

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

August, 1920.

THE MONTH.

Anglo-Catholics in Conference. THE Anglo-Catholic Congress has come and gone, and has left the Church unmoved. Great things were expected of it; it was to explain what Anglo-Catholics are out for; it was to convince the bishops of the Lambeth Conference that the Anglo-Catholic movement must be reckoned with; and it was to do a hundred and one other things in support of the Anglo-Catholic position. But, in fact, it has accomplished very little; it wholly failed to capture the imagination of Churchmen; it told us very little we did not know before of the aims of the party; and we believe we are correct in saying that, in regard to some at least of the bishops, its proceedings provoked mild amusement rather than anything else. So far as the Congress set itself to vindicate the Christian faith against the attacks of Modernism, we could watch its proceedings with interest and sympathy, although the description given by one speaker of the Bible as "that volume of rustic Semitic folk-lore" seemed strangely out of place in such an assembly. We can and do admire the zeal displayed for foreign missions, when men and women in response to impassioned appeals gave not only money but also emptied their jewels into the collecting plate, with the result that more than £25,000 of the £50,000 asked for was subscribed. Hitherto the interest of Anglo-Catholics has not been markedly shown in the sums contributed to foreign missions, and we hail with delight this new departure. But concerning the doctrinal position of Anglo-Catholicism and the insistence upon a ritual (e.g., at the celebration of "High Mass") which, like the doctrine it represents, is wholly alien from the teaching of the Church of England, we can only say that the Church will have none of it. The attempt to undo the work of the Reformation can never be tolerated. It had been proposed

that the Congress should be answered by a counter-demonstration, but wiser counsels prevailed. It is not by demonstrations that the truth is forwarded, but rather by quiet, patient, plodding work. The nature and extent of the Romeward drift is now generally acknowledged, and it is for Evangelical and other loyal Churchmen to counteract it by clear, definite and steady teaching in their parishes and elsewhere as opportunity may offer. Anglo-Catholicism will have no chance with well-instructed Churchmen.

It is good to note the widespread interest taken in the gathering of bishops for the Lambeth Conference.

As a mere historical event an assembly of nearly 300 bishops from all parts of the habitable world is of great significance, showing as it does how far-reaching is the influence of the Anglican Communion. But it is not in appeals to the imagination that the chief importance of this great gathering consists. The assembled bishops have before them for discussion some of the gravest problems which are agitating the mind of the Church at the present time, and the resolutions of the Conference in regard to these are being awaited with anxious interest. Pre-eminent among such questions is that of Reunion, upon which the Church, not only at home but in the mission field, is looking to the Lambeth Conference for wise guidance and strong leadership. It is not necessary in these pages to restate the nature of the issues at stake. The papers read at the Cheltenham Conference which appeared in our last number, taken together, presented a wide conspectus of the Reunion problem such as is to be found nowhere else, and it is difficult usefully to add anything to what was there set forth. Indeed, there is a strong feeling in many quarters that the time for talking and writing has passed and that the hour for action has struck. Whether action is possible, and, if so, of what nature it should be, must depend very largely upon the decision of the Lambeth Conference. We cannot believe that the bishops will be indifferent to the strong and earnest pleas, which come from so many quarters, that some plans may be devised by which those Christian Churches which have so much in common may be able to practise true Christian fellowship one with another as a step forward towards the much-desired goal of a fully-united Christian Church. On the contrary, we believe they will view them with sympathy, but, to be

of any real value, sympathy must be translated into action, and action will depend upon how far the bishops may feel able to go forward from the position they took up in 1908. The difficulties are many, and there are enemies not a few, but we earnestly hope that the outcome of the Lambeth Conference—the object of so many prayers—will be a real advance towards intercommunion and fellowship between all who love the Lord Jesus Christ.

We congratulate the Bishop of Manchester upon **The Bishop's Triumph.** the triumph he has won in the action brought against him by the patron of the Sacred Trinity, Salford. Sir J. Gore-Booth, having presented to that living a clergyman whom the Bishop did not think was (in the legal phrase) "a fit and proper person," his lordship' refused to institute him, and the patron began a suit of *quare impedit*. The case was heard before Mr. Justice Coleridge, and counsel for the Bishop urged the grounds upon which it was held that the patron's nominee was not "a fit and proper person." It was alleged—and indeed, was not denied—that in his present cure the clergyman used vestments, incense and lights, and reserved the Sacrament, and refused to give an undertaking not to introduce such practices at the Salford church. These practices being illegal, it was argued that they constituted a valid ground for refusal to institute. Mr. Justice Coleridge upheld the Bishop's contention, and dismissed the action with costs. The plaintiff gave notice of appeal, but two days before the appeal was in the list for hearing his solicitors gave notice that he would not proceed with the appeal, for the reason that the Bishop had given notice of his intention to collate a clergyman whom the patron regarded as quite satisfactory, and that therefore his object in bringing the action was attained. This statement was made in court on July 16, and his counsel said that as he was instructed not to argue the appeal, he must consent to its being dismissed. Counsel for the Bishop expressed the surprise with which his clients had heard of the decision not to proceed with the appeal, explained that the clergyman whom the Bishop proposed to collate had not engaged, nor had he any reason to suppose he would engage, in the practices admitted by the patron's nominee, and asked that the appeal be dismissed with costs. The court, consisting of three judges, accordingly dismissed the appeal with

costs. It is not necessary to examine too closely the reasons given for abandoning the appeal; more to the point is it to emphasize the fact that the English Church Union—the power behind the plaintiff in this case—has hesitated to face the Court of Appeal on the question whether or not a bishop has the right to refuse to institute a presentee who is known to have practised illegalities and refuses to give an undertaking not to do so in the parish to which he is presented. According to Mr. Justice Coleridge—who followed well-established decisions—a bishop is entitled so to refuse, and the Bishop of Manchester deserves the thanks of all loyal Churchmen for vindicating this position. It now remains to be seen whether other bishops will be equally courageous and say “No” definitely and decisively to any patron who presents for institution a clergyman who is known to be guilty of illegalities.

**National
Church
Assembly.** Evangelical Churchmen have no reason to be dissatisfied with the general result of the elections to the House of Laity in the National Church Assembly.

It is much to be regretted that, in the London diocese, a few of the candidates who have rendered the Church splendid service in the past failed to secure election, and they will be very greatly missed. But, taking the country as a whole, it may safely be said that Evangelical and Moderate Churchmen have been returned in large numbers, and that they will make their influence felt in the new Assembly, which has held its first session, and the tone of the proceedings was admirable. Several Committees were appointed, and one at least—that charged with the preparation of the Parochial Church Councils Bill—has already begun its work in real earnest. The question is one of some complexity, but there is reason to believe that in the result a measure will be produced which will give real power to the Councils.



SOME LATTER-DAY HERESIES.

IV. MODERN THEOSOPHY.

BY THE REV. W. ST. CLAIR TISDALL, D.D., Vicar of St. George's, Deal.

THE wise man of old said of his own day and generation :
 "There is no new thing under the sun" (Eccles. i. 9). Our modern discoveries and investigations, in spite of our supposed progress in many matters, lead us sometimes to fancy that his words apply in some things even to our own times. Does the tale of the ill-fated Icarus imply that Crete, that mysterious isle, had, thousands of years ago, her airmen? Must not the crane have been used in building Mycenæ, Stonehenge, and even the Pyramids, in spite of Herodotus? We cannot answer with certainty; but this we know that all our latter-day heresies bear such a striking resemblance to age-old errors, long since confuted and believed outgrown, that to meet them it is hardly necessary to do more than to put into modern shape and phrase what the early defenders of the Faith said and wrote long years ago. The revival in our own time of outworn ideas under the guise of new discoveries is due to more causes than one, but one is that among us, as in Athens in St. Paul's time, there are many who "have leisure for nothing else but either to tell or to hear some new thing"—or at least something they imagine to have the charm of novelty. Hence, through want of moral earnestness and desire to know the Truth that they may do it, they are "ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge" of the one thing needful.

There is now prevalent in certain circles a weird system of pseudo-philosophy known as Theosophy, a term which ought to mean "Divine Wisdom," but which has about as much right to this misnomer as "Christian Science" or "The Holy Roman Empire" have to their respective appellations. It is a clear case of *lucus a non lucendo*. It claims considerable antiquity and therefore assumes the name of an ancient system of philosophy with which it has little in common. Some of the errors and absurdities of that effete system it has, it must be confessed, endeavoured to revive, but in essentials its errors are more modern. What is to-day styled

Theosophy is in the main of recent origin. Yet it already possesses a considerable literature in various modern languages, and no inconsiderable number of adherents. Its aim is the ambitious one of supplanting Christianity everywhere. Its motto is: "There is no religion higher than the Truth," which is, of course, a platitude. The claim which it makes to have anticipated many of the discoveries of modern science are based upon the pretence that in its teachings it is the lineal inheritor of the old-time theosophists, Photinus and his followers. By cleverly perverting their rather enigmatical utterances, and making them mean what they cannot possibly signify, the modern system gives plausibility to its assertions, at least in the opinion of the half educated and the credulous. It professes to reveal not only the future destiny of mankind but also to disclose much of the lost history of the past. Moreover it asserts that it has removed the fear of death, the torments of remorse, the terrors of an awakened conscience, and belief in God, in the Christian sense of this great word. It affirms that its self-appointed hierophants receive instruction in mysterious ways from beings vastly superior to man, and that such instruction is of very great value to the human race at large. These are lofty demands to make upon our credulity. It is only fair to examine the evidence which is adduced to support them, for the Christian principle is, "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." Hence we proceed to inquire into the history and the chief tenets of modern theosophy, and then to draw the inevitable conclusion as to the truth of its claims.

I. HISTORY.

Modern theosophy originated with a Russian adventuress, Madame Blavatsky, and an American called Col. Olcott, whose reputation does not stand very high. The Theosophic Society was founded in New York in 1875, both its founders being spiritists. Madame Blavatsky had previously been exposed in Egypt for defrauding her dupes of money at spiritist *séances*. Col. Olcott was afterwards acquitted of the charge of fraud by the Society for Psychical Research on the ground of his "extraordinary credulity and inaccuracy in observation and inference," as evidenced by the inquiries they had made. In America Madame Blavatsky earned the title of "the champion impostor of the age." Mr. Maskelyne

describes her theosophy as "the greatest fraud of the present day," which is saying a good deal. Yet we think that he is not far out in the statement. Her campaign in India ended in an *exposé* by one of Mme. Blavatsky's confederates, Mme. Coulomb. From the published correspondence between the two the adventuress's unscrupulous contempt for her dupes and the barefaced impostures she practised on them are completely revealed. The "Mahâtâmâs" of whose aid she boasted were "Koot Hoomi" and "Morya," the latter being simply the Greek word for "folly" (*μωρία*), and the former a name composed of an amalgam of the last syllable of Col. *Olcott's* and the Indian attempt to pronounce Mr. *Hume's* name, that of another dupe.

In *Hypatia* Charles Kingsley has told us how the theosophy of the school of Plotinus, Porphyry, Iamblichus, Proclus and other Neo-Platonists failed as the last effort of dying paganism in the Greco-Roman world in endeavouring to resist the incoming flood of Christianity. Its adherents "descended deeper and deeper, one after the other, into the realms of confusion—confusion of the material with the spiritual, of the subject with the object, the moral with the intellectual; self-consistent in one thing only, namely their exclusive Pharisaism; utterly unable to proclaim any good news for man as man or even to conceive of the possibility of such, and gradually looking with more and more complacency on all superstitions which did not involve that one idea which alone they hated—namely the Incarnation (of Christ); craving after signs and wonders, dabbling in magic, astrology, and barbarous fetishisms." In utter decrepitude the original theosophy died out during the sixth century. It sprang up again in the Dark Ages, was found a profitable means of imposition in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in the hands of Paracelsus and Jacob Boehmen, and then again became extinct, having exhausted the credulity of the age. Our own age, the age of credulity *par excellence*, witnesses a recrudescence of the disease.

Reverting to the rôle of the earlier theosophists, its modern supporters are striving to do in India, Japan, Ceylon and the East generally what the Greco-Roman disciples of Porphyry failed to accomplish. Following Mme. Blavatsky, Mrs. Besant has for years tried to revive dying Hinduism, Buddhism and other Eastern religions and enable them to withstand Christianity. The

completely anti-Christian character of this pseudo-philosophy is thinly veiled in England, and an attempt is made to persuade its adherents that what they are taught is a higher and esoteric type of Christianity, at once "broader" and "more liberal" than that accepted by the orthodox Churches. No one who has studied the New Testament can honestly accept this statement, however. But in India the veil is boldly cast aside. In Northern India the Theosophic Society "stands as the champion of Hinduism against what it represents as a merely Western religion." It adopts and encourages Hindu idolatry. In Madras it has frequently made bitter attacks upon the Christian Faith. In Ceylon there is open war between the two faiths, while Western converts there publicly profess to be Buddhists. In the literature of modern theosophy all the attacks that have ever been made on Christianity in the past are renewed, from the scurrilous tales in the Talmudic Töledôth Yeshu' to the works of Haeckel, Grant Allen and Wrede. In spite of this an attempt is made to claim the Lord Jesus Christ Himself and His Apostles as secretly teaching the doctrines of modern theosophy. The effort made to delude ignorant people into fancying that St. Paul's use of the word "mystery" shows that he in secret taught doctrines very different from those openly inculcated in his Epistles would be amusing if it were not so insolently mendacious. The same method of "reasoning" would as convincingly prove that he was a Roman recruiting sergeant. Does he not urge his converts to "put on panoply," that is to take up the shield, sword, helmet and all the other accoutrements of a legionary? This is a fair imitation of the method employed by theosophic ingenuity to prove anything from the Bible they desire. Those who know their Bible are not so readily deceived, but the careless and ignorant are so easily imposed upon that some of them now call themselves "*Christian* theosophists." They might just as appropriately entitle their creed "*Christian* atheism." [For modern theosophy is practically atheistic, a fact which accounts for Mrs. Besant's rapid conversion from Bradlaughism to Blavatskyism. The *Theosophist* for September, 1882, says: "We do not at all deny the charge of atheism, the word being used in an ordinary theistic sense." Nor is this contradicted by the statement made a little later, "The founders maintain that they *do* believe in the very divine principle taught in the Vedas, in that principle which is 'neither entity nor nonentity' but

an abstract entity, which is *no* entity liable to be described by either words or attributes."

