence. It is written attractively and is an invitation to come forward for Confirmation. The second leaflet, *The Race of Life*, is intended for distribution after the Confirmation day is over. These leaflets are published at 9*d.* net a dozen, or 4*s.* per 100.

Confirmation.

Those who know the writings of Lieut.-Colonel Seton Churchill will welcome two pamphlets which have recently been written by him. One entitled *Is there a Prayer-Answering God? Lessons from the late Great War*, is being published by the Church Book Room at 2*d.* net or 15*s.* per 100 net. This pamphlet is suggestive and will be found of considerable service at the present time, when reconstruction is so much in the air. It is written in Col. Seton Churchill's usual clear and convincing style. The second pamphlet, *Brave Women of Great Britain*, is also published at 2*d.* net. It is dedicated to the memory of the brave men who have died for their country, leaving sorrowing hearts behind them. The Workers' Paper of the Mothers' Union says of it that "it might well be read aloud at women's gatherings, for the praise it so gallantly bestows is of a stimulating character which should raise every woman to make renewed effort to deserve it."

Is there a Prayer-Answering God?

In view of the importance of the efficiency of Sunday School teachers, a little pamphlet entitled *Points for Sunday School Teachers*, by the Rev. H. E. Duncan, 1*d.* or 10*d.* per dozen, post free, will be found exceedingly useful for distribution amongst the teachers now. Mr. Duncan has given considerable attention to Sunday School work, and has written several lesson books, which have been found of great value. This little manual is concise, and although to the experienced Sunday School teacher many of the points may seem to be a little too obvious, to the inexperienced or young teacher they will be found of real help.

Sunday Schools Advent 1919.

Sunday School Lesson Books.

Two lesson books by the Rev. C. R. Balleine have just been republished in response to many requests—*The Young Churchman* and *Children of the Church*. The first-named book contains fifty-two lessons for the Sundays of the Church's year for the school or home. Mr. Balleine in his Foreword gives a very good illustration which explains the purpose which he had in view all through the book—" In one of his Indian campaigns an English officer said to a native soldier, ' How is it that when you fight under our command you fight well; and yet when you fight under your own people you are not half so brave ? ' Said the native, ' Because when our officers tell us to charge they say " Go," but you always say " Follow ! " ' It is the difference between *leading* and *directing*. Now in the following series of Lessons on Church Life and Worship our aim is to give every young Churchman just that knowledge of his Church which too often is ' taken for granted.' But if you are to teach a boy, or girl, to be an enthusiastic, loyal, and devoted member of the Church you yourself must know the romantic history of which the grey walls and weathered towers and steeples speak so eloquently. You must know why Pulpit and Lectern, Font and Holy Table, are to be found bearing witness to mighty truths. And if you are an average Churchman you must know *that you do not know*." The second lesson book, the *Children of the Church*, contains a year's lessons on the Church Catechism. The book is attractively written and will interest children in the Church Catechism better than any other lesson book which we have seen. Mr. Balleine has made use of many anecdotes, and a possible criticism is that the lessons consist too largely of stories, but no teacher need use more of these than he or she thinks helpful. The idea of the author throughout has been constantly to remind all those who use the book that if they would retain the interest of their children, they must illustrate the brief statements of the Catechism again and again. For instance, instead of speaking of " the necessity of Renunciation," stories of men who did give up things they desired will bring the idea more vividly before the children. The book is adaptable to the age and capacity of various classes. We cannot refrain from giving one abstract from the Foreword of this book which will, we think, be of interest. " How shall we teach the Catechism ? A humorous paper recently recorded this dialogue. Lady (engaging a nurse), ' Have you had any experience of children ? ' Applicant, ' Shure, mam, but I used to be a child myself once.' "

The Church Assembly.

Now that it is practically certain that the Enabling Bill will pass into law within the next few weeks, the Archbishops of Canterbury and York have issued a letter to the Diocesan Bishops asking them to instruct their clergy to proceed at once with the compilation of the constitution of the new Church Assembly under the Rules for the representation of the laity passed by the Representative Church Council in February last. A very clear explanation of these Rules has been compiled under the title of *The Ladder of Lay Representation in the Councils of the Church of England: How it may be climbed*, by Mr. Albert Mitchell, a member of the House of Laymen, and is obtainable from the Church Book Room. Single copies are sent free on application, and quantities are supplied at the rate of 2s. per 100.

CORRECTION.—Unfortunately last month a mistake was made in the prices of the leaflets *Benediction*, *The Power of the Presence and its Relation to the Holy Communion*, and *Holy Baptism*. In each case the price should have been 2*d*. net or 10s. per 100.