The explanations which are given of the tenets of Oriental religions in many theosophic works are often as erroneous as those given of Christian doctrines in the same books. This may sometimes be due to ignorance, but occasionally it is designed. In either case theosophic works are unreliable as exponents of Oriental religion or philosophy. Hence the late Professor Max Müller says regarding some of the early writings of the founders of modern theosophy: "There is nothing that cannot be traced back to generally accessible Brahmanic or Buddhistic sources, only everything is muddled or misunderstood. If I were asked what Mme. Blavatsky's esoteric Buddhism really is, I should say it was Buddhism misunderstood, distorted, caricatured. There is nothing in it beyond what was known already, chiefly from books that are now antiquated. The most ordinary terms are misspelt and misinterpreted." A good example of such blundering is found in the passage from the *Theosophist* just quoted. The Vedas do not speak of the Divine as "neither entity nor non-entity" (by which the writer probably meant *sadâsat*, "the existent non-existent," a term pertaining rather to the Bhâgavata Purâna), but recognizes thirty-three gods, though, in what is said about Varuna and even Dyaus, traces of a still earlier belief in one personal God may be thought to linger. In the same way it is incorrect to speak of "esoteric Buddhism," as Mr. Sinnett, for instance, does in his book bearing that title. In the *Mahâparinibbânasuttam* Buddha himself declares to Ānanda that he has set forth the law "having made nothing esoteric and nothing exoteric," and not having kept back from the community even "a teacher's handful," that is to say a little information retained by the teacher so that he may remain somewhat in advance of his pupils. In later times, indeed, there did arise in India a system which may be termed esoteric Buddhism, and which is taught in the "Tathâgata Guhyaka," otherwise known as the "Guhya Sâmagha," one of the Nipalese Buddhist canonical sacred books. Of this system Râjendralâl Mitra says in his edition of the *Lalita Vistara* (Introduction, pp. 11, 12): "Theories are indulged in and practices enjoined which are at once the most revolting and horrible that human depravity could think of. . . . Among the practices enjoined, which promote the attainment of perfection, debauchery of the most bestial character

. . . is reckoned as most essential." We are glad that Mr. Sinnett has spared us the revelation of what the only " esoteric Buddhism " deserving of the title really teaches : but that very fact shows that he has not given a correct account of the system. What modern theosophists call by that name is an *olla podrida* of their own concoction, to which they have no right to apply the term at all.

Students of Zoroastrianism, Vedântism, the ancient religion of Egypt, and other systems of religion and philosophy, can bear witness to the fact that, in theosophic books such as *Isis Unveiled* and *The Secret Doctrine*, the references to and pretended explanations of the tenets of these systems are an exhibition of shameful ignorance on the subject. Even opponents of Christianity, such as Mr. Arthur Lillie (in his *Mme. Blavatsky and her Philosophy*) admit this. Swâmi Dayânand Sarasvati, the founder of the Ārya Samâj, who was at one time recognized by the Theosophic Society in India as its " lawful director and chief," soon discovered this in reference to the Hindu philosophy with which he was best acquainted. Hence he wrote to the *Bombay Gazette* to " inform the public that neither Col. Olcott nor Mme. Blavatsky knows anything of *Yoga Vidya* (occult science) as practised by the Yogis of old."

The history of the modern theosophic movement, therefore, does not lead the earnest student to put much trust in its teachings or to credit its leaders with any excessive regard for the truth.

II. CHIEF TENETS.

In the first place modern theosophy inculcates pantheism, with the denial of a personal God. In this it agrees with Plotinus' teaching, for he speaks of the " One Thing " ($\tau\acute{o}\ \acute{\omicron}\nu$) which can be described only in negative terms, and which, can be attained only by mystic contemplation and the exclusion of the evidence of the senses. It is devoid of thought, ignorance, will ; it cannot be truly known, and can have no name. Both Neoplatonism and modern theosophy probably adopted this idea from Hinduism, for in Plotinus' time Alexandria was the meeting-place of East and West. In the Chhândogya Upanishad the ground principle of Hindu philosophy is thus stated, " Ekam evâdvitiam." " There is just one thing, without a second." Mrs. Besant accordingly takes Hinduism as the basis of her own system. " I regard Hinduism," she says, " as the most ancient of all religions, and as containing more fully than any other

the spiritual truths named Theosophy in modern times." With still less correctness she adds : " Theosophy is the ancient Brahma-Vidya of India. Of this Hinduism is the earliest and best esoteric presentment."

A somewhat notorious theosophist states the doctrine of pantheism and of man's supposed relation to the unconscious. All in these words : " Of the Absolute, the Infinite, the All-Embracing, we can at our present stage know nothing, except that It is. . . . In It are innumerable universes : in each universe countless solar systems. Each solar system is the expression of a mighty Being whom we call the Logos, the Word of God, the Solar Deity. He is to it all that men mean by God. He permeates it ; there is nothing in it which is not He : it is the manifestation of Him in such matter as we can see. Yet He exists above it and outside it, living a stupendous life of His own among His Peers." " Out of Himself He has called this mighty system into being. We who are in it are evolving fragments of His life, sparks of His divine fire ; from Him we all have come, into Him we shall all return." This passage illustrates the way in which modern theosophy borrows theological terms from both Christianity and other faiths and uses them out of their true meaning. It has well been described as an attempt to persuade people " to accept the exploded beliefs of the Dark Ages, as well as the existing superstitions of African and Australian savages, in the name of Theosophy or Divine Wisdom." It is " a new combination of old heresies," such as Ebionism, Docetism, Gnosticism, mingled with Orphicism, Nature-worship, Buddhism, and Hinduism. The Theosophic Publishing Society's catalogues printed in Madras and in London contain books on Spiritism, the Art of Casting Horoscopes, Geomancy or divination by means of numbers, Cartomancy or fortune-telling by cards, " Occult Science," Clairvoyance, Astrology, Palmistry, Oneirology or the science of dreams, Magic white and black, and other subjects as well worthy of being studied in the twentieth century of Grace. Besides these are books by Jacolliot & Schuré, whose ignorance and mendacity have been already brought to light by such men as Prof. De Harlez. Modern Theosophists have used such books as *authorities*, as they have the Zohar and quite a number of others, which no scholar of our time would venture to quote.

Pantheism has been described by Coleridge as " Painted Atheism."

Original Buddhism was an atheistic philosophy, not a religion. In Ceylon especially theosopists call themselves Buddhists and openly profess Atheism. In a Buddhist Catechism which he published in Ceylon, Col. Olcott says: "A personal god Buddhists regard as only a gigantic shadow thrown upon the void of space by the imagination of ignorant men." Such is the blasphemous system with which silly people in this country are trifling.

Pantheism, like Buddhism of the old type (as distinguished from the idolatrous religions now called by that name in the Far East), denies any true distinction between good and evil. Yet modern theosophy has adopted from Hinduism and Buddhism the doctrine of *Karma*, which is described as "the first basic law, the Law of Action and Reaction." To avoid admitting the existence of a Divine Lawgiver, who has enacted that man shall reap what he has sown, however, all three systems have adopted the doctrine of transmigration. Early in our era Christianity met and vanquished this theory, which has always been associated with immorality. It is, like most other theosophic tenets, entirely destitute of proof, but is also contradicted by the scientific fact of heredity. The rise of the theory of transmigration in India was closely associated with the development of the caste system, which Maine styles "the most disastrous and blighting of human institutions." Theosophy approves of caste in India, and thereby, as a Madras Hindu has said, has put back India half a century.

Modern theosophy professes to teach the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. But these Christian doctrines are absolutely contrary to the very basic ideas of modern theosophy. How can the "Shadow thrown upon the void of space by the imagination of ignorant men" be called our Father? Again, if we and all other forms of life, human, animal and vegetable, are alike "fragments of Divinity," then our brotherhood is not worth very much. Moreover, the caste system entirely negatives it. Its pseudo-philanthropy is therefore on a par with theosophy's pseudo-piety. In fact the prefix *pseudo* is thoroughly descriptive of the whole system.

Modern theosophy affirms that the ultimate destiny of all men and of all other beings is to be swallowed up in the All. In Mr. Lillie's words, it teaches that—

"There is no God.

Miracles are performed in His Ineffable Name.

The reward of the just is Annihilation.

The punishment of the wicked is Annihilation."

III. CONCLUSION.

The more carefully we study theosophic literature the less are we persuaded of the value of this system of pseudo-philosophy. It is merely a jumble of ill-digested ideas from various systems of religion and philosophy, its tenets are inconsistent with one another, and it is entirely destitute of proof. It is worthy of the age of credulity in which we live. It promises its dupes the Bread of Life ; it gives them a stone. Even for history it substitutes the legendary Etheric or Âkâšic Records, which tell of the fabulous Atlantis and still less real Lemuria. The Orpheus and Hermes of Greek mythology appear as historical characters, though we are spared Queen Mab and Jack the Giant-Killer. These records resemble the golden tablets on which the Book of Mormon was stated to have been inscribed. The "Mahâtâmâs," said to be the instructors of Mme. Blavatsky, Mrs. Besant, Mr. Leadbeater, etc., though styled the "Thibetan Brothers," have been proved ignorant of their own supposed habitat. The attempt to train the Hindu boy Krishnamurti to claim divine honours as "the Lord Maitreya, Krishna, the Christ," and who was to be taken possession of by "the Supreme Teacher of the worlds, who was last manifest as the Christ in Palestine," seems to have failed : but it shows the extent to which its authors were prepared to carry the blasphemous farce. But some new delusion will soon be invented, doubtless, for the leaders of the theosophic imposture are not to be deterred from running to any extreme of falsehood and folly.

The rise and temporary success of such delusions as Theosophy, "Christian Science," Bahâism, Spiritism, *et hoc genus omne*, are a noteworthy sign of the times. Many are restless and unsatisfied, many long for "some new thing." The only thing that *can* satisfy any earnest seeker after truth is what gave rest and peace to one of old who long wandered in the deserts of Neoplatonism and kindred delusions, but at last found the truth which he long had sought in vain. It was Augustine who wrote : "O God, Thou madest us for Thyself, and restless is our heart until it rest in Thee." One only could say of old, One only can now say : "Come unto Me, all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest."

W. ST. CLAIR TISDALL.

MEMORIES OF CANON CHRISTOPHER.

BY THE REV. W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS, D.D.

[Continued from THE CHURCHMAN of June, p. 323.]

[It may perhaps be permitted me to say that as Canon Christopher wrote to me many of his memories, the material now presented is usually very largely and sometimes identically in his language.—W. H. G. T.]

IV. CURACY AT RICHMOND, 1849-1855.

THE Bishop of Calcutta had also given Mr. Christopher a letter of introduction to Bishop Sumner of Winchester, who recommended him to the Rev. John Dixon Hales, afterwards Canon Hales, Incumbent of St. John's, Richmond, as a candidate for his Curacy. Mr. Hales called on him, and, to use Mr. Christopher's own words, "being a very prudent man, asked to see my wife." He added, "I believe that interview inclined him the more towards me." Another characteristic incident is that, during a stay with Mr. Hales, Mr. Christopher suggested that he should be given some questions to which he might write answers, lest the Incumbent "should be disappointed afterwards." But this was not likely, and the Curate's experience, on the other hand, was equally satisfactory, for, as he used to say, he could not have been with a better man or in a more interesting sphere of work. There was a district containing four thousand people attached to St. John's Church.

When he entered upon his duties as Curate Mr. Hales was away for his holiday, and the Rev. Henry Venn Elliott, of St. Mary's, Brighton, was occupying his parsonage for his annual rest. He was to take the preaching and Christopher the visiting. Mr. Elliott initiated the Curate by accompanying him on his first pastoral visit and giving him the benefit of his experience.

Some weeks before the time arrived for the examination for Priests' Orders, Bishop Sumner required each of those whom he had ordained Deacon to send three sermons which had been preached on three specified Sundays. After he had looked through them all, he chose one of the Deacons to preach one of the sermons at the evening service in the Chapel of Farnham Castle after the Ordination, and Mr. Christopher was selected for this in July, 1850.

It is interesting to know that on this occasion he met, as one of the Bishop's Chaplains, Dr. Trench, afterwards Archbishop of Dublin,

who was the uncle of the lady, Miss Melesina Trench, who is now the wife of Canon Christopher's second son, Captain Alfred Seton Christopher.

Less than a year after this, Bishop Wilson of Calcutta wrote to Bishop Sumner asking him to try to persuade Mr. Christopher to accept the post of Rector of St. Paul's School, Calcutta, the Church of England Grammar School for European and Eurasian boys in Calcutta whose parents desired that they should receive a liberal education. The Bishop invited Mr. Christopher to visit him at Farnham Castle to talk over the matter, but he had no hesitation in deciding to decline the offer, for he felt he could not again expose his wife to an Indian climate, from which she had already suffered. Moreover, he desired to devote his life to the ministry of the Gospel, and not to resume the work of a schoolmaster.

Soon afterwards, the failure of the health of Mrs. Hales obliged Mr. Hales to arrange with the Bishop for Mr. Christopher to take charge of the Church and district and to live in St. John's Parsonage. Mr. and Mrs. Christopher lived there rather more than three years. In addition to the ordinary work of a parochial clergyman, he had Bible Classes at several private schools, which contained, in the aggregate, two hundred girls, and there was also a weekly service at the Police Station. He had, of course, a junior curate working with him.

In 1851, instead of an ordinary holiday, Mr. Christopher took a fortnight's tour for the C.M.S., preaching sermons and addressing meetings.

Whilst he was Curate-in-charge of St. John's, Richmond, the parish was visited by the cholera.

When he came home from visiting one afternoon he felt ill and went upstairs to bed, and did not come down again for months. He became worse every day, and appeared to be on his deathbed. As he was the Church of England Honorary Secretary of the British and Foreign Bible Society for Richmond, he had become associated in God's work with the Nonconformist ministers, and these did not fail to pray publicly for his recovery. There were prayers for him in all the Nonconformist Chapels of Richmond, as well as in the Parish Church and St. John's District Church. He always rejoiced to speak of this as a testimony to the way in which union in work for the Bible Society promotes real heart-union between Christians

of different denominations. His long life confirmed his early experience of this, and he felt assured that united work is pleasing to Him Who prayed to His Father that all His people might be one, for, as the Canon never tired of saying, if we cannot be "one" in all respects, we may at least unite in the circulation of Holy Scripture. His state becoming one of great danger, Mr. Christopher's medical man, Dr. Julius (father of the present Bishop of Christ Church, New Zealand), called down an eminent London physician to a consultation. The consultant said on leaving, "He can't live." Dr. Julius did not mention this, but went home and said to his wife (Mrs. Christopher's dearest friend in Richmond), "Nothing but prayer can save him. Medicine has no effect whatever upon him. Go round and get up another prayer-meeting." Mrs. Julius called many praying Christians together for a prayer-meeting that evening, and sent over to Teddington to the Vicar, the Rev. Alfred Wilkinson, to help to lead the prayers. Although it was Saturday evening he came at once, and the schoolroom was full. An idea of the influence of the Curate can be gathered from the fact that working men came to that prayer-meeting in their working clothes, and some of them were deeply stirred in their sorrow. When Dr. Julius came at eleven o'clock that night (for his fourth visit) he found that the change he had longed for had taken place, and from that improvement the patient never went back, though six weeks afterwards he was still so weak that he had to be lifted by his wife and the nurse from the bed to the couch. Yet he never ceased to progress towards recovery from the hour of that prayer-meeting, and all through his long life he thanked God for those united prayers and for the gracious answer to them.

During this time (1854) Mr. Christopher edited the Memoir, long since out of print, of John James Weitbrecht, written by his widow. He had known Weitbrecht in Calcutta, and it was, therefore, a joy to him to be of any service in helping forward the missionary cause.

V. C.M.S. ASSOCIATION SECRETARIAT, 1855-1859.

No sooner had Mr. Christopher recovered from his illness in the Spring of 1855 than the Rev. Henry Venn, the Honorary Secretary of the C.M.S., asked him to take charge of a large district for the Church Missionary Society, as one of its Association

Secretaries. The extent of this can be understood when it is mentioned that the district included Oxfordshire, Berks, part of Bucks, Hants, the Channel Islands, Dorset, Wilts, and Gloucestershire. Although he was greatly helped by several local clergymen, the new Secretary had to provide deputations for the whole of his huge district, and probably no one who has not had a similar responsibility can realize the difficulty of finding efficient deputations, for a district of six counties and a quarter, with the Channel Islands in addition. The task is all the more arduous because every clergyman naturally prefers a missionary, though, obviously, it is utterly impossible that more than a fraction of the number of meetings held can be addressed by one who has had personal experience of missionary work.

Before relating the few available details of this secretarial work, mention may conveniently be made of one matter which Mr. Christopher was accustomed to associate with this period of his life. In connection with this missionary work, he used to refer to the question of what is often called *ex tempore* speaking. He would speak of those who say that they have "not the gift of *ex tempore* speaking, though they probably mean that they have not the gift of eloquence." Now eloquence is a very rare thing, though, as the Canon shrewdly remarked, it is perhaps not so rare for a young man to fancy he possesses this gift. But while eloquence may be used profitably for God, it is not essential to an instructive and interesting missionary address, since most men can speak easily enough if they have anything good to say, and by practice can obtain the necessary confidence and facility in speaking. To illustrate this, Canon Christopher told a story against himself, because he believed it might be useful to "some of the young soldiers who are coming on to replace the old soldiers, who are very soon going off." He made his first attempt at *ex tempore* preaching on a week-day evening, after he had been some little time in charge of St. John's, Richmond. An intelligent lady, the mistress of one of the High Schools at which he had a monthly Bible Class, said to him afterwards, in the kindest possible way: "Dear Mr. Christopher, I hope you will never preach *ex tempore* again! You know, dear Mr. Christopher, some clergymen have gifts!" The preacher said he entirely acquiesced in her judgment of his first effort of the kind, and afterwards said, "She could not

think it a poorer thing than I did myself." But, although he did not think then, and, indeed, never thought that he had the gift of preaching or speaking with what is called "eloquence," he was convinced that a clergyman would miss many opportunities of usefulness in the course of his ministry if he could not, after careful preparation, preach or speak with facility from notes. He therefore smiled at his kind adviser, expressed his entire agreement with her unfavourable opinion of that sermon, but, nevertheless, went on preaching from notes every Thursday evening, though he was not uncourteous enough to tell her that this was his decision. He felt he was very slow in improving, but in time he acquired more confidence, and if on any occasion he did not speak or preach with facility from notes, he regarded this as a sure sign that he had not given sufficient time and care to the preparation. One thing is certain, that if he had not persevered in overcoming his difficulty in speaking, it would have altered the whole course of his life, and might have deprived him of the success he obtained in it. Had he not acquired the power of expressing with confidence, clearness and fluency, whatever he had to say, he would not have been asked to be an Association Secretary of the C.M.S. If Mr. Christopher had not persevered in trying to preach from notes in the face of what he called "that sisterly discouragement," he would never have been suggested to Mr. Venn as a suitable man to be an Association Secretary of the C.M.S., and if he had not been an Association Secretary of the C.M.S., he probably would not have been invited to accept the living of St. Aldate's, Oxford. An address of his at Shanklin, in the Isle of Wight, at a C.M.S. meeting in a barn, which he could not have given if he had not by perseverance acquired the power of telling with facility facts and principles familiar to his mind, led a clergyman, who happened to be present, to suggest him as one suitable to fill the vacant Incumbency.

It is, therefore, not surprising that he always maintained that most clergymen could with facility and usefulness acquire the power of preaching from notes, and he often recommended undergraduates, who were looking forward to the ministry of the Gospel, to acquire the power of speaking in this way. He went so far as to prescribe a formula for so doing, in the shape of a study and imitation of Bishop Ryle's "Expository Thoughts on the Gospels."

Mr. Christopher was once told by Canon Garbett, a Bampton lecturer, and for many years an Incumbent at Surbiton, that he could **not** "think well without a pen in his hand."

It is only possible to relate a very few incidents in Mr. Christopher's work as an Association Secretary. In the first year he was one of the deputation to Weymouth, and the well-known writer, Charles Bridges, was at that time Rector of Melcombe Regis, now better known as Weymouth. The visitors were received at supper after the meeting by the local Treasurer of the C.M.S., Mr. Eliot, a banker, the father of the late Dean of Windsor, and of the late Canon Eliot, of Bournemouth.

The grace Charles Bridges said after supper that evening was this: "We thank Thee, O Lord, for these and all Thy *undeserved* mercies, through Jesus Christ." And the numerous guests at St. Aldate's Rectory will recall that Canon Christopher **always** used the word "*undeserved*" before "mercies." He said it seemed to magnify our conception of God's mercies to think **how** "*undeserved*" they are.

Mr. Christopher was greatly struck, in the first year of his travelling as a C.M.S. deputation, by the Christian happiness of the home of the Rev. Henry Moule, Vicar of Fordington, Dorchester. He and his wife were two of the most remarkable of the many Christians with whom Mr. Christopher became acquainted in his travels. Mr. Moule took some pupils whom he educated with his own sons. One of his sons was the Senior Classic of his year, and became Fellow and Tutor of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. Another is Dr. Handley C. G. Moule, the present honoured and beloved Bishop of Durham, who was bracketed Second Classic. A third son, George, who was in the Second Class of the Classical Tripos of his year, was the Bishop of Mid-China for many years. A fourth son, Arthur, was the Archdeacon of Ningpo.

In 1857, Mr. Christopher had a letter from the Rev. C. J. Glyn, then Rector of Witchampton, Dorset, asking him whether he **would** like to undertake the Secretaryship of the Bible Society. The **reply** was characteristic:—

MY DEAR FRIEND,

I value more than I can express this fresh proof of your confidence. I had been sounded by a member of the sub-committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society some time ago, when the vacancy first occurred; and

Wilkinson, Vicar of Teddington, urged it upon me, but I feel that I have been Providentially prepared for the work of the C.M.S., and called of God to it, and I do earnestly hope that, whilst it is His good pleasure that I continue in the work, He will give me grace steadily to persevere.

Affectionately yours,
ALFRED M. W. CHRISTOPHER.

P.S.—Of all I know, I think — is the best man for the post. He has much more power than you think. The C.M.S. work has brought him out. As Mr. Venn says, "He has great powers of organization."

The gentleman here suggested was appointed, and Canon Christopher added that it was only due to special, and, as it seemed to him, sufficient circumstances, that he himself gave up the idea of this work.

In 1858 he was requested by the Committee of the C.M.S. to take charge of the London District, twelve miles round St. Paul's, and there again he worked with all his immense energy. Some idea of the extent of his work and its development may be gained by the fact that on his resignation, in 1859, the area had to be divided into three separate Secretaryships.

W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS.

(To be continued.)

THE PILGRIM FATHERS.

HOMES AND HAUNTS OF THE PILGRIM FATHERS. London: R.T.S. 12s. 6d. net.

Despite present conditions the R.T.S. maintains its reputation for producing attractive literature. Here is a sumptuous volume with over a hundred black and white illustrations and photographs and four beautiful coloured plates. The letter-press is a new edition of Dr. Alexander Mackennal's work, revised and partly re-written by Mr. H. Elvet Lewis, and the object has been to provide a useful, up-to-date story of the sailing of the *Mayflower* for the Tercentenary commemoration. The result is more than satisfactory,—it leaves nothing to be desired. It is a story of noble endeavour and steadfastness, and as such makes its strong, undying appeal to our sympathy. Puritanism has often been branded as an inglorious thing calculated to make men miserable, but there is no concealing the fact that the men and women of whose devotion we read in these pages were worthy souls whose religion was by no means bereft of brightness, and to whom it was so intensely real that they could patiently and cheerfully endure hardness. A very delightful gift-book this, and one certain to be widely circulated, especially among those to whom the history of strenuous times must have an abiding interest.

The Necessity of Dogma.¹

By the REV. S. C. CARPENTER, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of
Selwyn College, Cambridge.

‘**H**E that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the Churches” (Rev. ii. 7). It will be obvious that I am proposing to make an unusual application of these familiar words. They are generally claimed by those who may, without prejudice, be described as modernists, and sometimes by those more than modernists, those “futurist” sons of the morning, who, in their conviction that the night is far spent and that the day is at hand, would cast off the works of dogma, and put on, a little breathlessly, the armour of enlightenment. They are not, I think, very commonly employed to indicate the necessity of maintaining the Catholic and Apostolic Faith.

But it is part of my purpose, both now and always, to claim that liberty and Christianity are identical, that the freedom of man and the Gospel of Christ are the same thing. We pray every morning to Him Whose service is perfect freedom, and St. John reminds us that our Lord said, “Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.” We attain our full stature, our perfect liberty, we become what God means us to be, only when we hear and comprehend and assimilate the truth of God.

And in order to assimilate as much as may be of the whole truth of God, we must listen not only with our own ears, but with the ears of our fathers. “O Lord, we have heard with our ears, and our fathers have declared unto us, the noble works that Thou didst in their days, and in the old time before them.” Those Christians who happen at this moment, or at any moment, to be what we call alive, are only a very small part of the whole Church. We may not disfranchise the departed, and refuse to hear their evidence, simply because their experience and the record of it is earlier in date than ours. If dogma is founded upon facts, let it be founded on all the facts. If we are going to “hear the Church,” let us hear the whole Church.

¹ From *Religious Reconstruction After the War*. London: Robert Scott, 2s. 6d. net.

For what is dogma? It is the experience, digested, recorded, classified, of Christendom. It is the result of the impression made by our Lord upon His servants. It is what the friends of Christ have thought about Him.

I.

There are three things that I desire to say. And the first is this. *Christian dogma is a fact, a phenomenon, that we must take into consideration.*

The great miracle of history is that Jesus, the Nazarene, has been able to project Himself forward into the world's life. His effect on human character has included the lives of persons of every imaginable kind: men and women, young and old, wise and foolish, ambassadors and children, kings and mothers, the lusty soldier and the crippled girl; a Paul, a Mary Magdalene, a Joan of Arc, a Thomas More, a Wesley, a Dr. Johnson, a Father Stanton. He has led to the production of writings so different as the Gospel of St. Luke and the *Summa Theologiæ* of St. Thomas Aquinas, the *Imitation* and the *Pilgrim's Progress*, the *Great Charter*, and the *Book of Common Prayer*. And all this has been born of the conviction that "Jesus is Lord." There are many things that might be said about the weakness and sinfulness of the Church of Christ, and if any reader is thinking of some of those things now, let him believe that I would join with him in acts of penitence. But it remains a great miracle—the greater as we know more truly the frailty of the material it has had to work upon—that the organ of divine salvation, which began when God did not abhor the Virgin's womb, is still surviving. The Christian religion has apparently been destroyed time after time by the ingenuity of its opponents and by the badness of its friends, but it is still here to-day. "One Jesus, Whom Paul affirmed to be alive." Yes, and He is still alive, because a young man, Onesimus, or Francis of Assisi, or William Smith, has just been converted by His grace.

II.

This dogma was an inevitable fact. You may regret it. You may wish that what you think is the simplicity of the Sermon on the Mount had never been encumbered by the metaphysics of the Nicene Creed. For my own part, I do not for a single moment

agree that the Sermon on the Mount is simple in the sense of being non-theological, or that our Lord's Gospel can ever be separated from a true belief about His right to speak it. But so far as metaphysics are concerned, as a plain person to whom metaphysics are always rather difficult, I will agree that it would have been nicer (I use a foolish word on purpose) if the amount of metaphysics could have been smaller. But it was impossible. The early Christians were entirely convinced of the fact, which is entirely true, that in religion you must use the whole of the faculties that God has given you, intellect and all. Religion is to some extent connected with the feelings, and to a much larger extent connected with the will. But the only complete description of religion is that it is an affair of the entire personality.

Remember what happened. The Church began, as you can read in the twelfth chapter of 1 Corinthians, verse 3, with the simple confession that "Jesus is Lord." Then came the heretics. A few of them were perhaps seekers after notoriety. A few of them were men of evil life. But the great majority of them were simply questioners, men who had hold—an exaggerated hold—on some one side of a Christian doctrine, and wanted to know whether room could be found in Christianity for the thing that they felt to be important. And the Church had to find an answer to their questions. The Church had to dig down deep into the wisdom of the Bible and the treasury of its own experience of Christ to find the answer. So came the Creeds.

It was not in the least that the Church was possessed with a lust for making definitions. The Creeds are defensive in their origin. For example, a man named Arius arose, and said that our Lord was only to be called divine in some sense inferior to that in which the Father is divine. St. Athanasius at once perceived that the whole doctrine of Redemption was at stake. For a being who is less than Very God of Very God may teach and lead and help. He may bring a message down from Heaven. *But he cannot bring divine Redemption, he cannot recreate humanity.* So Athanasius fought for the true faith, and so the famous Creed of the Council of Nicæa was made as a bulwark of the Gospel. But the thing for which Athanasius fought was not his own idea. It was not simply the private opinion of a clever man. It was the charter of Redemption for our children's children. The simple Christian of

to-day, who trusts in Jesus only for salvation, owes it, indeed to Jesus only that he has means of grace or hope of Heaven, but he owes it to Athanasius and those like Athanasius that the faith of Jesus has been preserved until to-day.

Or take that other Confession of our Christian Faith, which is commonly called the Creed of St. Athanasius, though it has much more connection with St. Augustine and the Latin-speaking Church. You perhaps do not like it. It would help a little if you realized that Morning Prayer, the service in which it occurs on thirteen occasions in the year, was never intended to be the general public service of Sunday morning, to which all manner of worshippers, instructed and uninstructed alike, should come. But it would help still more if you realized, as perhaps indeed you do, the meaning and history of the document, how every sentence of it is the actual answer to some question that actually was asked, how it bears from end to end the dints of actual conflict, how it has as a matter of historic fact preserved the faith.

The Church cannot undo the work of the great Creed-making centuries, the fourth and fifth, any more than it can undo the Reformation, any more than Europe can deny the French Revolution, or any other organization can deny an event which has left a permanent mark upon its life. It is not only that I *ought* not as a Christian to abandon Christian dogma any more than a soldier ought to lay down his rifle. It is that as a Christian I *can* no more abandon Christian dogma than I can shake off my arms and legs.

The Church can re-interpret? Yes, of course it can. Just as Athanasius re-interpreted the faith expressed in the New Testament and loosely current in the Church of his day, so we must re-interpret the ancient Creed of Christendom and express it to the men of our own day in language that they can understand. But always we begin with what the Spirit has said to the Church. The Historic Faith lays down the lines along which our Christian thinking will go. We hold it modestly and humbly. We know that it is not—that no human language ever can be—more than an approximation to the whole truth of God. Of course all theological language is of a metaphorical character. No one supposes that "Personality" or "Fatherhood," or any other such term, has, in the divine sphere no more meaning, no fuller and richer meaning than that with

which we are familiar in the human sphere. But the human language is a sufficient approximation to the truth. No one supposes that when you have said, with Christian theologians, that there are in Christ two Natures in One Person, you have exhausted the whole of what our Lord knows about Himself. But it is enough—and it is vital for our Christianity—to know that He is Very God in Very Man.

III.

My last point is this. *Christian dogma is the analysis of Christianity, a formula which Christian men will find it easy to remember, by which Christian men will live.*

Our religion is not a religion of mere aspiration. It does not consist simply of saying "Lift up your hearts," or "There is a good time coming," or "Perhaps after all it will be all right." It is a Gospel. It is *News* of something that God did. The "faithful saying" is that "Christ Jesus *came* into the world to save sinners."

St. Paul, when he was casting about for a formula which would exclude idolatry and the infection of belief in evil spirits, had no difficulty in finding what he wanted. "No man can say that Jesus is Lord, but in the Holy Ghost." Only in the atmosphere of that Holy Source of all Christian life can you take the sacred formula upon your lips.

St. Athanasius, when confronted by a heresy which, as Mr. Balfour has pointed out in an eloquent passage of his *Foundations of Belief*, would have inflicted irremediable impoverishment upon the Christian Faith, fought strenuously and victoriously for the formula which you find in the Nicene Creed, "Very God of Very God, Of one substance with the Father, By Whom all things were made." Without that, there is no Redemption.

We in our day are confronted by a double fact. On the one hand we find people who think they can be Christians without anything to stand on. Of course they are parasites; they are really living on the Creed of Christendom. But what they *say* is that their religion consists in going about and doing good. God forbid that I should impugn the reality of their goodness. It is the most difficult problem with which I am acquainted that a few strong souls appear to win through life without the Christian Creed. But I have not the least hesitation in saying that for very many

it is only a fine weather faith, which will not help them to face the real Cross when the real Cross comes.

And on the other hand we find people, especially poor people, who are the vast majority of the population of Great Britain, who in nearly all the affairs of life are accustomed to live by formulas. "Mustn't grumble" is the dogma of the poor. Magnificently patient, but theologically quite inadequate.

What the Church has to do is to teach a few—a very few—of *the right formulas*, to make Christian dogmas what they are meant to be, the saving knowledge of the simple man. Religious education ought not to consist, as it too often does, of imparting historical and geographical information, of instruction in the dimensions of the Temple or of the distinctive tenets of the Pharisees and Sadducees. It consists of a few Christian dogmas, "Jesus is Very God of Very God," "I believe in the Holy Ghost," "Every parishioner shall communicate at the least three times a year, of which Easter to be one," "Ye shall bring this child to the Bishop to be confirmed by him," "The things which a Christian ought to know and believe to his soul's health."

We are thinking of Reconstruction, but if the Church of England is going to reach the people, if it is going to begin to have the desired effect on character, it must deal more largely in simple Christian formulas—the old formulas, or new ones which mean the same thing—which men can learn, and remember, and use as they go about their work.

HOSPITAL ADDRESSES.

HONOUR AND HEROISM. By Fred A. Rees. London: R.T.S. 3s. net.

The author, a Baptist Minister in Birmingham, has had four years' experience in a large Military Hospital, and some of these very "live" chapters were written while he was thus on active service,—indeed, most of them would seem to contain the substance of addresses delivered during the course of this work. They are sound as a bell and as straight as a die, and despite the fact that a good many such books have been published, are well worth being preserved in this permanent form. A variety of subjects are dealt with,—some of the great problems of life are discussed, and there are some touching stories, many forceful illustrations and much sage advice in these pages. The volume is dedicated by Mr. Rees to the memory of his wife who died suddenly the day after the hospital in which she had been working was closed.

A MODERN DEVELOPMENT IN THE STUDY OF THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT.

BY THE REV. F. W. E. WAGNER, M.A., D.D., Rector of
St. Anne's, Strandhill, Sligo.

[Concluded from THE CHURCHMAN for June, p. 336.]

PART II.

DIRECT AID FROM THE PAPYRI.

I TURN now to indicate some of the direct additions to our knowledge of the Greek Testament which have accrued from the papyri. I remarked previously that no MSS. of portions of Scripture had been discovered which proved to be of any great importance.

Probably the most valuable is the *Washington Codex*, which was discovered close to Cairo, in 1906, by Mr. C. L. Freer of Detroit. This MS. has been published (1918) with critical notes by Professor Sanders of Michigan University. It dates from the fourth or early fifth century. The MS. consists of 374 parchment pages, and contains, with trifling omissions, the four Gospels. In connection with this MS. there was found with it another sixth century MS. containing nearly all the Pauline Epistles. It and the *Washington Codex* between them must have formed a complete New Testament, which did not include the Revelation. "This is not particularly strange, for it is well known that the Revelation of John was popular in the West much earlier than in the East, and in Egypt particularly it had a competitor in the spurious Revelation of Peter, a large fragment of which was discovered at Akhmîm in 1886" (*New Testament Manuscripts in the Freer Collection*, 1918, Sanders. Part II., page 252). The Akhmîm fragment was discovered by the French Archaeological Mission, and was published by M. Bouriant in 1892. It was a product of a sect of Docetae of the second century; it is valuable chiefly for its side-lights on Gnostic beliefs.

The Fayûm Gospel Fragment was discovered by Dr. Bickell of Innsbrück among some papyri which had been brought from

Fayûm to Vienna. It was published in 1885. The fragment is brief and unimportant. It deals with the foretelling of the denial by Peter. The text is uncertain owing to the mutilated condition of the papyrus. Bickell maintained that it was part of a Gospel of great antiquity, but Zahn (N.T. Kan. ii. 788) practically establishes it as an extract from a Patristic writing, a free quotation from the Second Gospel. The forthcoming Part XIII. of the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* will contain some interesting papyri of parts of the Apocrypha. In the New Testament the most interesting will be a third century fragment of Chapter xxvi. of the Acts. It may be noted in passing that Part XIII. will also contain part of the "Shepherd of Hermas," an early Christian work, in a text which Dr. Grenfell says shows several improvements on that of the Mount Athos Codex.

Another fragment is worthy of notice. If it may not claim to be of any importance from the point of view of the textual critic, it is, nevertheless, of considerable interest. It was discovered at Oxyrhynchus in 1896 by Grenfell and Hunt, who say that it may "claim to be a fragment of the oldest known manuscript of any part of the New Testament." It dates from the third century. The original is now in the Museum of the University of Pennsylvania; but there is an excellent facsimile in Grenfell and Hunt's *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, i., page 4, No. 2. It contains Matthew i. 1-9, 12, 14-20. The text is very similar to **NB**. In Matthew i. 18 the old papyrus reads τοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ with **NC** against **B**. Some Latin Versions, the Sinaitic Syriac and the Curetonian Syriac follow the reading Χριστοῦ. In spite of the testimony of this ancient MS., there is every reason to believe that **B** has preserved the correct reading, for nowhere in the New Testament do we find the article used before, Ἰησοῦς Χριστός.

Another fragment from Oxyrhynchus, dating from the fourth century, contains Romans i. 1-7. Deissmann suggests that this fragment was a sort of amulet or charm, belonging to a certain Aurelius Paulus, whose name is written on it in a cursive hand (the text itself is in uncials). See *Light from the Ancient East*, Deissmann, page 232. The original is now in the Library of Harvard University. The text is published in *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, ii., page 8, No. 209, and there is also a facsimile. In verse 1 the fragment impinges on a controversy as to variant readings which is rather

more important than it appears when looked at superficially. It reads *Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ*, "Christ Jesus," against *ΝΑΔ*. It is supported by B and the Latin Vulgate. In the opening verses of the Pauline Epistles (except 1 Thessalonians and Galatians, where the reading *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* or *Χριστοῦ*, "Jesus Christ," is not disputed), the MSS. vary between *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* or *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, "Jesus Christ," and *Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ*, "Christ Jesus." But, broadly speaking, it is the earlier Epistles which read *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* or *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, "Jesus Christ," while the later Epistles read *Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ*, "Christ Jesus." Of course variants exist in all cases apart from the two exceptions mentioned, and I only make a rough comparison following the preponderance of MS. evidence. The change of phrase marks a transition stage between *Χριστός*, "Christ" of the Gospels as a title (cf. Matthew i. 16, xxvii. 17, 22, and perhaps Luke ii. 26 *τὸν Χριστὸν Κυρίου*, "the Lord's Christ"—the familiar Septuagint translation of *יהוה משיח*, "the Lord's anointed," the title of the Hebrew kings) and *Χριστός Ἰησοῦς*, "Christ Jesus" simply as a proper name, with no idea at all of a title in *Χριστός*. We may say that in the Gospels *Χριστός*, "Christ," is distinctively a title; in the earlier Pauline Epistles it retains some of its significance as a title, but it has also taken on some of the sense of a proper name, and in the later Epistles it is purely a proper name. The line marking St. Paul's transition from the one phrase to the other might be drawn somewhere about the period 1 Corinthians–2 Corinthians–Romans, as there is a greater conflict of evidence as to the reading in these three Epistles than in any other group.

I wish to notice two more of the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, one in detail, the other with just a passing reference. Having done so, I think I shall have given a fair idea of the type and value of the species of MSS. with which this portion of my essay is concerned.

The first is No. 657 in the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, iv., page 36. It contains the following portions of the Epistle to the Hebrews: ii. 14–v. 5, x. 8–xi. 13, xi. 28–xii. Some critics, notably Blass, declare that many of the Epistles were written in a species of metrical cadence, or, at least, that their language is couched in a harmonious and artistic symmetry. We get very clear instances of this in the Greek of 1 Corinthians xv. 42, 43, 1 Timothy iii. 16, 2 Timothy ii. 11, 12, and in 1 Corinthians xiii. Of this latter Norden says, "Since the hymn of Cleanthes nothing at once so

heartfelt and magnificent had been written in Greek as St. Paul's hymn to love." Now the text of Papyrus No. 657 is divided, more or less metrically, by the insertion of double dots. The Greek text of the Epistle to the Hebrews shows evident care by the writer (whoever he was) in composition, choice of words and phrases, balance of periods, and no little pains to produce a work of a high literary standing. Probably, without actually writing verse, he had in mind a conformity to poetic canons, so that his work would gain in solemnity and effectiveness when read aloud. It is not unlikely that a similar motive inspired the moulding and phraseology of some of the Pauline Epistles. The chief value of this papyrus lies in the fact that its text is almost identical with B in Hebrews ii. 14-v. 5. Now B is not quite complete; it lacks Genesis i.-xlvi., Psalms cv.-cxxxvii., and in the New Testament it breaks off at Hebrews ix. 14, the remainder being lost. Now, from its virtual coincidence with B in ii. 14-v. 5, it is apparent that for the portions x. 8-xi. 13 and xi. 28-xii. 17 this papyrus is almost as valuable as B itself.

The other papyrus to which I wish to refer briefly is No. 1078 in the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, viii., page 11. It also dates from the fourth century, and contains Hebrews ix. 12-19. In this papyrus also the text is divided in the same way as No. 657 by the insertion of double dots.

With these examples I conclude my sketch of the purely Biblical papyri. There are numerous others of which complete lists are given by Professor Gregory, Von Soden, and Kenyon. Most of them are small fragments containing only a few lines, and none of them is of much importance or interest. I should serve no useful purpose by discussing them, for such a discussion could only take the form of tabulating them and mentioning the contents.

It will be observed that I have not said anything as to the use of tachygraphic symbols in the papyri. That is partly because it is somewhat outside the scope of my present subject, and partly because, so far as I am aware, not many papyri have come to hand which afford examples. In a future work I shall have more to say on this subject, and especially with reference to the hitherto undeciphered third century set of waxen tablets (British Museum Add. MS. 33270). My researches in connection with these are, at present, incomplete.

I point out now that the papyri have not afforded us any MSS. of the Greek Testament of primary importance. They have given us nothing approaching in value, say, the Lewis-Gibson Syriac palimpsest, which is of the greatest possible value in constructing a text of the Gospels, inasmuch as it probably reproduces, with a few corruptions, the second century Antiochian Greek text.

Our next consideration will be a type of papyrus which may be regarded as forming a link between the purely profane and the purely Biblical papyri. This type is illustrated by the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* fragments containing what are, or claim to be, "Sayings of Jesus." In 1897 a single papyrus leaf was discovered at Oxyrhynchus by Grenfell and Hunt. It contains eight "Sayings of Jesus." Three of them afford close parallels to sayings recorded in the Gospels. Two of these I regard as important; the third is rather a matter of interest. I deal with the important ones first.

Oxyrhynchus Fragment iv., when reconstructed, reads—*λέγει Ἰησοῦς· Ὅπου ἐὰν ᾧσιν [δύο οὐκ] ἐ[ἰσ]ὶν ἄθροισι, καὶ [ὁ]που ἐ[ἰ]ς ἑστὶν μόνος [λέ]γω Ἐγὼ εἶμι μετ' αὐτ[οῦ]*, "Jesus saith, wherever two are, they are not without God, and where one is alone, I say, I am with him." Compare this with Matthew xviii. 20, *οὐ γὰρ εἰσιν δύο ἢ τρεῖς συνηγμένοι εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα, ἐκεῖ εἶμι ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν.* "For where two or three are gathered together in My Name, there am I in the midst of them." From the comparison a point of textual interest arises. In reconstructing the text of the Oxyrhynchus Saying, the negative *οὐκ*, "not," must be inserted. It is practically certain that it, or some form of a negative, existed in the original of this first clause; so much is clear from the context. If the passage Matthew xviii. 20 be inspected in D, and in the Sinaitic Syriac Version, it will be noticed that the sentence is cast in a negative form: "For there are not two or three gathered together in My Name that I am not in the midst of them." Thus the third century papyrus, in a minor way, vouches for the accuracy of these two fifth century MSS. The passage in the Oxyrhynchus Fragment and in the Matthean version seems to be a subtle identification of Jesus with the Rabbinical Shekinah (שְׁכִינָה), the bright cloud by which God made His Presence known on earth (cf. Exodus xvi. 10). For the identification of the Shekinah with the Incarnate Christ in the New Testament see such passages as Ephesians i. 17, Luke ii. 32, John xiv. 23, Colossians ii. 9, and perhaps there is a

hint of it in Acts vii. 2, ὁ θεὸς τῆς δόξης, "the God of Glory," since δόξα, "glory," is the usual Septuagint translation of כְּבוֹד, "splendour" or "brightness."

Oxyrhynchus Fragment v. contains a saying of which the three Synoptists give us versions. I place all four in parallel columns for purposes of comparison.

<i>Matthew</i> xiii. 57.	<i>Mark</i> vi. 4.	<i>Luke</i> iv. 24.	<i>Oxyrhynchus</i> <i>Saying.</i>
ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς	καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι	εἶπεν δὲ 'Αμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐδεὶς	λέγει Ἰησοῦς
οὐκ ἔστιν προφήτης ἄτιμος	οὐκ ἔστιν προφήτης ἄτιμος	προφήτης δεκτός ἔστιν	οὐκ ἔστιν δεκτός προφήτης
εἰ μὴ ἐν τῇ πατρίδι·	εἰ μὴ ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ	ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ.	ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ.
Jesus said to them	And Jesus said to them	He said	Jesus saith
A prophet is not without honour except in his native land.	A prophet is not without honour except in his own native land	Verily I say unto you No prophet is accepted in his own native land	A prophet is not accepted in his own native land

It is easy to see that the Lucan version is the one which approximates most nearly to the Oxyrhynchus text. In investigating the Synoptic Problem I do not think that any hypothesis covers the facts so satisfactorily as what is known as the "Two-document hypothesis." Granted, as supplementary to it, a special Lucan source for the "Great Interpolation" (Luke ix. 51-xviii. 14), I am satisfied to accept this theory, and to believe that Matthew and Luke compiled their Gospels from two main sources. I might remark here that it is a tendency of modern critics to postulate additional sources, in spite of the fact that it is an excellent canon of literary criticism not to multiply sources beyond what is absolutely necessary. The two main sources of the First and Third Gospels may be said to be: 1. A Gospel almost, but not exactly, identical with our St. Mark; 2. A collection (now lost) sometimes incorrectly referred to as the "Logia," but usually connoted by the symbol Q. This collection consisted mainly of sayings and discourses, and included, perhaps, a certain amount of narrative matter. Now, I believe that the Oxyrhynchus papyrus leaf referred to above is a leaf from Q, the lost non-Markan source. I have always held that Luke reproduces Q in his Gospel with much closer verbal accuracy than does the author of the First Gospel in

his work. And if my supposition about the papyrus leaf is correct it seems to bear out such a theory.

There is yet one more Oxyrhynchus Saying which deserves mention, because there is a parallel to it in the First Gospel ; otherwise it is not of much importance. Fragment vii. is almost identical with " a city set on a hill cannot be hid " (St. Matt. v. 14).

Five other " Sayings " were discovered at Oxyrhynchus in 1903. To enter upon a detailed discussion of them would be productive of no good result. They have been edited and published. In spite of many ingenuities of reconstruction, I am not satisfied that the true text has yet been obtained. To fill in the lacunae is a most difficult task, and here, too, I deem discretion to be the better part of valour, and I reserve comment, at any rate for the present.

CONCLUSION.

I venture to hope that this little compilation of mine will be of use to others who, like myself, are endeavouring in a humble way to cast some light on the problems and exegesis of the New Testament. I have sought to marshal facts and results in an interesting way in the hope that others may be inspired to pursue researches further. A study of contemporary literature and thought is one of the best guides which we can have to a right understanding and a deep appreciation of the Inspired Word. It is the message of God to us men, a divine treasure in an earthen vessel. And I plead that in our studies and researches we shall not so concentrate all our powers of intellect upon the earthen vessel as to lose sight of or neglect the treasure in it. Rather let us pause sometimes so that the Divine rays which emanate from the Mind of the God of love and mercy may fall, as it were, across the written page, bathing it in a golden sunlight. Biblical criticism is not an end in itself. If it is indulged in merely as a species of mental and intellectual gymnastics, it will be of very little real value ; but if it be pursued as a means whereby we may come to a profounder knowledge of the Eternal, and if, as we discover new depths of meaning underlying the old familiar words, it makes our thoughts and beliefs, our hopes and our aspirations, less " of the earth, earthy," then it is indeed a study full of blessing, a pearl of great price.

As we press on the horizons of our knowledge will ever widen.

That, indeed, must be so from the very nature of our study. We ought to approach our Bibles and study them as a means whereby we may, by coming to a greater knowledge of God, receive blessing to our souls. We must make that our primary objective, and we can work up to it in no better way than by careful, deliberate, thoughtful study, critical and exegetical, of the language and text. Many auxiliary sciences afford great assistance, and it behoves the student to make himself acquainted with them, such as Philology, History Archaeology. It is the business of the student "to trace back the steps by which any ancient book has been transmitted to us, to find where it came from and who wrote it, to examine the occasion of its composition, and search out every link that connects it with the history of the ancient world and with the personal life of its author" (*The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, Lecture I., Robertson Smith).

From all such research and study two very real values accrue. I call the one spiritual and the other intellectual. Study of, and research work in connection with the Bible, done in the right spirit, should have the effect of widening the outlook of the student and increasing the sum total of his intellectual equipment, in proportion as it broadens and deepens his spiritual life. We need to take care that in our studies we do not, on the one hand, seek solely the intellectual benefit to the entire exclusion of the spiritual, and give to our own souls but a stone when they cry aloud for the bread of life. But we shall err also if, on the other hand, we seek solely the spiritual benefit, without allowing full scope to the intellect and judgment. We shall win but half the truth if we allow the God-given powers of intellect to become atrophied by disuse. To travel on a "via media" between the two extremes, or rather, to unite, the two impelling forces into one resultant should be the aim of every diligent student of the Holy Scriptures.

The value and usefulness of studying the Scriptures in the original cannot be over-estimated. Our translations rise in many places to heights of exquisite beauty, in others they have failed lamentably to catch the thoughts which were glowing in the minds of the inspired writers. Sometimes they reflect a sparkle of the original splendour, anon they miss a gleam from the jewel of many facets.

Our Authorised Version is monumental, its majestic and sonorous

English is beyond all praise. Its beautiful and stately measures have permeated the whole of our religious and devotional literature through and through, in every branch of literature its influence pulses and vibrates. Its familiar words are laden with the fragrance of sacred and tender memories. But we are compelled to admit that, as a translation, its defects are manifold and serious. The Revised Version has gained somewhat in accuracy, but at the expense of all those splendid qualities which have endeared the Authorised Version to the whole English-speaking world. And we may say that the gain has by no means compensated for the loss.

What a relief it is to turn to the originals. If there is a beauty or a gleam of glory in the translations, it is a hundred-fold greater in the original, where the pages are rippling and sparkling with undreamed-of loveliness and magnificence. Some passages ring out with the trumpet note of the warrior, inspiring by the very lilt of the words, the soldiers of Jesus Christ to fight the good fight of faith, and lay hold on eternal life. Other passages come to the sad, the weary, and the sin-stained souls of the children of men, like balmy breezes across a summer sea to a parched and dry land where no water is; and here, again, the very harmonies of the words tell of pardon and of peace. When "these hearts of ours are hot and restless," when our lives are brimming over with cares, and when sore anxiety respecting some of the "changes and chances of this mortal life" presses heavily, the innate sturdiness of some of the Hebrew writers, or the gently sympathetic delicacy of some of the Greek phrases are a very inspiration of hope and courage, of peace and rest. They are the lights of home shining out clear and strong over the storm-tossed waves of this troublesome world.

But if such study be to the laity a matter of choice, often governed by circumstances; to the priesthood of the Church it is a sacred duty. Every priest, at his ordination, has a charge laid upon him to wax riper and stronger in his ministry by daily reading and weighing of the Scriptures. And at that ordination he makes a solemn vow and promise that, by God's help, he will endeavour to be diligent in reading of the Holy Scriptures, and in such studies as help to the knowledge of the same. But how many are there who are not thus diligent, who seldom or never study any part at all of the originals from the day of their ordination to the priest-

hood to the end of their lives, and who are thus false to their ordination vows! Not all are acquainted with the Hebrew tongue, but all have, or are presumed to have, some knowledge of the Greek; and it is the sacred duty of every priest of God's Church to devote, at the minimum, a brief time every day to a critical and exegetical study of some portion of the Greek Testament. Not all have the special bent of intellect which makes research work a pure joy to many, and a fascinating pursuit, but it is within the power of all to read and digest what other men have written as a result of their investigations and researches.

I commend to my readers the words of the good Bishop Jewel about the Bible: "The Word of God is the water of life. The more ye lave it forth, the fresher it runneth. It is the fire of God's glory; the more ye blow it, the clearer it burneth. It is the corn of the Lord's field; the better you grind it, the more it yieldeth. It is the bread of heaven; the more it is broken and given forth, the more it remaineth. It is the sword of the Spirit; the more it is scoured, the brighter it shineth."

And, in conclusion, I commend also the words of Archbishop Sandys on the same subject: "This most precious jewel is to be preferred before all treasure. If thou be hungry, it is meat to satisfy thee. If thou be thirsty, it is drink to refresh thee. If thou be sick, it is a present remedy. If thou be weak, it is a staff to lean upon. If thine enemy assault thee, it is a sword to fight withal. If thou be in darkness, it is a lantern to guide thy feet. If thou be doubtful of the way, it is a bright, shining star to direct thee. If thou be in displeasure with God, it is a message of reconciliation. If thou study to save thy soul, have the Word ingrafted, for that is able to do it. It is the Word of life. Whoso loveth salvation, will love this Word—love to read it, love to hear it; and such as will neither read nor hear it, Christ saith plainly, 'they are not of God.' For the spouse gladly heareth the voice of the bridegroom. 'My sheep hear My voice,' saith the Prince of Pastors."

F. E. WAGNER.

STUDIES IN TEXTS.

Suggestions for Sermons from Current Literature.

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

VII. EARLY CHURCHMANSHIP.

Text.—"And they continued stedfastly in the apostles' teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers" (Acts ii. 42, R.V.).

[Book of the Month : THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH AND CHRISTIAN REUNION,¹ by Headlam = H. Other reff., *Hastings' Dictionaries, of the Bible, of Christ and the Gospels, and of the Apostolic Church* = respectively DB, DCG, and DAC. Hort's *Christian Ecclesia* = CE. Forsyth's *Church and the Sacraments* = F.]

The Lambeth Conference has been discussing Church questions. Let us think of some elements of Primitive Churchmanship, germs of the organism we see to-day.

"The earliest period in the history of the Christian Church is described in the first five chapters of the Acts of the Apostles. It was mainly, although not entirely, confined to Jerusalem. It is represented to us as a period of spiritual enthusiasm, of brotherly unity, of miraculous power and popular favour. The Church was as yet confined entirely to Jews. It was a new sect" (H. 50). "Whether they at once began to speak of themselves as the Church we cannot say. They were called 'the believers,' 'those who are being saved,' 'the brethren.' They were probably known to outsiders as the sect of the Nazarenes" (H. 50-1). "What He declared that He would build was in one sense old, and in another new. It had a true continuity with the Ecclesia of the Old Covenant; the building of it would be a rebuilding. Cf. Acts xv. 16, where James quotes Amos ix. 11" (CE. II). "The name 'Church' is in itself strong evidence of the connexion between the Old Covenant and the New. In the Old Testament, two different words are used to denote gatherings of the chosen people, or their representatives—'*ēdhāh*' (R.V. 'congregation') and *qāhāl* (R.V. 'assembly'). In the LXX *sunagoge* is the usual translation of '*ēdhāh*', while *qāhāl* is commonly

¹ The Bampton Lectures for 1920 by Dr. A. C. Headlam, Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford. Perhaps the most discussed book of the day on the subject of Reunion.

rendered *ecclesia* " (DAC. I. 204). " We do not know who so happily adopted the word for Christian use. It is not impossible that Christ Himself may have used it, for He sometimes spoke Greek " (DAC. I. 204).

What are the five main elements of Primitive Church life? Even so pronounced an Independent as Dr. Forsyth writes: " No form is sacrosanct. But also to discard form is suicidal. If an imperial Church is mischievous, sporadic Churches are futile. For a Church to live anyhow is to die " (F. 74). F. incidentally speaks more strongly on sacramental questions than many Churchmen (see his book). H. turns to Acts ii. 41, 42, for a picture of primitive churchmanship: " They were received into the number of the believers by Baptism. The Apostles were their teachers and leaders. They were bound together in unity of life and fellowship, in the sacramental rite of the breaking of bread and in common worship " (H. 51). " The author of the Acts of the Apostles lived at a time when there were certainly presbyters and perhaps bishops, and when the diaconate was a regular institution. He was strongly influenced by the thought and ideas of St. Paul. But he does not read any of these things back into the account of this oldest Christian community. The life is early and unformed. The doctrine is simple and undeveloped. The organization is embryonic " (H. 55). " But although this is true, it is also true that the principles that are required to account for the later ecclesiastical development are already present " (H. 55).

I. THERE WAS A PRIMITIVE INITIATION.—" The condition of receiving the promise of salvation was repentance and faith in Jesus Christ as the Messiah. The external sign of the reception of that promise and of incorporation into the community was Baptism " (H. 51). " From the beginning Baptism is clearly a normal and necessary Christian institution, and the author of the Acts having once clearly indicated this does not refer to it again except for special reasons " (H. 51). At the same time " The Church " means more than a mere Baptismal Roll. " The Church, like the individual Christian, is regarded as being that which it is becoming " (DCG. I. 326). In the New Testament the " Church " " refers neither to dead nor living Christians, but to an indefinite body of members belonging to no time, present, past, or future, because it is a timeless, ideal conception " (DB. I. 425).

II. THERE WAS A PRIMITIVE RULE OF FAITH.—“ The community is represented as under the rule and guidance of the Apostles. The believers ‘ continued in the Apostles’ teaching.’ It is the Apostles who take the lead on all occasions ” (H. 51). “ They had been the companions of our Lord during His life, they had received His last commands. They were the witnesses of the Resurrection. They with the other disciples had received power by the coming of the Holy Spirit ” (H. 52). “ In the absence of authoritative records the testimony of the Apostles to the words and deeds of Jesus naturally formed the basis of the common faith ” (H. 52). “ A position of special prominence is held by St. Peter. On all occasions he takes the initiative ” (H. 52). “ Not as one apart from, but as one joined with, the Apostolic body, as chief among them, not as a ruler over them ” (H. 52).

III. THERE WAS A PRIMITIVE HARMONY.—It is called “ fellowship or communion. This it is stated was in an especial sense exhibited by the fact that they had all things in common. We need not now examine in detail the vexed question what exactly this primitive communism implied economically. On the religious side it meant that the unity and fellowship of the life of the primitive community was shown by, a singular generosity which almost amounted to a practical communism. The believers were as one family ” (H. 52-3). “ The self-sacrifice, unity and generosity which should be always characteristic of the Christian, were realized for a short time in a manner that, as the community grew, became impossible in practice, although always possible in spirit ” (H. 53). “ The meetings of the Church must have been in houses, and none in Jerusalem can possibly have contained all the disciples ; but no importance is attached to the place of meeting, nor are house congregations ever spoken of or alluded to as separate units of Church life ” (DCG. I. 326). “ The whole body of disciples is the only unit ” (DCG. I. 326). “ ‘ An isolated Christian ’ is a contradiction, for every Christian is a member of Christ’s body ” (DAC. I. 205).

IV. THERE WAS A PRIMITIVE RELIGIOUS CEREMONY.—It is called “ the breaking of bread.” “ A meal was intended, for it is added, ‘ they did take their food with gladness and singleness of heart,’ yet the context in each case implies that the meal was also a religious act ; in the first passage it is coupled with ‘ the prayers,’ in the second with the daily visit to the Temple. The phrase ‘ breaking

bread' is used in all the accounts of the Last Supper" (H. 53). "Here we have a religious rite, identical with what was afterwards called the Eucharist" (H. 53). "It was celebrated privately in the home of believers and was thus distinguished from the assemblies in the Temple courts. There was the ordinary evening meal, but there was more. The special accompaniment was the praise of God; it was a glad and happy festival, in fact a Eucharist, a feast of thanksgiving" (H. 54). "It is true that it is impossible to prove any connexion between Acts ii. 42 and the 'Last Supper,' but that there was a religious significance attached to the former seems clear from the way in which it is mentioned" (DAC. I. 374). And see Acts xx. 7-II, for an obvious parallel.

V. THERE WAS A PRIMITIVE WORSHIP.—"The Prayers." "The meetings for prayer seem to have been of two kinds, in the Temple and in private houses. The body of believers were constant in their attendance in the Temple, not only as individual Israelites, but in a corporate capacity. To the Western, and especially to an English reader, accustomed to the orderliness and dignity of our public services, this would imply taking part in an organized system of public worship. Yet this is probably the very last thing that is meant. The wide and spacious porticoes of the Temple would, as in the case of the modern mosque, form admirable places for religious meetings" (H. 54). "They met at the stated hours of prayer, for common worship and to receive the instruction of the Apostles" (H. 54).

So to sum up: "All that was required for the growth of the Church was there" (H. 55). "The Catholic Church life must have had a beginning, and here are all the elements out of which it might arise. The Church grew up with a ministry, sacraments, a common creed, and a common worship. Here we have all these, but in an undeveloped form, and these again grow naturally out of elements in the Gospels" (H. 56).

[*Cheltenham Conference Paper.*]

EVANGELICALS AND THE NATIONAL CHURCH ASSEMBLY.

I.

BY THE BISHOP OF BARKING.

LIKE several Church measures which hung fire for years, the scheme for Church Self-Government has passed into law at the last with exemplary rapidity. Parliament shook off its accustomed lethargy, and whether from a desire to be relieved of Church business, or from a sincere wish to give the Church of England a chance, the House of Commons welcomed most readily the Enabling Bill. Members of Parliament tumbled over one another in their offers of support, and the Bill was passed almost in the precise form that the Representative Church Council had desired.

There have been murmurs of discontent in various quarters, but the present is no time for complaint. The Enabling Act is now a fact. It is suicidal to refuse to carry out its provisions. For years we have been clamouring for a share in the control of the Church to be given to the laity. This has now been done. Our duty then is to be the first to throw ourselves with enthusiasm into the effort to make the Act work.

The old policy of isolation is hopeless. In days gone by some Evangelicals have refused to share in diocesan work because of their disagreement with Churchmen of other views. They have retired into a corner and sulked, because they could not have everything their own way. Then they have complained, not always truly, that they were ignored in diocesan administration. Such a policy is indefensible. The generosity, the freedom, the elasticity, the frankness, and the attractiveness, which are the natural outcome of that indwelling of the Spirit which is precious to us, must be strangely wanting, when such an attitude is taken up. The day for such a policy is, however, past. We are now forced into the open.

If we are to make any contribution to the effectiveness of the National Assembly, we must be at unity amongst ourselves. Of late years there have been signs of disunion among Evangelicals, and though the serious dangers which threatened our work in the world three years ago have been averted, the omens to-day are not wholly favourable. Our traditions on this score are not unimpeachable. In the early days of the Evangelical Revival there was not only disunion, but recrimination. . . . We see now the folly and wickedness of it all, and we have long outgrown such language. Still the spirit of disunion is not wholly exorcised, and the disdain and the suspicion which such a spirit breeds should be burnt right out under the rays of the love of Christ. "Sirs, ye are brethren."

The unity of believers in Christ was very near the heart of our Lord. That ought to be enough for us, enough to make us desire unity with those from whom we differ, and demand unity with those with whom we agree. With such unity we may hope to make some contribution to the work of the National Assembly, but we have to get there first.

We claim that a large majority of the laity are, if not in vociferous or even vocal sympathy, at least in latent sympathy with ourselves. We might hope, therefore, that the representation of the laity in the National Assembly will be mainly Evangelical; but there is this disturbing factor. The clergy largely control the situation. We cannot pretend to claim a majority amongst them. They control the type of churchmanship in their churches, and they affect the character of the representation on the governing bodies of the Church. Some representatives in sympathy with us will be elected in some parishes or deaneries where the clergy are not of our way of thinking, and a limited cumulative vote will help, but we can hardly look for that majority which we claim would fairly represent our position amongst the laity of our Church. One might hope that a desire for the adequate recognition of all sections of the Church in the National Assembly might prevail, but there is ground for fear that the attempt will be made to obtain as large a share of the representation as possible and to swamp other sections. Parliamentary government and party politics are not the best models, and those who copy them in Church affairs must be a little less ready to bandy the charge of Erastianism than heretofore.

If we are to find our way to the National Assembly, we must have adequate organization. For this end we cannot do better than utilize the good offices of the National Church League. Some of our friends have looked askance at it, but it has done good work, by which many outside its ranks have profited, and it deserves well of us. The dear Bishop of Durham, who has left us so recently, felt of late years the value of the League, from which he had stood apart for long, and he became a Vice-President of the League some time ago. If we attach ourselves to the League, we do not join it with any wish to accentuate party divisions. There has been a breaking down of these divisions of late years. The different sections of the Church of England have learned from each other. Each school has assimilated certain of the principles and adopted certain of the methods of each other school. We admire the heroism and self-sacrifice of many who wish to capture and commit the Church to a pre-Reformation and mediæval position. We appreciate much in their work. We are drawn to the Christ that is in them. But we must defend the Evangelical and Protestant character of the Church of England, and we entertain some fear that an attempt may be made to exploit the grant of self-government with a view to change the character of the worship of the Church of England. We have been styled No-Churchmen; we have been told that we were out of place in the Church of England, but we desire no change in the doctrinal balance or in the ritual directions of the Book of

Common Prayer. We are keen on Prayer Book Revision, but we wish to modernize rather than to antiquate our national liturgy.

There is thus a possibility that the exercise of self-government by the Church may revive and deepen the previously declining party divisions. Even if it does, and this we should deplore, the National Assembly is worth the risk, and we enter it with the cause of the Gospel and humanity at heart, and with an eye not to any sectional interest, but to the welfare of the whole Church.

Our positive contribution to the work of the National Assembly will be along the lines of what have been our distinguishing marks in the history of the last two centuries, - to go back no further. We have stood for the preaching of Christ as the Saviour of men; for the place of faith in the personal acceptance of Christ; for the continuous contact with the indwelling Saviour; for the direct touch with Him without any human mediation; for the primacy of the Ministry of the Word; for the gift of the Ministry to help men's joy rather than to have dominion over their faith; for liberty to all the Lord's people to prophesy; for the place of the laity in Christian work. Our best traditions tell of devotion to missionary enterprise. The work of Missions Overseas tends to become more difficult. There is a danger that with new and coming difficulties this work may be relegated to a subordinate place. We shall try through the National Assembly to keep what we may still call Foreign Missions in the forefront of the Church's interests. Our earliest modern Evangelicals were marked by keen interest in social problems. The emancipation of slaves abroad and virtual slaves at home was effected mainly by Evangelical Churchmen. Injustice has sometimes been done to the Evangelical school on this score, but the Gospel which our forefathers preached was an emancipating, uplifting, and ennobling influence. Its new wine burst many an old bottle in its time. Return to these traditions will mark our policy in the National Assembly.

Our influence will be exerted in the great cause of Re-union. While some long for reunion with the Eastern Churches, or even with the Church of Rome, we begin nearer home. We hope for a reunion with the Nonconformist Churches; and not for a reunion which will mean mere absorption of these Churches by the Church of England, but one which will preserve their self-respect, recognizing their position as Churches, and retaining what is of special value in the contribution of each to the Catholic Church of Christ.

We shall have a special eye to the place of the laity in the councils of the Church. We shall favour all that tends to place more power in their hands. The records of early Church history remind us that the divergence between the clergy and the laity was not so strongly marked as it is to-day. Mr. Rackham, in Bishop Gore's *Essays on Church Reform*, tells us that the laity were entrusted with wide powers, even in the election of bishops and the settlement of Church doctrine. Bishop Gore himself says, "To co-ordinate the laity with the clergy (and let it be said, Presbyters and Bishops) in regulating the affairs of the Church is only deliberately to return to the

primitive ideal of the New Testament and the purest Christian centuries." Again he says, "All through the Nicene troubles, the informal influence of the faithful laity who would not accept Bishops or teachers who represented alien doctrine, was so great a counterpoise to imperial pressure that it is the opinion of well-informed contemporaries that in that great crisis the laity saved the Church."

The present constitution of the National Assembly needs considerable amendment. The laity deserve fuller powers than are accorded to them. There is no reason why measures which relate to worship should emanate only from the House of Bishops, or why amendment of such measures should be denied to the laity. To discuss details would open up some large questions, so I merely urge that Evangelicals should aim at developing the powers of the laity in the government of the Church. We need courage and confidence. The laity have saved the Church before. They may do so again.

Our policy in the National Assembly will be to help, not to hurt ; to impress, to co-operate, to improve, to advance ; where necessary, to repress, to prevent ; to foster the freedom of the Spirit rather than the narrowness of ecclesiasticism ; to emphasize the inner life as well as external order ; to develop spiritual rather than ecclesiastical power ; to make the Church of England the minister rather than the master of the English people. Our power in the Church assemblies does not depend even mainly on the number in which we go there. "Was Canon A. there to-day?" asked a clergyman of his friend in a Church assembly where there was scarcely another Evangelical. "I do not think he was," the reply came, "for there is something about him, that you are always conscious of his presence, even if you do not see him in the room."

II.

BY ALBERT MITCHELL, Member of the National Church Assembly.

THE National Assembly of the Church of England is not created or constituted by Act of Parliament or by any action of the State. The Act of Parliament that we call, for convenience, "The Enabling Act" (although its full title is the "Church of England Assembly (Powers) Act, 1919"), did not create the Assembly, as the heading and preamble to that Act clearly recognize ; nor does the fact that the constitution of the Assembly is included in the schedule to the Act imply that it is given to the Church by the State. "The Enabling Act" recognizes an accomplished fact, and makes provision in respect of the "powers in regard to legislation touching matters concerning the Church of England" which the State recognizes ought to be conferred on the Church Assembly . . . "constituted in the manner set forth" in "addresses presented to His Majesty" by "the Convocations of Canterbury and York."

Who then is the parent of the Church Assembly? There is only one possible reply: "The Representative Church Council"—the purely voluntary body that, since 1904, had been patiently engaged in the work of constitution building, and automatically ceases to exist, as its own child, the Assembly, comes into existence.

It is in the study of history that we find the clue to the understanding of our own times. I am but paraphrasing the famous dictum of a great student. The period of the silencing of Convocations lasted from 1717 to 1852; and, during that period, the political history of England included a complete transference of the balance of power, and great changes in voting and legislative and administrative methods. When, after the lapse of nearly a century and a half, the ancient Church Assemblies of Bishops and Clergy attempted to take up again the thread of workaday existence, they discovered themselves to be anachronisms; and they have ever since been engaged in the pathetic attempt to overtake Time. In 1717, the Houses of Parliament still represented the Laity of the Church, and knew that there was a constitutional kinship between them and the Convocations of the Clergy. In 1852, Parliament had ceased to be even nominally composed of churchmen, and scarcely any one took Convocations seriously. The Church was inarticulate; most people supposed (without thinking) that it was quite right that it should be so, and treated such inarticulateness as one of the fundamental conditions of what it had become the fashion to term "the Establishment." If any one thought otherwise, and sought a remedy, public opinion referred such a dreamer to what is euphemistically termed "Disestablishment," the effect of which, it was indolently assumed, would be miraculously to put the laity into their proper place—the precedent of Ireland, after 1870, being gravely quoted as final and authoritative!

In 1885, under the leadership of Archbishop Benson, a House of Laymen for the Province of Canterbury was brought into being. In 1892, a similar House was constituted at York. In 1902, the Canterbury House suggested a National Council of the whole Church; and this was constituted and convened, in 1904, by the quite simple device of bringing together the four houses of Convocation and the two houses of Laymen into one room for common deliberation—The Representative Church Council. Because this Council, like the Houses of Laymen, had no parliamentary sanction, it was the fashion to belittle it as of no legal authority, and to ignore its work and action. Those who, with a better understanding of the lessons of English history and a clearer vision of the future, struggled to take their part in the making of history, were regarded by most churchmen as faddists and devotees of an interesting hobby. But the Representative Church Council has made good; and the National Assembly, now in course of convention, is the natural and inevitable fruit of the work of the Representative Church Council, and of that work alone. The constitution of the Church Assembly was framed by the Representative Church Council and presented to the Church by the Council. The old

Clerical Convocations have sponsored it, and the King in Parliament has recognized it. It is in being. And, on all sides, people who sleepily and dreamily disregarded all the constructional work, and idly imagined that until "Disestablishment," diversely regarded, came upon them from without, all things would continue as in the great nineteenth century, have awaked with a shock to find that something like a revolution has taken place; and there is not a little danger of heads being turned. That is why we are asked to-day to consider the subject of Evangelicals and the National Church Assembly.

The functions and powers of the Assembly are regulated by clause 14 of the constitution :—

14. *Functions of the Assembly.*—The functions of the Assembly shall be as follows :—

- (1) The Assembly shall be free to discuss any proposal concerning the Church of England and to make provision in respect thereof, and where such provision requires parliamentary sanction the authority of Parliament shall be sought in such manner as may be prescribed by statute :

Provided that any measure touching doctrinal formulæ or the services or ceremonies of the Church of England or the administration of the Sacraments or sacred rites thereof shall be debated and voted upon by each of the three Houses sitting separately, and shall then be either accepted or rejected by the Assembly in the terms in which it is finally proposed by the House of Bishops.

- (2) The Assembly or any of the three Houses thereof may debate and formulate its judgment by resolution upon any matter concerning the Church of England or otherwise of religious or public interest :

Provided that it does not belong to the functions of the Assembly to issue any statement purporting to define the doctrine of the Church of England on any question of theology, and no such statement shall be issued by the Assembly.

May I call attention to the wording "to discuss *any* proposal concerning the Church of England, and to make provision in respect thereof," and again, "may debate and formulate its judgment by resolution upon any matter concerning the Church of England." No terms could be wider. Note, also, the phrase, "Where such provision requires parliamentary sanction." That obviously means that it is contemplated that "provision" may be made which may not require "parliamentary sanction." Some may ask how such provision will be enforced; and I will then reply with a counter question, "How do the Bishops enforce upon the Church numerous provisions that lack parliamentary sanction?" The fact is, whether we like it or dislike it, the powers of the new Assembly will be limited in practice only by the willingness of the episcopate to enforce its decisions. If legal coercion is required, then parliamentary sanction must be sought; but there is a whole world of possibilities in between before that becomes necessary.

So the first thing that we Evangelicals have got to get clear in our heads is this: that those who ignore or despise the Assembly do so at their peril. It will be an ill thing to attempt to flout it. And the next thing we must be quite clear about is that the Assembly

having been constituted, any control henceforth exercised by Parliament will be so exercised on political, constitutional, and national grounds only, and not on religious grounds.

Therefore we must face the fact that henceforth it is in the National Church Assembly that we have to give our witness to the truth, to assert our rightful place and responsibility in church life, and to serve our Master and His Church, according to the privilege and call that God has given to us as Evangelical churchmen. If we fail there, in the purity of our witness, in the faithful consistency of our principles, in the courage of our convictions, and in the effectiveness of our resistance to that which we regard as adverse to God's will and truth, then we have no second line of defence; we cannot look to Parliament to save us from the consequences of our failure.

I do not think it is possible to over-emphasize the importance of this point. We cannot hug to ourselves the idea of an appeal from the Assembly to Parliament. The House of Commons will not intervene to protect us from our own Church Assembly. I would like to say this over and over again till the solemn and far-reaching consequences of any failure in the Assembly are burned into our very souls. Whether from a positive or from a negative standpoint, we must make our stand—our last stand—with all our might and power, *in the Assembly*. *It is the Assembly* that matters henceforth.

Now if it be as I have said, see the great responsibility that is thrown upon us all. No Evangelical clergyman and no Evangelical layman can afford to put the subject aside as of secondary importance. Looked at from that sectional point of view that of necessity suggests itself to our minds, the continued existence of the Evangelical section—or school, if you prefer the term—I do not—in the Church may hang upon the wise, patient and uncompromising vindication of its essential principles in the National Assembly. But looked at from the bigger, broader, deeper point of view, that matters far more to every one of us here, who knoweth if we be not come to the kingdom for such a time as this? May it not well be, in God's Providence, that the way of the desert through which Evangelicals have been called to pass in recent years has been the sifting and discriminating process necessary to fit us for the peculiar witness that God requires us to give in these critical days; and that in the fearless, unshaken re-assertion in the National Assembly of the principles that made the Reformation in the sixteenth century, and also that Evangelical Revival in the eighteenth century to which all that is best in modern Church life can mediately or immediately be traced, Evangelical churchmen may lead the Church of England to be articulate and to rediscover its own soul. Do not think this is rhetoric—I detest rhetoric. I want to be practical.

If this is our duty as Evangelicals, I want to lay down a few theses:—

1. If we are to give a clear witness in the Assembly, we must

go into it as Evangelicals. Principle and straightforward openness before tactics. Tactics rarely agree well with spiritual principles. "Be not . . . ashamed of the testimony of our Lord, nor of me His prisoner," counselled the old apostle to his young deputy. We must accept the reproach of the Gospel if we wish to share its power. If we are ashamed to be known in the Assembly (or the elections to the Assembly) as Evangelicals, we are not likely to *be* evangelical. Do not waste time upon platitudes, about greater unity, seeking opportunities of working with men of other schools, and such like. Those phrases are "common form"; and it is only those who are uneasy about their own strength who resort to them. What the Church and the Assembly will want to know is what is our *distinctive* positive contribution.

2. We must unite on a constructive basis. We must be "in," early, with our policy, and not simply wait to see to what of some one else's proposal we can say *Yes* or *No*! And we must be on our guard against the "divide and conquer" policy which the great adversary of all evangelical truth finds so effective. This involves frank conference among ourselves, and agreed and concerted action of all Evangelicals, under Evangelical leadership, on all points, and not merely on what are unhappily classed as party questions. To take one concrete example: we, as Evangelicals, must be ready with our own positive contribution to the debate on the powers to be conferred on Parochial Church Councils. *Ex uno disce omnes*. Let all Evangelicals stand together, and the relations of Evangelicals with other churchmen will "sort themselves." But if there is division in the Evangelical ranks, the "larger unity" will be illusive and delusive.

3. Then we must see to it that we have no axes of our own to grind among ourselves. One of the greatest hindrances to a constructive Evangelical policy will come from those with pet plans to push, because such people are often tempted to trim their sails to catch a passing breeze from any quarter. Closely connected with this danger is another—over-anxiety as to personal status and reputation. In both these particulars there must be a readiness to subordinate personal aims to the fidelity of the Evangelical witness, which is of much more importance than a transient triumph in some detail.

4. Then we must be prepared for sustained effort. That requires patience, dogged sticking to the post, and self-sacrifice. It is never possible to go into Church work as a pastime; we must pay the price if we are to deserve success. That points, among other things, to securing that representatives to the Assembly will take their work seriously. We must see to it that we do not suffer from the all too common practice of electing a man to the Assembly "because he cannot well be passed over." If our representatives do not *work*, we must call them to account.

5. We must recognize that the strength of Evangelical churchmanship in the Assembly will at first very much depend upon the laity. It will, I fear, be some little time at least before we can

hope for any very great representation in the Clerical Houses. And in any case, the numbers of the House of Laity will always be the greater. Do not let anything operate to drive a wedge between Evangelical clergy and Evangelical laity. Neither can do without the other. Let us hear no more cant about lay apathy, and let us trust and confide in one another. And, in this connexion, let it be remembered that the Assembly is the successor to the Council; and let us take full advantage of the experience of such members of the old Council who may secure re-election to the Assembly. Do not begin all over again.

6. And over all, and before all, and after all, let us take the whole matter of the Assembly—its elections, its meetings, its members, and its measures, before the Throne of the Heavenly Grace. Let it all be in our constant prayers whenever Evangelicals meet together, as in such Conferences as this, and in all details of preparation. I do hope that Evangelical members of the Assembly, as Evangelicals, will meet for prayer before and during every session, as well as before every election. There will be, in all probability, corporate services from which Evangelicals, by the nature of their principles, may possibly find themselves excluded by the ritual adopted—a most cruel wrong. Well, then, let them meet together themselves. It will be quite feasible. But, beyond that, let there be constant prayer about every detail of policy. Let us seek the Holy Spirit's lead in everything, great or small.

III.

BY THE REV. E. W. MOWLL, M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Southport.

THE machinery of the Church of England needed improvement. On that question there can be no doubt. Some of that improvement is available, and more is possible by the passing into law of the National Assembly Act. On that score we welcome it heartily. The Act has a democratic basis in consonance with the times in which we live. It opens up a new avenue of approach to the laity in matters of Church life and government, which they never possessed before. It compels Churchmen to take a wider view of Church life than that limited by the parochial horizon. It gives the Church a far greater opportunity of making her voice heard and her influence felt than she has ever known heretofore. The very fact that the members of Parochial Church Councils are *elected* gives much enhanced value to resolutions passed by them, whether they deal with Church affairs, civic affairs, or matters touching the country's well-being.

At the same time, let us face the fact that the number of those, who up to the present have signed the Declaration and are on the various Electoral Rolls, is insignificant when compared to the membership of the Anglican Communion. We are told that those who have not signed are not so much indifferent as ignorant. Now

is the time to enlighten such. Let us not wait till somewhere about Easter next year, for a whip-up, but seek at once and all through these coming months to increase the electorate.

The Parochial Church Councils, for the most part, have not sprung into existence alert and alive—bursting with enthusiasm and thirsting for hard work. On this point we should not be too disappointed. Rome was not built in a day. Is it not true to history to say that the parliamentary franchise has invariably been given before the new recipients were ready to exercise their privilege and responsibility to the full. It will fall largely to the Parochial Clergy and to the comparatively few ardent spirits among the laity to foster the membership of the Electoral Roll and the Parochial Church Council, and therein to train men and women to think and work, and pray for the Church as a whole, and to produce, by the grace of God, leaders who shall be statesmen of His Kingdom.

PRESSING NEEDS.

What are the pressing needs of the hour? Needs which cannot but occupy our minds at the present moment?

1. *What are the statutory powers we desire for the Parochial Church Councils?*

(a) In the first place may I make a humble plea for simplification and not multiplication. Let the Parochial Church Council supersede the ancient Vestry—Dual control is rarely satisfactory.

(b) Let the Council have control over the finances of the parish, and the Wardens act as Lords of the Treasury. It is a privilege longed-for by the laity, and rightly so. It is surely their sphere. At the same time it is a task which has been and is loathed by the clergy.

(c) By all means let the Council have power to make suggestions as to the conduct of services (within proper and well-defined limits), and the right to make some representation to the Patron of the benefice as to who should be appointed to minister to them.

(d) Should there not be a recognition of the fact that the provision and up-keep of a Vicarage or Rectory, especially with regard to dilapidations, is a parish matter, and not only the often overburdening responsibility of the Incumbent? The method in use among the Wesleyans has much to commend it.

2. *Should not the Act itself be amended in at least two particulars?*

(a) At present the Lay Representatives form the electorate of the House of Laity. Would not much greater interest be aroused if a more direct election from the parishes was in vogue? The expense entailed is, I know, against it.

(b) With a view again to simplification—should not the Lower House of Convocation, drastically reformed, become the House of Clergy in the National Assembly.

3. *Organisation.*—Another pressing need is closer—and yet wider—organisation of Evangelical Churchmen. In and around London this organisation appears to be excellent. With regard to the North there is still much room for improvement. When will

the "seccotine society" or federation for binding us together and not further splitting us up come into existence? Let us not be so foolish as to go on dissipating our forces. A central headquarters in London for co-ordinating, for advice, and for information is essential to success. The National Church League supplies this need.

These points have been and will be dealt with by other speakers much better qualified than I to place them before you. Let me pass on to another matter of great importance.

4. *The type of men and women who should be elected*, whether to the House of Laity—as Lay Representatives, or as members of the Parochial Church Council. We want to see elected to whatever office, the best brains and the wisest heads, men and women of affairs, possessed with "a superabundance of sanctified common sense, and animated with a spirit of self-sacrifice, willing at whatever cost to home-life, time and commercial interest, to attend to the duties devolving upon them. They should be folks who know where they stand, what they stand for, and at what they are aiming, and yet have a breadth of outlook and vision which enable them to gauge the force, course, and ultimate end of the various movements in the Church. Probably we all agree upon these requirements. But let us remember that although we organise up to the hilt and evolve (on paper) a perfect machine, although we win elections, secure majorities, and gain the reforms, amendments and powers we seek, yet "Except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it."

(a) *Those who look back.* We desire to see elected those who are students of history. Men and women who will not discard but rather build upon the gains, so hardly won, of the past—those who will be true to Reformation principles and proud of their descent from the great Evangelical Revivalists, who did so much to transform our land at the close of the eighteenth century. Such folks will bring no mean contribution to enrich the life-blood of the Church in our own day.

(b) *Those who look right on.* We need, too, to elect those whose eyes look right on, whose faces are set Sionwards, who know that their citizenship is in heaven, whose one aim is the Glory of God in the coming of His Kingdom. To this end let us remember that in days gone by God chose the foolish things of the world, that He might put to shame them that are wise: and God chose the weak things of the world that He might put to shame the things that are strong (1 Cor. i. 27 R.V.). When He wanted a statesman, a king, a leader for His people, He selected a humble shepherd lad, one who was faithful in life's little things—and not a clever courtier. He chose, I know, an Isaiah—well versed in the ways of the palace and *au fait* in matters pertaining to state-craft. Another time He chose a Daniel, an administrator par excellence, but He also picked out a herdman to be His prophet. The so-prayerfully selected apostles of our Lord—the men whom He so implicitly trusted to "carry on" after His Ascension were for the most part "unlearned and ignorant men," though I know the early Christian Church owes more than

she can ever gauge to the intense spirituality and great intellectuality of St. Paul. In those first days in order to increase efficiency, to perfect their organisation and administration, and to keep everything in true perspective, the apostles appointed seven men, whose qualifications were that they were of "good report, full of the Spirit and wisdom" (Acts vi. 3). Well will it be for the National Church Assembly if these qualifications are possessed by each of its members.

We desire to see elected men and women who are not merely Protestants (as that term is usually used) but who are witnesses for Truth—the Truth as it is in Jesus. We need not merely clever speakers, skilled in all the arts of dialectic, but folks who are filled with the spirit of that wisdom which is from above, and infilled and overflowing with the Holy Ghost. We want as our elected representatives not simply the student or the master of Church History, but men and women who humbly and constantly sit at the feet of Jesus and seek at all times to do His will. In a word, the necessary attributes of each should be—God-given wisdom and deep spirituality.

Above all the greatest need of to-day is Prayer. The Church at large should be roused to this work; nothing—neither conferences—nor scheming—not even the best-laid plans can prevail without it. The Parochial Church Councils, the House of Laity—indeed, the three Houses of the National Assembly, if they are to accomplish anything of permanent value to the life of the Church and her main duty—viz., the hastening of the coming of our Redeemer's Kingdom—must be backed up by earnest, continuous, persistent prayer.

If we would make full use of this Act of Parliament let us remember that our work is but just begun—the road is a long one—sustained interest and effort, and self-forgetting service are vital, but that prayer, humble and full of faith—prayer which continually seeks the guidance of the Holy Spirit for the discovery and the doing of God's will, is absolutely essential to success.

IV.

BY THE REV. CANON ALFRED ALLEN, M.A.,
Vicar of Rotheram.

WHILE the Enabling Bill was before the country, and being debated in the Houses of Parliament, it met with opposition from men of all schools of thought, some of our most devout and earnest Evangelicals being amongst them. Now that it has been placed on the Statute Book by large majorities in both Houses, and, above all, was approved, all but unanimously, by our Convocations and the Representative Church Council, it behoves us all to set aside our opposition. We must take our places—all we can get—in the Church Assembly, the Diocesan Conferences, and the Parochial Church Council, and do our utmost to make them effective in the development of our Church and the increase of the cause of Christ in our land. The part Evangelicals played in some of the

developments of the last century is not altogether to our credit, and, indeed, I think I may truly say has injured the Evangelical cause. When the Convocations were revived, and the Church Congress, Diocesan Conferences, and the Lambeth Conference were started, Evangelicals, as a body, stood aloof, and the few who did join in them—great and good men as they were—were sneered at, and their faithfulness to our cause all but doubted. We must not make such a mistake now. We are not embarking on a scheme for which we have no precedent and nothing to guide us.

We take the Bible as our guide, and the Church Assembly Act is a reversion to the Church government of the earliest times. In Acts xv., we read of the first Council of the Church, in which a doctrinal question of the highest importance to the Church had to be settled. Archbishop Benson says: "It was determined by the Apostles and the Elders, together with the whole Church, unless this is thought to be mere rhetoric."

Again we have the example in modern times of the Disestablished Church, in Ireland, and the unestablished Churches in all our Dominions, whose constitutions are very similar to that which has been accorded to us. How has the system worked with them? The leaders in all these Churches speak in the highest terms of the working of their Church Councils, and are especially loud in their praises of the influence of the laity, which, they say, has been all for good. The laity are the conservative element, who will not agree to any change unless clearly convinced of its necessity. They are impatient at the desire to revert to mediæval practices, and look at matters from the present-day need, of which their knowledge of men and things enables them to be good judges. The majority of the laity belong to no extreme section of the Church, and their presence in the Councils has lessened the bitterness of party strife, and restrained excesses. Now, why should Evangelicals take their place in the Church Assembly?

1. We believe that the laity, as well as the clergy, are a "Holy Priesthood," and, therefore, should have their rightful place in the government of the Church. We were the first to use the ministrations of Laymen, and thereby aroused much opposition, although events have proved that we were pioneers in a movement which has so developed that we have Diocesan Lay Readers' Associations all over the land. Our Evangelical Societies have always had many laymen on their committees, and the work has given them a greater knowledge of the teaching of the Church and a deeper interest in her welfare. May I not also truly say that their presence has led to more practical views and a greater dispatch in business. Thus we cannot but rejoice that we shall now be able to have their counsel and help in the great Assembly of the Church.

2. We stand by the Reformation Settlement, and accept the Prayer Book and Articles as containing the true doctrine of the Church. Articles 20 and 34 tell us that the Church "has authority in matters of faith, and power to decree or change rites and ceremonies, according to the diversities of countries, times and

men's manners." Now, this is our firm belief. We are not averse, as is sometimes said, to all change. We wish to have our Prayer Book revised and enriched by the addition of much-needed forms of service, but we maintain that the doctrinal standard should not be altered. Professor Vinet said: "We want no new Gospel, for that which is new is not true; but, on the other hand, whatever is not, in a sense, new—that is, is not adapted to the thought and development of the age—is not wholly true either." Again, the Preface to the Prayer Book exactly expresses our views when it says: "As on the one side common experience sheweth, that where a change hath been made of things advisedly established (no evident necessity so requiring), inconveniences have ensued, many times more and greater than the evils intended to be remedied; so on the other side, the particular forms of Divine Worship, and the rites and ceremonies appointed to be used therein, being things in their own nature indifferent and alterable, and so acknowledged, it is but reasonable that upon weighty and important considerations, according to the various exigency of times and occasions, such changes and alterations should be made therein, as, to those that are in place of authority, should from time to time seem either necessary or expedient." This is our attitude, and in the Church Assembly we shall have the support not only of those laymen who are Evangelical, but of the vast majority of the lay members.

3. Again, most Evangelicals are as dissatisfied with our Ecclesiastical Courts as are the members of any other school of thought. We kick at decisions based on appeals to laws and regulations made in mediæval times, when conditions were utterly different. But no sensible man could dispute the decisions of the living Church of the day. Evangelicals, both clergy and laity, should be prepared to contribute their part to both the framing and administering of these regulations. We must admit that there are many abuses in the Church which ought to be removed.

4. While Evangelicals must never waver from their belief in the necessity of personal holiness in the individual, we cannot but rejoice at the deepening of the idea of the corporate life of the Church. The whole framework of the Church Assembly Act is built upon this idea. The laity have recognised this, and are entering into the working of the Act with real interest and enthusiasm. The Parochial Church Councils, Diocesan Conferences, and Representative Church Council—all voluntary bodies with no legal powers—have done much to prepare men to take their part in the new Councils of the Church with their statutory powers. The members of these bodies have learned to look at matters from other men's point of view; to realise that we must be tolerant to whatever comes within the limits of the doctrine and practice of our Church. They have learned the difficulties of the work of their ministers, and are more ready to help; they realise the inadequacy of the finances of the Church, and are seeking to remedy it. With added powers and responsibility there cannot fail to be added interest, and added interest always leads to increased effort.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

BOOKS ON THE OLD TESTAMENT.

- (1) OLD TESTAMENT PROPHETS. By W. A. C. Allen, Cambridge: *W. Heffer & Sons*. 6s. net; (2) THE OLD TESTAMENT: ITS MEANING AND VALUE FOR THE CHURCH TO-DAY. By R. H. Malden, M.A., sometime Principal of Leeds Clergy School. London: *Macmillan & Co.* 6s. net; (3) UTOPIA ACCORDING TO MOSES. By M. D. R. Willink, S.Th. London: *S.P.C.K.* 6s. 6d. net.

The sub-title of (i.) *Old Testament Prophets* is "a study in Personality." The author is a clear thinker and a lucid writer. In Biblical criticism he is a follower of Professor Sayce. Religion, he says, is a subject to which every human being without exception has given some thought; it reaches down to the bed-rock of our nature. But the majority of men are unable to give clear expression to their religious ideas. When, therefore, there appears a person who has the power of clearly expressing their ideas, they hail that person as "a seer, a man of genius, a prophet; his teaching becomes authoritative." As no religion can exist long without some institution, temples are built, services and ceremonies are performed, and the officials are accorded favours and privileges. Thus a national Church is established and its religious beliefs are formulated. Now faith is based on experience. As experience grows, the interpretation of faith changes. "Men begin to formulate in their own minds professions of their belief which differ widely from those officially taught." This causes a cleavage between the established religion and the religion which a great number of citizens really hold. "Under the circumstances the outward forms no longer correspond to the inward belief." So, there is need once more of another prophet. The teaching of this new prophet is regarded as subversive of the old form. The prophet is persecuted, but, if he is a true prophet, that is, if his preaching is based upon real experience, victory will be on his side, his new form of religious worship will be adopted, and so faith will be enlarged. Such was the case among the Hebrew people, says Mr. Allen, and he then proceeds to prove it by an examination of the religious history of the Israelites. He runs through each period of the Hebrew history and traces the development of religious thought through the activities of the Hebrew prophets. The book is altogether thoughtful and its perusal is likely to strengthen the faith of educated young men in the reality of a Divine revelation through the Hebrew people.

Mr. Malden is a convinced Churchman. He holds to the belief "that the Old Testament points to the New, and that the Figure drawn in the Gospel is a historically accurate portrait, against or beyond Whom there can never be any question of appeal" (p. viii). He is also a believer in the findings of the modern critics. Believing that much of the Old Testament is a matter of perplexity to many Christians, he has written (ii.) *The Old Testament: its Meaning and Value for the Church To-day* in order to help to resolve such perplexities. He deals briefly with the whole of the Old Testament. His book is, in fact, an introduction as well as a history of the Old Testament, written to show that, rationally regarded, the Hebrew Scriptures are inspired by God. No doubt, there are statements in the book to which some of our readers will take exception; but those who can read a book with discrimination will find in this volume many stimulating and helpful thoughts. We cannot do better than give a condensed account of what the author says

about the Fall :—" The story of the Fall is a meditation upon Sin marked by very profound spiritual insight. It may be summarized as follows : (1) Sin goes back to the early dawn of human history ; (2) It is neither inevitable nor involuntary ; (3) The first outcome of Sin is to destroy the relationship which ought to exist between Man and his Maker ; (4) The immediate practical consequences of Sin are serious and lasting ; (5) But though the power of Sin is great, Man may overcome it. The struggle is not hopeless. The Seed of the Woman is destined to bruise the serpent's head " (pp. 54-5).

In (iii.) *Utopia According to Moses*, Miss Willink has hit upon a new way of writing on the Social Teaching of the Old Testament. She describes a young officer, who had been a student of the works of Plato and of Sir Thomas More, going to Palestine. There he is wounded. During his state of unconsciousness, he is introduced to the Hebrew Commonwealth, after the time of Ezekiel, when the Mosaic laws are supposed to be in full operation with all the promised results. He interviews judges, priests, prophets and kings and makes an exhaustive examination of the institutions of the Kingdom of Zion. He gives a graphic account of the Body Politic, the Ideas about Private Property, the Religious Observances, the Position of Women, the Work of the Prophets, the general conception about God and about Holiness, and so we get a charming picture of the Ideal Hebrew Commonwealth according to Moses. In the Mosaic Utopia the standard for both sexes is equal, the family is the object of special care, the right of private property is maintained, but nobody becomes over-rich or unduly poor. The government is theocracy, and the foreign policy is regulated by the use of Urim and Thummim and the advice of the prophets. " The prophet doesn't care twopence how unpopular his advice is likely to be if he knows that it is inspired " (p. 35). The Law forbids multiplying horses lest the nation should be tempted to wage wars of aggression. We may say that Miss Willink has read widely and gives all the Biblical references in the margin. She has got some sense of humour. She says : " I'll talk about Moses ben Amram, and you can take it as meaning Messrs. J. E. D. and P. Moses, Unlimited " (p. 11). We can heartily recommend this book for Bible Study Circles.

KHODADAD E. KEITH.

OUR LORD BEFORE THE SANHEDRIN.

TRACTATE SANHEDRIN, Mishnah and Tosefta. Translated from Hebrew with brief annotations by Herbert Danby, M.A., Sub-warden of St. Deiniol Library, Hawarden. London : S.P.C.K. 6s. net.

The language of the Mishnah, being concise and technical, is often very difficult to render into another tongue. Mr. Danby has succeeded in giving us an intelligible translation with valuable explanatory notes.

The Tractate, dealing with the " higher legislative Courts, their constitution, authority and method of procedure," is invaluable for the light that it throws on the trial and condemnation of our Lord before the Sanhedrin. Unfortunately we cannot be quite sure whether a Tractate which was put into writing by the *Pharisees* at the end of the second century reflects faithfully the normal practice of the first-century Sanhedrin which was largely under the control of the Sadducean priesthood. Mr. Danby says : " If we assume that the *Gospels* give us an essentially complete account of a formal trial before the Sanhedrin of a prisoner charged with blasphemy, and if likewise we assume that all the details of procedure laid down in the *Tract*

Sanhedrin were in operation in the first half of the first century, only one conclusion is open to us: our Lord's trial was no trial at all, and His condemnation was illegal" (p. ix). He does not tell us how it was that the Sanhedrin, who was such sticklers for the letter of the law, came to act so illegally. We would suggest an answer. The charge brought against our Lord was not that of blasphemy *only*, it was also one of "*beguiling*" or "*deceiving*," i.e., tempting men to apostasy. This is the clear testimony of the Talmud. In the Babylonian Talmud, *Sanhedrin*, 107b. (uncensored Edition), we read: "Jesus the Nazarene practised magic and *led astray and deceived* Israel." Now according to both Talmuds, the customary rules of capital trial were in abeyance in the case of a "*beguiler*." Nay, even fraudulent means might be employed to entrap such a heretic (*Mishnah*, *Sanhedrin* vii. 10a.; *Tosephta* x. 11). We are further told that such deceitful means were actually employed against Ben Stada—a veiled term in the Jewish writings for our Lord; "And thus they did to Ben Stada in Lud, and they hung him on the eve of Passover" (*Babylonian Talmud*, 67a). We have also the evidence of the New Testament that the enemies of our Lord did bring such an accusation against Him (*Matt.* xxvii. 63; *Jn.* vii. 12 and 47). This, we believe, will explain the reprehensible attitude of the Sanhedrin against our Lord.

Mr. Danby has rendered a great service to the students of the New Testament by his solitary translation of the Tractate *Sanhedrin*.

K. E. KEITH.

LEADERS OF THE CANADIAN CHURCH.

LEADERS OF THE CANADIAN CHURCH. Edited with a Preface by the Rev. W. Bertal Henney, B.A., B.D. London: S.P.C.K. 8s. 6d. net.

An attractive volume giving, as Dr. H. M. M. Hackett says in his Foreword to this English edition, "a vivid picture of the Canadian Church." The story begins with Bishop Charles Inglis who was consecrated Bishop of Nova Scotia at Lambeth Palace Chapel, on August 12, 1787. He had the oversight of an immense Diocese and he found himself confronted by conditions that were the reverse of encouraging, but he was a man of untiring energy and high ideals and a strict disciplinarian. It seems strange to us to-day to read of a Bishop who took exception to a free and open Church as he did on one occasion! The story of Bishop Jacob Mountain's Episcopate,—he was consecrated Bishop of Quebec in 1793,—is told by Canon Kittson. He was a man of marked ability, and the account of his objections to the appointment of a titular Roman Catholic Bishop of Quebec reveals his courage. John Strachan, Bishop of Toronto, is described as the greatest statesman and ecclesiastical administrator that Canada ever had. The story of John Medley's life is full of interest. Never physically robust, he was nevertheless a strong man in other ways, and was consecrated Bishop of Fredericton in 1845, and his Episcopate extended to forty-eight years. No one could be better qualified than Dr. Peck for writing of Bishop Horden and his untiring labours in the great lone land, and the account of his life and work is an inspiration. Archbishop Bond, Bishops Sullivan and Baldwin, both of Huron Diocese, all of them men of parts and wide experience, are better known, of course, than the men of the earlier generation. Bishops DuMoulin and Carmichael are the last of the ten prelates who played so important a part in the making of the Canadian Church, and the ten photogravure portraits are certainly not the least interesting pages in a book that as a whole constitutes a fine record of devoted service rendered by men of very varied types and different

characteristics and temperaments. It is remarkable to notice what a large proportion of these men—five out of ten—were Irish by birth or descent,—in fact, three of them, Sullivan, Carmichael and DuMoulin, all set sail in the same vessel,—a fact which reminds Archdeacon Davidson, who writes on the latter, of a certain book, "*Three Men in a Boat*," and of the story of the Examining Chaplain who asked a Candidate if he were familiar with the writings of Jerome and received the astounding reply, "Yes; I like them awfully. I think *Three Men in a Boat* is the best!" This will indicate the fact that there are gleams of humour in these biographical sketches.

S. R. C.

OVERSEA MISSIONS.

THE SUPREME CRUSADE. By Constance Morison, B.A. With a Preface by Sir Alfred W. W. Dale, M.A., LL.D. London: R.T.S. 3s. net.

Mrs. Morison has given us in a little book of less than 160 pages what is well described as a clear statement of the case for Oversea Missions. She calls it a Crusade because of the real meaning of the word,—“which implies a cross somewhere in the proceedings,” and because she feels, as we must all do, that the missionary enterprise of the Churches is really “the war of the Cross of Jesus Christ on the rampant evils abroad in the world.” The most common objections of the opponents of missions,—(1) that there are plenty of heathen at home who should be evangelized first; (2) that the people of non-Christian lands have religions better suited to them than Christianity and much in them that is good; (3) that the character of converts shows that missions are a failure and that Christianity is not suitable for all peoples; and (4) that our Lord never taught the necessity of foreign missions,—all these are answered with considerable force and effect. There are some useful hints under the heading “The Home Base” and “Training.” For instance, she suggests that the matter in our magazines should be of two kinds,—articles specially written for New Readers and others for Constant Readers, and this because some people never read the articles that are packed with names and statistics and because, too, not all missionaries have the gift of writing attractively, and many have to write under difficulties and at times of high pressure. Those who are prayerfully trying to prepare themselves for a missionary life will find much to help them, and many who have never thought of the world-wide, present-day opportunities may, in reading these pages, hear the insistent Call of the Christ for service and sacrifice. Mrs. Morison has some apposite remarks upon the Second Coming. While recognizing that there is considerable divergence of opinion as to the time and manner of the Lord’s return, she fastens attention on the two promises—“Blessed are those servants whom the Lord when He cometh shall find *watching*,” and “Blessed is that servant whom his Lord when He cometh shall find . . . *doing*.” We hope for this little book the circulation it deserves.

S. R. C.

